

HARRIS MILLER MILLER & HANSON INC.

77 South Bedford Street
Burlington, Massachusetts 01803
T 781.229.0707
F 781.229.7939
W www.hmmh.com

July 26, 2013

Mr. Jim Brundige, Manager
East Hampton Airport
P.O. Box 836
East Hampton, NY 11937

Mr. Dennis Yap, President
DY Consultants
401 Franklin Avenue, Suite 318
Garden City, NY 11530

Subject: Proposal for Second Phase of Use Restriction Justification and Analysis
Reference: HMMH Proposal P13-20046

Dear Mr. Brundige and Mr. Yap:



As requested, I am pleased to present this proposal for HMMH to assist East Hampton Airport (HTO), through DY Consultants (DY), in that firm's capacity as the airport's General Engineering Consultant. The proposal addresses the second phase of responding to direction from the East Hampton Town Board in Resolution (RES-2012-832, "Intent to Pursue Use Restrictions at East Hampton Airport"); i.e.:

[T]he Airport Manager and DY Consultants (through their subconsultant, HMMH) are directed to assess and evaluate data that has been (and continues to be) collected on noise and operations at the Airport for the purpose of providing recommendations to the Town Board; and ... within the next 3-6 months, Airport Manager and consultants are directed to prepare a report for the Town Board setting forth their conclusions on whether the data can justify a restriction on operations by helicopters at the Airport and, if so, what restriction would be most effective in light of the available data.

HTO, DY, and HMMH staff presented initial results of this assessment as part of a comprehensive report on the status of the HTO "Management Plan" to the Town Board on February 5, 2013. At that meeting, the team committed to the Board that we would provide this proposal for the next project phase, and also identify potential subsequent phases.

Project Phasing

This proposal is presented in the context of a multi-phase process that includes the following completed, currently proposed, and potential future phases:

First Phase: Implement and Assess Enhanced Data Collection (Completed)

The first project phase was initiated in January 2012, when the Town, as part of its Management Plan process, directed DY and HMMH to identify "essential initial data-collection actions that will assist management in addressing noise concerns and in undertaking preparations for a Part 161 study process, which could ultimately aid in addressing fixed-wing and helicopter noise issues through non-restrictive or restrictive means, as might prove to be most appropriate."

That process was completed in the first quarter of 2012, and led to recommendation of the enhanced data-collection actions using the AirScene, Vector Airport Solutions, and PlaneNoise systems. These actions were implemented in time to collect data during the 2012 peak summer operations period.

Over roughly the same time frame, three other potentially relevant events occurred:

1. Operation of a temporary seasonal air traffic control tower, starting June 26.
2. FAA establishment of a formal rule "New York North Shore Helicopter Route" on August 6.
3. Abandonment of the experimental Northwest Creek helicopter arrival traffic route.

HARRIS MILLER MILLER & HANSON INC.

Mr. Jim Brundige, Manager, East Hampton Airport and Dennis Yap, President, DY Consultants
Proposal to Assist with Second Phase of HTO Use Restriction Justification and Analysis
July 26, 2013
Page 2

The first-phase assessment of the enhanced data and these events led to the conclusion that necessary information was available to undertake the second phase in the use-restriction evaluation; i.e., to refine the noise problem definition to identify potential methods for addressing it, including restrictive and non-restrictive options.

Second Phase: Refine the Helicopter Noise Problem Definition and Identify Methods to Address It (Current Proposal)

This second project phase has three primary goals:

1. Refine the helicopter noise problem definition sufficiently to identify the specific issues that the Town should seek to address.
2. Identify combinations of voluntary and restrictive options to assess to address the specific issues.
3. Identify steps to take in subsequent project phases to investigate and pursue these options.

At the end of this second project phase, we will look for direction from the Town Board regarding which options – if any – it desires to pursue.



Additional Project Phases (Potential Future Activities)

Further data collection, analysis, consultation, and documentation steps will be required to pursue approvals for and implementation of the promising options identified in this phase. The specific steps that must be undertaken to pursue the options depend on their specific nature; e.g., whether they are formal or informal non-restrictive measures, formal restrictive measures, etc. We believe that it would be realistic to assume that a mix of options from these categories is likely to be considered.

This assumption suggests that the following additional project phases will be required. It would be unproductive to attempt to define these phases in detail at this time. However, it is reasonable to expect that they are listed in an order that represents increasingly complex analyses, documentation, and public notice, and increasingly demanding review and approval processes, and, therefore, in the order in which it would be most reasonable to pursue them.

- Phase Three: Identify and Pursue Actions to Optimize Non-Restrictive Options
- Phase Four: Identify and Pursue Restrictive Options that Do Not Require a Part 161 Process
- Phase Five: Identify and Pursue Restrictive Options Requiring a Part 161 Process

Proposed Second-Phase Scope

Consistent with discussion at the February 5, 2013 Town Board meeting, this proposal describes the next steps to undertake in refining the noise problem definition and options for addressing it.

1. Task 1 – Refine Helicopter Noise Problem Definition

This task will involve identification of relevant patterns in operating conditions, operator compliance with existing voluntary procedures, and complaint analysis, for use in identifying the existence of an aviation noise problem or problems. It will include statistical analyses of helicopter operations in 2012, in terms of factors like time (e.g., monthly, seasonal, day-of-week, time-of-day, etc.), helicopter type (e.g., Stage 1, 2, and potential 3), origin and destination, altitude profiles, routes, and weather. The idea is to see if the operational statistics would let us screen out any options (e.g., if we find there are few helicopter operations between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m., then we could conclude a night curfew would be meaningless), identify how the Stage 3 rule might affect decision-making, see if differing seasonal or day-of-week rules might make sense, etc. The objective will be to identify patterns of interest in all potentially relevant areas where data are available.

HARRIS MILLER MILLER & HANSON INC.

Mr. Jim Brundige, Manager, East Hampton Airport and Dennis Yap, President, DY Consultants
Proposal to Assist with Second Phase of HTO Use Restriction Justification and Analysis
July 26, 2013
Page 3

2. Task 2 – Conduct Detailed Inventory of Existing Voluntary Noise Abatement Measures

This task will include meetings with representatives of helicopter operators – e.g., the Eastern Region Helicopter Council (ERHC) and individual pilots – in order to ensure that we have a full inventory and understanding of all the voluntary, informal procedures that they have pursued to minimize their local impacts, which may go beyond those published or otherwise promoted by the airport or other entities. We need to fully understand the particulars of the procedures, to support detailed noise analyses that will follow. The objective will be to collect sufficient information to identify which procedures merit detail technical analysis, and to define the scope and level of effort necessary to properly assess the benefits of these voluntary measures.

3. Task 3 – Conduct Noise Analyses to Depict the Effectiveness of Existing Voluntary Noise Abatement Measures

This task involves using data and information collected in the preceding tasks to prepare *preliminary* noise analyses (largely, if not wholly, single event) to evaluate the effectiveness of existing informal procedures; i.e., to obtain a preliminary answer the question “How effective has the industry been at addressing the issues on a voluntary basis?” This evaluation will be preliminary in that we will not go to the effort necessary to develop and obtain FAA approval of detailed “user-defined” modeling inputs, which would be necessary to use the analyses in any formal submission to the FAA. That type of analysis is very costly (on the order of \$5,000 or more, per procedure, on an aircraft-type-by-aircraft-type basis). The idea will be to identify which procedures (if any) that merit such detailed analysis and FAA approval.

4. Task 4 – Identify Areas Where Existing Measures are Deficient, Promising Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Measures, and Next Steps for Town Board Consideration

Taking into account the effectiveness of voluntary measures, we will identify in a preliminary fashion actions that might be undertaken in two categories to address noise issues that are not fully addressed by existing procedures: (1) enhanced voluntary procedures and (2) potential formal restrictions. Part 161 requires that this step be taken. Even for airports eligible to pursue restrictions outside of the Part 161 process, this step is necessary to support a defense against any challenges to proposed restrictions. We will provide more specific detail on the steps to take in the third project phase to address these problems, and provide more detail on subsequent phases that are likely to be required.

Consulting Terms and Conditions, and Anticipated Budget and Schedule

HMMH will provide services in coordination with DY on a time-and-materials basis, in accordance with the HMMH “Standard Terms and Conditions” provided with this proposal.

We estimate that we can complete these four tasks for a budget of approximately \$85,000. We will not exceed this budget without prior authorization.

We anticipate that it would be realistic to complete these tasks over a four- to five-month period, ideally starting in April, to permit interaction with helicopter operators during their pre-season preparations with HTO management. This project duration also would permit us to interact with the HTO air traffic control tower staff after they initiate operations for the 2013 season.

Further assistance will be provided, as requested, on these same terms.

Proposal Acceptance

Please indicate acceptance of this proposal by signing and dating on the lines provided at the end of this proposal.

HARRIS MILLER MILLER & HANSON INC.

Mr. Jim Brundige, Manager, East Hampton Airport and Dennis Yap, President, DY Consultants
Proposal to Assist with Second Phase of HTO Use Restriction Justification and Analysis
July 26, 2013
Page 4

We appreciate the opportunity to assist you and the Town of East Hampton on this very important project. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely yours,

HARRIS MILLER MILLER & HANSON INC.



Ted Baldwin
Senior Vice President

enc.

c: W. Castillo, DY



Proposal Terms and Conditions Accepted by:	Signature: _____
	Printed Name: _____
	Printed Title: _____
	Date: _____