

Response to PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMENTS  
PUBLIC MEETINGS - DECEMBER 19<sup>th</sup> 2007, JANUARY 16<sup>th</sup> AND JANUARY 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008  
MINDEN-TAHOE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

Comment/Question	Response
1. The key people should wear name tags indicating who they are and who they represent so that citizens with concerns know who to direct questions to.	Agreed. We will address this for future public meetings.
2. What is going to happen in 10 years regarding property values?	The airside alternatives are not anticipated to have a significant effect on flight tracks or flight patterns in the vicinity of the Airport, and it is unlikely that the implementation of the Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) will negatively affect surrounding home values.
3. Will planning be broken down into stages?	Yes, the implementation of the CDP will be phased into short term (0-5 years), medium term (6-10 years) and long term (11-20 years) time frames.
4. Why don't junkets operate with a standard pattern?	The County, as the sponsor of the Airport has no authority over aircraft in flight. The County and airport staff can make recommendations for aircraft flight paths for noise abatement purposes; however, the decision to follow those designated paths is at the sole discretion of the aircraft operator in accordance with FAA rules and regulations pertaining to aircraft in flight.
5. What guided the development of the assumptions?	The assumptions listed at the beginning of Working Paper 3 are guided by the analysis included in Working Papers 1 and 2, FAA Advisory Circular 150/5070-6B entitled Airport Master Plans, direction from airport staff and the BOCC and the BOCC resolution passed in May of 2007.
6. Please define "commercial service aircraft operations"	In Assumption One we are stating that <i>no plans for public infrastructure to serve scheduled airlines</i> will be proposed.
7. East side infrastructure should be in place before any of these plans can be implemented.	Agreed. Some infrastructure is in place (e.g. Bliss Road), and the County is working on extending utility lines to this side of the Airport to adequately serve proposed development.
8. Explain what a "vital transportation facility" is?	A vital transportation facility would include any transportation infrastructure that connects Minden and Douglas County to the rest of the State and the rest of the country, including the Airport and the highways that service Douglas County.
9. Explain specifics when you talk about "enhancing soaring and improving operational safety"	The working papers very clearly explain how the development of both airside and landside facilities on the east side of the Airport will enhance soaring and improve both operational efficiency and safety at the Airport.
10. How large or small will the environmental impact be and what mitigation measures will be proposed?	The Master Plan environmental overview will address this question in an upcoming chapter of this Master Plan.
11. How will you enhance the self-sustaining ability of the Airport	One way we can plan to enhance the self-sustaining ability of the Airport is to recommend on-airport land uses that maximize revenue generation

Comment/Question	Response
and ensure the financial feasibility of airport development?	potential. The financial feasibility of the proposed development will be explained and clarified in an upcoming chapter.
12. How will you encourage the protection of existing public and private investment in land and facilities?	By planning the future layout of the Airport to take advantage of existing investments in facilities to the greatest extent possible and by planning to develop the Airport within the confines of existing airport property line to the greatest extent possible.
13. Why does capacity have to increase?	All planned infrastructure improvements included in the airside alternatives are designed to increase safety at the Airport and minimize runway crossings by pedestrians, golf carts, aircraft, gliders and other vehicles. Adding an additional runway is necessary to accomplish this goal. The increase in annual capacity of the Airport is a consequence of adding additional runway facilities. The point is well taken, however, that increasing capacity is not a goal of this Master Plan. The screening criterion related to airfield capacity was included to simply note the fact that some alternatives would increase the annual service volume (i.e. the capacity) of the Airport.
14. Glider efficiency, was west side considered in this analysis?	<p>Having landside glider facilities on the west side of the Airport requiring glider operators to cross Runway 16/34 to access the smaller runways is not considered efficient or consistent with current FAA design practices that discourage the crossing of runways. On the other hand, shortening Runway 16/34 to allow an access road across the south end would significantly limit fire bomber operations during fire season.</p> <p>While not universal agreement, we believe that we have reached a reasonable consensus with the glider community regarding the superiority of an east side development plan for gliders that would eliminate the consequences of west side glider operations, as described in the preceding paragraph. We have consulted with the glider community, and the majority of this community has accepted and embraced the east side plan. The glider community is obviously curious about the feasibility of the east side plan and what projects might be constructed when. This information will be provided in upcoming chapters of the Master Plan.</p>
15. For the segregation screening criteria, the east side infrastructure must first be completed.	Agreed, and again, the phasing of development projects will be outlined in upcoming chapters of the Master Plan.
16. The priority for “world class” soaring facilities is clear, what is unknown is the funding, schedule and final design.	Agreed. The potential funding sources, opportunities and challenges, as well as schedules, will be outlined in upcoming chapters of the Master Plan. Planning level cost estimates for each project will also be provided. Depending on the project, final design would not take place until 6 to 12 months prior to project construction.
17. An improved instrument approach is not needed, why is this a stated priority?	While there is no plan to improve the type of instrument approach or the published minimums for the existing instrument approach to the Airport, it is a sound airport planning principle to protect for potential improvements to approach procedures. This is primarily an on-airport land use planning effort that seeks to avoid development in certain areas of the Airport, or the distance between certain pavements (e.g. Runway Protection Zones, runway to taxiway separation, etc.) that could restrict the future improvement of the instrument approach procedures.
18. What is the purpose of	This is primarily related to the airside alternatives and their effect on the

Comment/Question	Response
maximizing the landside development area?	landside development area for gliders and small aircraft on the east side of the Airport. In order to plan for “world class” glider and sport aircraft facilities, we are looking for an airside alternative that maximizes the east landside area.
19. Where is the funding for land acquisition and why is it needed based on your projected operations?	Land acquisition for a demonstrated aeronautical need is eligible for FAA grant funding. If a land acquisition project is implemented, the County would be required to comply with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Policies Act which requires an appraisal and a review appraisal and offers the landowner fair market value for the land. The purpose and need for the land acquisition shown on the Conceptual Development Plan (CDP) is to shift (not extend) both Runways 12G/30G and 12/30 for safety related purposes. There are also elements of the CDP that could be implemented without any land acquisition or prior to land acquisition.
20. Most leases are out, what source of revenue generation were you considering and how much revenue are you estimating?	The Minden-Tahoe Airport is very unique for a general aviation airport of its size and operational level in that the airport is self-sustaining and currently generates enough revenue to cover its operations and maintenance expenses (less depreciation). Future revenue estimates and recommendations will be provided in upcoming chapters of the Master Plan.
21. While 95% of the capital for development comes from the FAA, this only supports the growth of the powered side of the Airport leaving glider improvements with no funds and a back seat.	The FAA grant eligibility for a project is not related to whether the project is designed for use by powered or non-powered aircraft. Many of the development projects planned for the east side of the Airport are eligible for FAA grant funding. However, it is recognized and understood that many of these projects, while eligible, may be of lower priority to the FAA, as they have less impact on the overall system of airports within the U.S. It is our understanding the design and construction of the aircraft apron, expansion of water lines for fire protection purposes, and the extension of Runway 12/30, allowing for the runway shift are all eligible FAA projects. The design of the East side apron and the extension of the water main have both been placed into the Airport’s Capital Improvement Program (ACIP) by the FAA for funding in federal fiscal year 2008. Moreover, future funding potential for each identified project will be analyzed in upcoming chapters of the Master Plan.
22. Airside Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are totally inappropriate for further discussion and planning.	We appreciate the sentiment, but respectfully disagree. Each of these three airside alternatives was designed to enhance safety and improve the operational efficiency of the Airport. In addition, it is our job as planners to provide our clients with options. All three alternatives were designed to stimulate thought, present concepts, and allow the client to review a full-range of improvement options for the undeveloped portions of the Airport.
23. What is the operational weight limit of the Airport including tarmacs and taxiways?	<p>The published weight bearing capacity of both existing paved runways is 30,000 lbs single wheel gear, 50,000 lbs dual wheel gear. There is also a 2002 pavement capacity study completed by Eckrose/Green Associates for the Nevada DOT that includes a capacity analysis of various sections of the runways, taxiways and aprons.</p> <p>This Master Plan will not make any recommendation related to the existing weight ordinance or any future weight or use ordinance. As discussed in the Chartering Session for the Working Group, this plan will</p>

Comment/Question	Response
	<p>merely reflect whatever policy decisions are made by Douglas County regarding the weight issue, should they be made while the Master Plan is being prepared. The master plan will recommend that the County keep the airport open to all general aviation users that can be accommodated based on the published weight bearing capacities of the runways. There has been much discussion about the weight bearing capacity of the runways and it is our understanding that the County is considering additional studies related to the pavement strength at the Airport to clarify this issue.</p> <p>The Master Plan will NOT recommend the strengthening of any existing runway or taxiway facilities to further accommodate larger aircraft, based upon the forecasted critical aircraft.</p>
<p>24. The community wants to develop a community and sports airport, not a commercial or regional commuter hub of small biz jets. Airport design must reflect these desires.</p>	<p>We certainly understand and appreciate this community desire; however, we cannot recommend that the County restrict any valid general aviation type or class of airport user that already allows such uses. Doing so would be contrary to FAA policy and federal grant assurances. We have, however, focused on facilitating the requirements to revitalize and enhance sport aviation at the airport, but not to the exclusion of other protected classes of general aviation users of the Airport.</p> <p>The Airport does not possess an Airport Operating Certificate under FAR Part 139, to our understanding, nor is the County planning to apply for any such Operating Certificate for scheduled air carrier service.</p>
<p>25. Use of airspace over the Carson Valley is a prime citizen concern and the Master Plan must address noise, pollution and safety concerns.</p>	<p>Agreed. Upcoming chapters of the Master Plan will review potential environmental effects of the Plan, including anticipated changes in the noise environment immediately surrounding the Airport. The CDP is not anticipated to substantially change flight tracks or flight patterns at the Airport. It is important to note that the County has no jurisdiction over aircraft in flight, once the wheels have left the ground. Aircraft in flight are under the sole jurisdiction of the FAA. Based upon current and forecast traffic levels, it is anticipated that air quality/pollution considerations will be of minimal concern, but will be reviewed as will all other National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) resource categories.</p>
<p>26. Jet approach and take-off patterns impact existing and approved residential neighborhoods, how can this impact be mitigated?</p>	<p>We are assuming this comment is related to residential home values and the impact of airport development on these values. The airspace alternatives are not anticipated to have a significant effect on flight tracks or flight patterns in the vicinity of the Airport, and it is unlikely that the implementation of the CDP will negatively affect surrounding home values.</p>
<p>27. How will the Airport Master Plan complement and support the stated goals of the Douglas County Master Plan?</p>	<p>The goals, policies and strategies of the 2006 Douglas County Master Plan were reviewed prior to the initiation of this Airport Master Plan. These goals, policies and strategies were also considered in the development of alternatives for the Airport and will be important considerations for the off-airport land use plan to be included in an upcoming chapter. It is very important that planned future off-airport land uses are compatible with airport operations. An example of an incompatible land use is the church constructed near the approach end of Runway 12. The off-airport land use plan included in this Airport Master Plan will assist the County in making future land use decisions in the vicinity of the Airport.</p>

Comment/Question	Response
28. The revised plan is lacking a parallel runway to the primary runway. This is needed for glider operations.	Following the Master Plan Work Group meeting 3, we organized a meeting with a consortium of glider pilots on October 26, 2007 at Soar Minden. The result of that meeting was suggested revisions to the CDP including the removal of Runway 16L/34R and the addition of some glider turnout areas on Runways 12G/30G and 12/30. Revisions to the glider staging aprons were also made as a result of this meeting.
29. The shift of Runway 12/30 to the southeast will improve safety, but will not completely solve the problem. The shift needs to completely separate the runways to solve the problem.	Agreed. However, based on our experience, our understanding of the potential funding availability and the stated goal of maximizing existing investment in airport infrastructure, we feel that the 1,640-foot shift of Runway 12/30 to the southwest is the best alternative. This provides enough runway length for most takeoff and landing operations on Runway 30 to either turn or stop prior to reaching the runway intersection with Runway 16/34.
30. December 19 <sup>th</sup> was a poor date to hold a public meeting due to holiday conflicts.	Noted. The public outreach program was designed to incorporate multiple meetings in various locations throughout Douglas County and at different times of day to allow for maximum participation. The County held additional public meetings on January 16 <sup>th</sup> , 17 <sup>th</sup> and 31 <sup>st</sup> . Furthermore, the public is invited to attend all Master Plan Work Group meetings, the next of which is scheduled for January 31 <sup>st</sup> . (Note: Attendance at the workshops indicate that the meeting on December 19 was the best attended meeting with 30 persons signing in. 24 persons signed in at the workshop on January 16 and 9 and 2 persons signed in for the respective workshops on January 17, 2008.)
31. An introduction to the meeting should have been conducted to explain the plans and how the meeting is conducted.	This workshop format was selected by the County and was appropriate for this setting. All background information and explanation is provided in the Working Papers available at each workshop, and the consultant team was on hand to personally describe the program elements to the public as they viewed the presentation boards. At any future public meetings the consulting team will make a stronger effort to better explain the open house format to attendees as they arrive at the workshop, so there is less meeting design confusion.
32. Do not downgrade west side glider facilities before the east side is ready.	Agreed. The current plan is to continue to maintain all apron and taxiway facilities on the west side of the Airport concurrent to construction of east side facilities.
33. Need Runway 21 ASAP.	Understood. This is a high priority project and will be included in the short-term capital improvement program pending FAA review and approval.
34. The ambiance and sense of welcome to soaring at Minden has been lost, this needs to be regained.	Understood. The east side glider/small aircraft facilities have been planned to improve the ambiance and sense of welcome at the Airport. The intent and desire is to make Minden-Tahoe Airport a premiere sport aircraft facility, welcoming and encouraging all forms of sport aviation.
35. Will a tower be built?	Theoretically this is a reasonable assumption, and an air traffic control tower could theoretically enhance the safety of the airport operating environment by providing for positive segregation of traffic. However, the Airport does not accommodate the necessary number of annual aircraft operations to qualify for a federally funded airport traffic control tower. Generally speaking, unless an airport has commercial service, an airport would have to have annual aircraft operations well in excess of 100,000 for the airport to be considered for the Contract Tower Program.
36. Will there be more jets?	The projected increase in both jet aircraft operations and based jet aircraft

Comment/Question	Response
	is included in Chapter 2, Forecasts of Aviation Activity. The forecasts included in this chapter have been approved by the FAA.
37. The County yards on airport property should be converted to airport uses.	From an airport planning perspective, changing the use of this parcel to aviation related has technical merit. Existing airport development surrounds the parcel and it has access to all utilities. However, that would be at a significant expense to Douglas County to alter the use of this land. We have not been asked by airport or county staff to plan for a future aeronautical use of this parcel and there would appear to be ample space for airport landside development without this parcel. If the relocation of the County yards is something the County decides to pursue, the CDP can be revised accordingly.
38. The County should not spend taxpayer dollars to purchase new land to expand our Airport. The Airport should use the existing footprint.	The purpose and need for the proposed land acquisition is to allow for a shift of both Runway 12/30 and 12G/30G for safety related purposes, not extend or otherwise expand either runway. Also, the funding for such land acquisition would likely be a combination of federal grants and on-airport generated revenue. No taxpayer dollars from the Douglas County general fund are anticipated to be expended for airport-related land acquisition.
39. I suggest Assumption One be revised to state "No more jets."	We understand and appreciate this suggestion related to the community desire to keep the Airport small and community oriented; however, we cannot recommend that the County restrict any valid general aviation type or class of airport user. This is a violation of FAA policy and federal grant assurances. Limiting jets and other protected classes of airport users can also trigger a violation of the Interstate Commerce Clause of the U. S. Constitution.
40. Soaring is consistent with maintaining our rural community character.	Agreed. We have developed a plan to enhance and facilitate soaring that also improves safety for all airport users.
41. Why was there no formal dialog about this Master Plan of our Airport?	The purpose of the Outreach Meetings was to facilitate this dialogue between the community and the consultants, as well as airport and county staff. The Master Plan Working Group was also organized to represent the interests of airport users and the general public and all Working Group meetings have been open to the public.
42. If you could guarantee that the jet traffic would only increase 1 or 2% per year, then I would agree with the plans for airport expansion.	Aircraft operations, including jet operations, will increase at the Airport based on market conditions in Douglas County. We have estimated this increase in Chapter 2 of the Master Plan. Furthermore, all proposed projects included in the CDP are designed to serve small aircraft and gliders. There are no major improvements planned for the primary runway to attract increased jet operations.
43. Eliminate skydiving, they are accidents waiting to happen.	Again, we cannot recommend that the County restrict any valid general aviation type or class of airport user. All we can do is make recommendations for improving the safety of airport uses.
44. This County needs private aircraft including jets to build an economical industrial base that will generate a higher paying workforce.	It is not in the scope of the Master Plan to estimate the economic impact of aviation activity at the Minden-Tahoe Airport. However, it is our understanding that such a study has recently been published that attempts to quantify this positive economic impact of the Airport.
45. Airport expansion will ruin the rural setting of Minden, cause more noise and air pollution,	The proposed improvements included in the CDP are not designed to facilitate any increases in aircraft operations at the Airport, over historic levels. Aircraft operations are forecast to increase over the 20-year

Comment/Question	Response
lower property values and raise our taxes.	planning period regardless of what improvements are implemented. The impact of increased noise and air emissions will be discussed in the Environmental Overview Chapter of the Master Plan. Please see previous responses related to property values and County taxes.
46. I don't want a charter jet facility "hub" owned mostly by overseas investors.	Comment noted. However, implementing such a restriction at a federally funded airport is virtually impossible.
47. I am fed up with the poorly put together, difficult to understand presentations.	We apologize for the complexity of the material included in the Airport Master Plan. We understand it is highly technical information that can be confusing to the general public and will try to better explain the process and the plan at the January 31 <sup>st</sup> meetings.
48. The revised CDP reflects most of the inputs and seems to satisfy most operational requirements, my concerns are how realistic the CDP is? FAA approval of 21, funding, Bentley's willingness to sell, etc.	<p>We agree that the CDP will satisfy the operational requirements of the Airport and that the CDP includes several "if's." Most Conceptual Development Plans do. It's our job as planners to present opportunities for consideration and help client determine space reservations necessary to meet the potential development needs of a given airport. Moreover, there are many important improvements that can be implemented without the acquisition of land and help return the Airport to its prior status as the Soaring Capital of North America.</p> <p>This CDP will be broken into a specific project list and the projects will be phased over 20 years based on project priority and potential funding availability.</p> <p>For the benefit of the small aircraft and soaring community, we sincerely hope that FAA will allow the reopening of Runway 21. However, there are no guarantees. We have prepared wind data that supports the reopening of this runway, but there are many factors for the FAA to consider. A final determination will not be rendered until the FAA formally reviews the Airport Layout Planset incorporated in this Master Plan.</p>
49. I live nearby and the amount of low flying aircraft that do not follow the noise abatement procedures is very bothersome.	The County, as the Sponsor of the Airport, has no authority over aircraft in flight. The County and airport staff can make recommendations for aircraft flight paths and altitudes for noise abatement purposes; however, the decision to follow those designated paths is at the sole discretion of the aircraft operator in accordance with FAA rules and regulations pertaining to aircraft in flight.
50. Why would you anticipate approval of your work product by the BOCC if it clearly conflicts with their unanimous resolution passed in May of 2007?	<p>All Master Plan Working Papers produced to date, including the goals, assumptions, screening criteria, all three airside alternatives, and the preferred alternative were developed in accordance with the policy set in the May 2007 BOCC resolution.</p> <p>The resolution states that "the future operation of the Airport shall continue to serve the needs of Douglas County residents and businesses through a safe, compatible and friendly airport with the focus being on a general aviation community oriented airport." All proposed improvements are intended to serve small aircraft and gliders and enhance the Airport's role as a small community general aviation airport. There are no infrastructure plans to expand the primary runway to serve larger and faster aircraft. However, the current configuration and pavement</p>

Comment/Question	Response
	<p>strength of Runway 16/34 allows this runway to serve many large aircraft. As a federally funded airport, there is nothing we can professionally recommend to “block” or prevent the use of this runway by the large aircraft for which it was designed.</p> <p>Our preferred alternative and conceptual development plan call for the reopening of a Runway 03/21 as the only “additional” runway facility. The two other runway recommendations include shifts, not extensions, of Runway 12/30 and 12G/30G. These recommendations are intended to meet FAA design standards and maximize safety for aircraft operators utilizing these runways.</p> <p>The resolution also states that “infrastructure development of the Airport will be appropriate and consistent with maintaining the rural community character of the County and the general aviation purposes of the Airport.”</p> <p>All planned airside and landside infrastructure improvements included in Working Paper 3 are designed for small aircraft and gliders. There are leaseholds on the west side of the Airport that will be developed according to the structured agreements between the leaseholders and the County. The Master Plan simply looks at all landside areas and recommends the best use of available land for aeronautical development. Keeping larger aircraft hangar areas and parking areas segregated on the west side and smaller sport aircraft and glider hangar storage and parking on the east side is logical based on sound airport layout planning principals.</p> <p>The resolution also states that “it is the intention of the Board to continue to provide for firefighting and other emergency aviation needs, and to promote various sports aviation activities, particularly soaring as the Airport is internationally recognized as a premiere place for soaring and has historically provided our local economy with significant tourism dollars.”</p> <p>We have maintained the existing Runway 16/34 facility to continue to serve firefighting and other emergency aviation needs, and we have attempted to plan world class sport aviation and glider related facilities on the east side of the Airport in accordance with this stated objective in the resolution.</p> <p>The resolution also states that “the Airport should continue to remain financially self-sufficient, including continued FAA provided grant funding.”</p> <p>Based on this stated objective, we must develop a plan for the Airport that meets FAA design standards (including clear approaches to both ends of all runways and no landing only runways). We also must ensure that all elements of the plan meet FAA grant assurances and do not discriminate against any one class of airport user. We can’t recommend that some general aviation aircraft should be allowed and not others, if the airport is designed and constructed to accommodate such aircraft.</p>

Comment/Question	Response
	We must also make recommendations that allow the Airport to maximize revenue generating opportunities in order to maintain the Airport's financial self-sufficiency and not have to rely on County general funds for its maintenance and operation.
51. New and/or extended runways and other "improvements" are fundamentally unacceptable to the residents with the exception of a reopened Runway 21.	Runway 03/21 is the only new runway facility on the revised CDP. There are no runway extensions planned.
52. Growing the footprint of the entire airport is not acceptable to the residents.	The recommended land acquisition for the shift of Runways 12/30 and 12G/30G is for safety related purposes.
53. The recent removal of the parallel Runway 34R appears to be progress, but if the concept is to simply burden an extended Runway 30 with glider and small plane traffic in search of separation of aircraft types then we have made little progress.	The plan is to shift Runway 12/30, not extend the runway. Also, the separation of dissimilar aircraft types is progress and sound planning. Runway 30 will not be "burdened" by increased use as Runway 16/34 will still be available for use by gliders and small aircraft.
54. Stating that all the west side land is already consumed is not true, the non-aviation uses could be relocated and some leases of unimproved land could be allowed to expire.	We agree that changing the use of the County yard parcel to an aviation related has theoretical technical merit. However, that would be at a significant expense to Douglas County. We have not been asked by airport or county staff to plan for a future aeronautical use of this parcel. Nor have we been given any indication that the County plans to not renew existing unimproved land leases. We have not addressed the Pinion Aero property because it is a current leasehold interest in good standing with approved land uses. Unless directed, we would not generally assume the creation of a site development plan for an area already under lease.
55. The Master Plan needs to be revised to include specific measures designed to prevent an increase in jet and turboprop aircraft operations including limitations on airport facility improvements desired by owners/operators of such aircraft (hangars, runway lighting, etc).	<p>The improvements recommended in the CDP are intended to service small aircraft and gliders. No major improvements are planned for Runway 16/34 and the runway is already lighted. The hangar construction planned on the west side of the Airport will be in accordance with the agreements between the leaseholders and the County.</p> <p>Please see consultant's response to comments above regarding the limiting of aviation uses at a federally funded airport.</p>
56. All of the plans, but especially the CDP, would clearly accommodate substantial growth. Many acres of additional land would be available for development. How does this square with the County Commission's vision and with the mere 10% projected increase in operations?	The CDP is not designed to accommodate substantial growth and the recommendation to acquire approximately 166 acres is based on a need to revise the runway layout to make the airport safer. The CDP is principally designed to increase the safety and efficiency of aircraft operations. Additional acres will be available for development on the east side of the Airport; however, this development will be limited to that which serves small aircraft and gliders.
57. I fail to see how shifting the	The 1,640 foot shift of Runway 12/30 to the southeast increases the

Comment/Question	Response
intersecting runways increases safety for anybody.	<p>distance from the end of Runway 30 to the intersection with the primary runway (Runway 16/34). This will allow users that are taking off or landing on Runway 30 to turn or stop prior to reaching the intersection of Runway 16/34. This increases safety for users of both runways.</p> <p>The shift of Runway 12G/30G to the east and south will increase the separation of this runway to a standard 700 feet (runway centerline to runway centerline) from Runway 12/30. This will increase safety for users of both runways and allow adequate space between the two runways for glider staging.</p>
58. I was told that this plan will allow for jet operations to increase by 6,000 per year.	This process has attempted to clarify such misconceptions. The forecast included in Chapter 2 estimates total annual jet aircraft operations to <i>increase to</i> approximately 6,000 per year in 2026. However, the existing <i>estimate of jet operations is 5,400 annual operations</i> , so these operations are <i>forecast to increase by 600 per year by 2026</i> , not 6,000.
59. I was told that this plan will allow for an increase in total aircraft operations to 355,000 per year.	The preliminary or initial CDP presented in October of 2007, included both a parallel runway to Runway 16/34 and a separation of 700 feet between Runways 30G and 30. The consequence of these recommendations is an increase in the Airport's ability to accommodate aircraft operations, or an increase in the annual capacity of the Airport. <i>However, the existing capacity is, and always has been, in the neighborhood of 230,000 annual operations with actual operations having never higher than 80,000 per year.</i> There are small general aviation airports all over the State of Nevada with annual capacity in the 200,000 to 300,000 range that have very few annual operations.
60. Conversation – There has been absolutely no mechanism or evidence of serious conversation with those folks who clearly un unhappy with the progress so far.	The public outreach process was designed specifically to improve this dialog and present the public with the facts about that master plan and inform the public about what a Master Plan is and what it is not.
61. Loudest Voice at the Table – All stakeholders should have a voice, but not an equal voice, the loudest voice should be that of the resident owners of the airport.	We consider all comments and make CDP revisions based on sound planning practices, public policy, federal guidance and meeting the Sponsor's specific needs. We attempt to incorporate all comments that meet these criteria, as appropriate. The loudest voices must be those of the Sponsor and the FAA.
62. Outreach Meetings Ineffective – The public outreach meetings have been somewhat useful, but constructed in such a way as to inhibit, instead of promote, a constructive exchange of issues, ideas and potential solutions.	We feel the public outreach process was both effective and useful. Again, the public outreach process was designed specifically to improve this dialog and present the public with the facts about the Master Plan and the master planning process in a casual and non-confrontational manner.
63. Back Room Meetings – Sub-groups of the Working Group should never have been allowed to huddle because it disrespects	As consultants, we have met with County and airport staff many times which is part of the master planning process, and as called for in our Scope of Services. The only meeting we organized that could potentially be considered a "sub-group" was a set of meetings with a consortium of

Comment/Question	Response
the rest of the group and the entire public process.	glider pilots to ensure our CDP met their specific needs. It is our understanding that all interested parties were given the opportunity to attend these meetings. These meetings were conducted at the request of Douglas County.
64. Previous Public Comment perceived to be Ignored – Extensive public input over two years of good meetings has resulted in little evidence that it has found its way into the plan.	Public comment, from the visioning sessions to now, has not been ignored and much of the comment and recommendations have indeed found their way into the plan. We understand that the community is concerned about the environmental impact of increased aircraft operations, specifically large jet aircraft operations. We have made no suggestions for improvements to the primary runway in terms of widening, strengthening or lengthening the runway to serve larger, faster or heavier aircraft. This is despite our determination in Chapter 3 (Working Paper Three) that the existing runway length is insufficient for the type of aircraft <i>currently</i> using Runway 16/34. This is a prime example of public comment and input making its way into the plan.
65. Wasted 6 months – The six month delay due to FAA issues should have been used to gather and respond to public input on the earlier phases of the project.	This was due to the complexity of the airfield layout proposed, specifically the reopening of a Runway 21 configuration and the desire to receive FAA review of this proposal prior to including it on the CDP.
66. Building Blocks – Your work plan is one of placing building blocks on top of each other in phases, however, you have not received consensus on each phase before moving forward.	The purpose of the Working Group is to serve as a sounding board for each phase of the master plan. No master plan can appease everyone or even hope to achieve complete consensus with each phase. The wider the stakeholder groups, the more difficult to achieve complete consensus. It's a noble goal to attempt to achieve full consensus on each phase of a project and consensus building is something that we strive to do with each of our planning programs. Being realistic, however, this may not be a practical consideration. Depending upon the program, or the issues and considerations involved, it may well be impossible to achieve complete consensus.
67. AMPWG Make-Up – It is totally unrepresentative of the owners of the airport and lends far too much power to special interests.	Douglas County appoints the members of the Working Group and had determined that a balance of stakeholders is represented on the panel. The Working Group is an advisory group intended to review and comment on each phase of the plan as it is developed and provide structured feedback to the consultant.
68. AMPWG Member Activism – It has been disappointing and has provided no meaningful dialog towards consensus solutions.	Please see the response to comment 67, above.
69. Unmet Local Aviation Needs – There is a large and growing unmet need for affordable T-Hangars.	Agreed. We have attempted to quantify the unmet aviation demand in Chapter 3, Capacity Analysis and Facility Requirements. We have also provided for three aviation/hangar infill areas on the west side adjacent to Taxiway C that could be used for the construction of County owned or private T-Hangars. Furthermore, we have provided areas on the east side (also adjacent to Taxiway C) that could be developed for private or County owned T-Hangars to accommodate this demand.
70. Seduction – It is always seductive to draw pretty diagrams of exotic new facilities. However, savvy people will	In developing a plan for glider and small aircraft facilities on the east side of the Airport, we were attempting to plan for world class sport aviation facilities. We are not attempting to be seductive. The practicality in terms of capital funding, financial viability, etc. will be examined and presented

Comment/Question	Response
<p>always want to test the concept for practicality – capital funding, project leadership, ongoing financial viability, critical mass, transition plan, etc.</p>	<p>in later chapters of the Master Plan. The development of the east side will be a phased process based on funding availability and economic realities. In the alternatives chapter, we are simply attempting to produce airside and landside plans that accommodate forecast aviation needs throughout the 20-year planning period. Some of the projects we currently show on the east side may not be feasible in the 20-year planning period and may not make it into the 20-year capital improvement program for the Airport.</p>
<p>71. Backlash – I hear a growing minority calling for a total shutdown of the airport. Such a backlash just might take hold unless we can demonstrate significant progress in recognition of the public’s deep concerns.</p>	<p>The development of this Airport Master Plan simply cannot please everyone. All we can do is consider everyone’s point of view and develop a plan that minimizes the negative impacts to the surrounding community to the greatest extent possible while moving aviation forward.</p>
<p>72. “Growth is Good” – This is a natural backdrop to any project, no one wants to think we are spending thousands of dollars for a plan devoid of sexy and seductive growth plans, but the owners of this airport are looking for something far more subtle, valuable and modest.</p>	<p>The only type of aviation “growth” that we are planning to accommodate with changes to the airport layout is the growth of small aircraft and glider activity. Through the visioning process, we learned that this is the type of growth that should be accommodated and that this type of growth is, in fact, good.</p>
<p>73. The Concrete is Setting on this Master Plan – Staff and consultants are still saying there is plenty of time for public comment because there is a long way to go in the process, but by the time this document gets to the BOCC, we’ll need a jackhammer to make changes.</p>	<p>Valid and constructive public comment will always be considered and until the FAA signs the ALP, changes can always be made.</p>
<p>74. Protection and Preservation – This is what the residents are looking for.</p>	<p>We understand this and are trying to provide for this protection and preservation within the limits of federal law and consistent with FAA policy.</p>
<p>75. Airport Character – Most residents demand no change in the historical character of the airport. Why would you expect approval of your work project by the BOCC if it clearly conflicts with their unanimous resolution last May?</p>	<p>We do not agree that our work project conflicts with the BOCC May 2007 resolution. Please see the previous related responses.</p>
<p>76. Airport Vision – The vision should be that we are not open to all comers and that we are focused on accommodating sport aviation and personal aircraft.</p>	<p>According to FAA guidelines, the Airport must be open to all comers based on the design aircraft for each runway. If the fire bombers did not operate at the Airport, it might be possible to redesignate a smaller aircraft as the design aircraft for Runway 16/34. However, because the fire bombers do operate at the Airport, the County must not discriminate against any one class of user that can operate at the published runway</p>

Comment/Question	Response
	length and strength. That said, the CDP has been developed to accommodate growth in sport aviation and personal aircraft and ensure that this growth is compatible with existing and projected use of the Airport by larger aircraft. This is a point that we have repeatedly stated. Please contact FAA directly for their concurrence on this point.
77. 800 Pound Gorillas! – It is totally unprofessional and ridiculously incomplete to show a plan that ignores some obvious huge future impacts such as Pinon Aero.	We have revised our CDP to show both Phases I and II of the Pinon Aero leaseholder plans (only Phase I has been approved by the County to date). The reason we showed this area as an aviation/hangar development area bubble, was because the entire area has been privately leased and we have not been asked to plan a hangar and taxiway layout for this area. We have simply identified this area as a good parcel of land for future aircraft hangar development with good vehicle access to Heybourne Road and good airside access to Taxiway A and C.
78. Forecast Movements – Despite being approved by the FAA already, the forecast is just not credible.	As an airport consulting firm, we have developed literally hundreds of Airport Master Plan operations forecasts throughout our 30 plus year history. We respectfully disagree.
79. Airport Environment Zoning – A primary concern of residents is to achieve much greater protection though land zoning in the airport environs.	Understood. We must first determine what the future layout of runway facilities at the Airport will be. Once we know this, we can analyze future flight tracks and patterns and make recommendations for appropriate land use planning and zoning in the vicinity of the Airport. One of the drawings included in the ALP drawing set will be an Airport Land Use Plan that makes land use recommendations both on airport and off airport.
80. Implementation – I know any Airport Master Plan will not focus on implementation costs, funding sources, time frame or a transition plan, however, the plan should still be rooted in reality.	On the contrary, a good master plan should absolutely examine the implementation of all proposed major projects. We have contracted with an engineering firm to provide planning level project cost estimates for each phase of the 20-year capital improvement program. These estimates will be included in Chapter 7, entitled Implementation Plan.
81. Domino Theory – If you move gliders east, you remove a significant impediment to jet growth.	Please see previous response related to this comment.
82. Bias – This total package of the Master Plan so far is riddled with obvious bias toward growth and jets under the cloak of “safety.”	We could not disagree more. Safety is not a cloak, it is a priority in the development of any Airport Master Plan. We can't stress this enough; it is not safe to have pedestrians, golf carts, gliders and aircraft in general constantly crossing Runway 16/34 to access other runways. This significantly increases the potential for runway incursions.
83. Alternatives – These are just variations on the same theme.	We believe the array of alternatives developed for this project is appropriate, given the scope and nature of the Airport.
84. Safety – How serious is the threat?	We believe quite serious.
85. Welcome all-comers, or focus? – With its infrastructure and services, KMEV should focus on sport aviation, light power planes and the occasional jet.	Sport Aviation is exactly the focus of the Master Plan. This has been the focus of our efforts since visioning and remains our focus today.
86. Airport is an economic engine – This is the battle cry of some	Airports are part of the economic health and prosperity of a given area. This fact should not be in dispute. The examination of this relationship is

Comment/Question	Response
folks as their basis to support any and all incoming activity as a source of economic development.	outside the scope of this master plan. Relatively recent data is available reporting on Minden-Tahoe Airport's contributions to the area economy.
87. Public sentiment is loud and clear – Why doesn't this get translated into the Master Plan?	The public comments have been incorporated into the recommendations of the Master Plan, as appropriate.
88. No corrective content – The past 10 years have seen a relentless drive to develop this airport in direct conflict with the will of the people, this trend must be reversed.	It is not our place to not offer an opinion regarding this comment.
89. Control our destiny through infrastructure.	There are no infrastructure improvements included in the CDP to serve larger or faster aircraft.
90. County Funding – There is absolutely no stomach with the voters for anything that even smells of incremental county funding for the Airport	As mentioned in Working Paper One, the Airport is an enterprise fund that generates its own revenue and doesn't take funding from the County General Fund to pay for operating or capital expenses. We will make recommendations that allow the Airport to maximize revenue generating opportunities in order to maintain the Airport's financial self-sufficiency and not have to rely on County general funds for its maintenance and operation.