1	EAST HAMPTON TOWN BOARD
2	
3	IN THE MATTER OF
4	
5	EAST HAMPTON AIRPORT FUEL FLOWAGE FEES
6	
7	May 20, 2014
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Meeting held at the Town Hall Meeting Room
13	159 Pantigo Road, East Hampton, New York
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	<u>A P P</u>	EARANCES:
2		Larry Cantwell, Supervisor
3		Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman
4		Sylvia Overby, Councilwoman
5		Fred Overton, Councilman
6		Peter Van Scoyoc, Councilman
7		
8	A L S	<u>O PRESENT:</u>
9		Elizabeth Vail, Town Attorney
LO		Carole A. Brennan, Town Clerk
11		
12		
13		
L4		
L 5		
16		
L7		
18		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
) [

SUPERVISOR CANTWELL:	We have a report from
the Budget Finance Advisory	Committee, Airport
Finance Subcommittee Report	#1. Arthur, good
morning.	

MR. MALMAN: Good morning. My name is Arthur Malman. I'm the Chairman of the Town's Budget and Finance Advisory Committee, and I'm here today to report to the Town Board and the public generally the progress we're making on resolving some airport issues, and bringing, hopefully, some good conclusions to the Board later in June, we believe.

Our first progress report was a preliminary debt capacity analysis, which was unanimously adopted by our committee. And I want to stress the word "unanimously," because we have a core of members of the Budget and Financial Advisory Committee who work in a whole host of matters. But when we were approached to be involved with the airport, we realized that what we were trying to do was develop financial data for the airport that could be relied upon by all sides.

Without addressing any airport policy issues, we wanted everybody to be working from the same data set. And in order to do that, we

asked that the committee be expanded for this
purpose and include people over the years who
have taken various positions on airport matters.
So that when we came up with a conclusion, and
this one happily was unanimous, we would have the
support of all segments of the community behind
at least the factual data that we were all
working with. And, in particular, I'm going to
read some names of people who are familiar with
airport discussions, are probably going to
recognize, some perhaps not. Frank Dalene, David
Gruber, Frank Oshrin or Gene Oshrin, rather,
Pat Trunzo, Jr., and Tom Twomey. All these folks
were on our committee and all unanimous, we
agreed with this report. This is our first
report.

This report tries to set up a financial matrix or an Excel spreadsheet to -- for the Board and the public to use to analyze the effect of various policy decisions that could be made. What we did first was we tried to vet all the financial information existing about historical operations at the airport. And wile Peter Wadsworth, who will talk a little bit later, took the lead in this, it could not have been done

without really terrific help from Len and
Charlene, who were there on every step of the
way, because the last thing we wanted to do was
develop some data in a vacuum, and then somebody
pull out historical data which was different,
then we'd have a real mess.

This report, which we're presenting now, is the simplest of all cases. It says nothing changes. Everything that's happened at the airport for the last five years pretty much continues as is. The growth in revenue stays the same from various components, the growth and expenses stays the same from various components, so really no changes. But if we pay attention to the airport, how much debt can carry comfortably in order to make the improvements that we all recognize have to be made at the airport, but, I want to stress, made at the airport without expanding the airport.

One of our guidelines at the very beginning, we've steck (phonetic) to that -- stuck to that, rather, was we're supposed to analyze the airport as it is now, and not with an airport operations expansion. Apparently, there's no support for that.

I mean, for example, to make it very easy to understand, right now, we have lots of helicopters landing at the airport, some people think too many. However, every time a helicopter lands, it pays a landing fee into the airport. And most of those air -- most of those helicopters get filled up with gasoline, or jet fuel, actually. So, if we start cutting back helicopters, we're going to cut back revenue from helicopter landing fees and helicopter fueling fees. However, we believe there are other revenue enhancements that we can make that will overcome those, but today we're trying to keep it simple. We're not going to change any sources of

1	revenue, we're just going to keep it the same.
2	So, with that, I'd like Peter really to
3	take over and walk you through our first base
4	case analysis.
5	MR. WADSWORTH: Thank you, Arthur. You
6	know, I'm a little bit in awe of where I stand
7	today, because if anybody had told me in 2002
8	that I'd be representing the committee that had
9	Tom Twomey, and David Gruber, and other airport
10	proponents and opponents on it, and they all
11	agreed on something, I wouldn't have believed it.
12	So we've come a long way.
13	And there are a number of people that need
14	to be thanked. I mean, first of all, you have to
15	start somewhere, so I'm going to thank Larry for
16	reaching out to me over a year ago to talk,
17	before he was even a candidate, announced
18	candidate, to talk about airport finance and how
19	the two sides related to that.
20	I want to thank Kathee for creating these
21	crazy committees, three the three-headed
22	monster that made this possible; Arthur, for
23	being a party to that; Frank, Mike, other people
24	in the audience who have been a part of that.

And I also have to say that I couldn't have

1	done this if I hadn't spent 20 years on Wall
2	Street and in other and on Wall Street and
3	with my own financial advisory firm doing similar
4	kinds of work, and knowing what a corporate
5	financial statement looks like before I went to
6	the Munis reports, which are still Greek to me in
7	many respects.
8	And, again, Jim Brundige, Len, Charlene,
9	couldn't have done it without those three people,
10	because they are a fountain of information. They
11	have cooperated at every step along the way.
12	They've given a lot of time. And, frankly, I've
13	reviewed a lot of the findings with Len and
14	Charlene to make sure that we're not off base in
15	terms of what our assumptions are.
16	So, if I can figure out how to get the
17	screen operating, do I just touch it? Anybody
18	know? John, you've been here before. Can I get
19	a little technical help here from somebody?
20	Anybody know how to operate this?
21	COUNCILMAN VAN SCOYOC: Does he have to log
22	in. Does he have to log it in.
23	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Jim?
24	COUNCILWOMAN OVERBY: Jim, yeah.
25	MR. WADSWORTH: Do you know how to do this?

1	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, the last time I was
2	here.
3	MR. WADSWORTH: Yeah, you are the man who
4	makes it all happen. Now, everything that's
5	going to be on here just give me the password.
6	We gave all of you this. It's a 10-page
7	presentation. I have more copies here for
8	audience members. You want to share? Yeah,
9	that's fine, thank you.
10	And, also, I hope that actually, I know
11	that each one of you people have a copy of the
12	actual report in case we have to refer to it.
13	And here's another member of the committee,
14	that's great.
15	So the first page is I'm not showing it
16	here, because it's basically parsing the
17	conclusions, the actual written words in the
18	report. It's a summary of what we found out.
19	The Town could generate sufficient cash flow over
20	the next five years from airport operations and
21	properties to pay debt service on 5.1 to 8.5
22	million dollars of additional debt, additional
23	debt, with readily achievable revenue growth, and
24	without FAA funds, and without any revenue
25	enhancement that Arthur alluded to, and I'll also

mention at the end of this, which is part of our continuing work, but subject to the assumptions and caveats, of course, herein.

So I thought I'd start with the answer and then back up and sort of tell you how we got there a little bit. Sylvia's smiling because she already knows this. But, anyway, we -- you can't do financial projections without scenarios, because no matter what you assume, you're going to be wrong. So we wanted to do two things. We wanted to show a range of realistic and maybe even unrealistic possibilities. And secondly, we wanted conservative projections so that we never overstated profits -- revenues, we never understated expenditures, and, therefore, never overstated debt capacity. So we're working with four scenarios here, labeled confusingly 1, 2A, 2B and 3, and I'll explain what they are.

The status quo is basically continuing as is, and we used historical growth rates going forward, none of which would have been possible without studying the last five years of financial statements. None of that would have been possible without Len and Charlene, who I guess aren't here, they're busy auditing the books or

1	being audited.
2	COUNCILWOMAN BURKE-GONZALEZ: Len's here.
3	COUNCILWOMAN OVERBY: Len's here.
4	COUNCILWOMAN BURKE-GONZALEZ: Len's in the
5	back.
6	MR. WADSWORTH: There you are.
7	(Laughter)
8	And so, anyway, so basically this is
9	trending on as is, with a slight modification.
10	We've added some money to the cost of
11	maintenance, not enough to satisfy Arthur, but
12	more than has been spent in the past. And what
13	we found, we made no assumptions there about
14	noise abatement restrictions. There are no
15	restrictions, you're just continuing to grow or
16	shrink. The result, eight-and-a-half million
17	dollars worth of debt capacity for capital
18	expenditures, ending fund balance of 1.3 million,
19	as opposed to a starting fund balance of
20	1.6 million. We allowed in every case, including
21	this one, you to spend 550,000 over the five-year
22	period for planning and development costs for the
23	consultants that are here all the time anyway, so
24	and I think you only have budgeted 100,000 for
25	outside professional for 2014. So we recognize

that might be a little tight.

And landing fees, this is the only mildly aggressive assumption. We assumed that landing fees would be increased by 5% a year going forward. We assumed no cost savings, except in the last -- in the last scenario, and I'll explain that later when I get there. And, finally, no litigation costs. And, you know, you can advise yourselves on what you think -- how realistic you think that is, but it might argue for more reserves than we ended up with.

Scenario 2A is a 20% reduction in helicopter flights in 2016, presumably as a result of noise abatement initiatives, together with a mandatory curfew, which we found out probably wouldn't have very much effect, because you only have about 2 to 3% curfew operations right now. We assume 50% of those would come within compliance, and the other 50% would disappear, so a very small impact there. The resulting debt capacity drops to seven million, because helicopters are providing revenues, both for landing fees and for fuel purchases, although the latter isn't a big number. And everything else is the same as the first scenario.

The next scenario, 2B, is a 50% reduction in helicopter flights in 2016, and then we assume in all these cases, except three, that they continue on the trend line, but from the lower basis. Nothing else changes, but the debt capacity goes down to 5.1 million, and the reserves are a little skinnier, 2.126 at the end of.

And, finally, this is the -- well, I'm not going to put a label on it, but you eliminate all helicopters, and guess what, some of your costs go away, at least we assumed that for this purpose. We assumed the cost of the control tower disappears. We assumed that the cost of air scene for flight tracking goes away, and the cost for plane noise, the professional complaint hotline goes away. So we're saving half a million dollars a year, and that's why the debt capacity goes back up.

Next slide just talks about how we computed debt capacity. The key measurement here is debt service coverage, and it's simple on the surface of it, but it involved a lot of work to get there. You've got two components. You've got cash flow available. We had to determine cash flow available for debt service, and then, of

1	course, we had to determine the debt service.
2	The debt service is easy, because we plugged it
3	in, and our assumptions were that you could
4	borrow for 15 years at 2% if you do it this year,
5	3% any subsequent year. And since you recently
6	borrowed at 1.8%, 2% doesn't seem like too much
7	of a stretch at the moment.
8	We also kept you know, retained the debt
9	service from one a little over a million
10	dollars worth of bonds issued in 2009 through
11	2011 for debt service for small airport
12	improvements.

Now the cash flow is what the rest of this is all about. The way you get Munis reports, the cash flow is truly cash flow, but not in the corporate way of doing things. In a corporation, you start with an income statement, and then you go to a cash flow statement that backs out some noncash items and gives you actual cash from operations. What you're trying to get to is something called a EBITDA, Earnings Before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation and Amortization. You don't have three out of the four, but you do have interest. So we're trying -- we get cash flow before your discretionary expenditures,

1	which is all of the consulting fees, all of the
2	capital expenditures, and that kind of stuff.
3	And the criterion is that for every dollar of
4	debt service, you want to have \$1.25 of cash
5	flow, minimum. So that gives you a cushion, so
6	that we haven't figured something that's so much
7	of a knife edge, that if you have a bad downturn
8	in revenues, that you have to go to the Town for
9	money. We want this we wanted the airport to
10	be self-sufficient.
11	And this is kind of a 1.25 number is a
12	number that was used in many, many bond documents
13	that I was a party to as the trigger for the
14	Trustee to step in if you fall below it, so we
15	don't want to fall below it.
16	Okay. Now we're going to go back to how we
17	got these projections, and this means you can
18	stop me when we're get into too much detail and
19	you want to move on.
20	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: You're getting close.
21	MR. WADSWORTH: You're done?
22	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: You're getting close.
23	(Laughter)
24	MR. WADSWORTH: Okay. This is and I
25	couldn't have done this without the Noise

Ţ	Abatement Committee, and convincing Jim Brundige
2	to do reports along the way. This is a
3	pattern obviously, flight volume drives
4	revenues at the airport, because that's what it's
5	there for. So the most the most ticklish
6	problem was to figure out what should assume in
7	terms of growth of helicopter flights and jet
8	flights. And if you look at this slide, which
9	gives you all the way back to '98, and peaks out
10	in 2007, you can see to project forward from
11	what's been happening recently is a little
12	confusing. It's not clear what whether
13	because helicopters were growing at the most
14	rapid rate, then jets, then other fixed wing.
15	Well, let's confine it to the last five years.
16	You can see more clearly what's happening.
17	Helicopters are growing actually at 2% over the
18	last five years, jets by 5%, and fixed wing
19	other fixed wing declining, shrinking by 9% a
20	year.
21	So let's go on to revenues. I'm going to
22	try to hurry it up, Larry, because I can see.
23	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: You're doing fine.]
24	know you put an enormous amount of effort into
25	this here.

1	MR. WADSWORTH: Well, that's the purpose,
2	it's shows you don't care about the numbers,
3	but, I mean, this is we did a lot of work.
4	So, basically, what we had to do is tear apart
5	the Munis reports and figure out what the
6	components were. And one of the things that
7	really surprised me is how substantial revenue
8	what a substantial portion of revenues landing
9	fees were. I did not know that, even though I
10	played around with the financials here for a long
11	time. One of the key reasons is the Munis
12	reports include as revenues all fuel sales, okay?
13	We don't get the revenue from all fuel sales, we
14	get a 15% a 15 cent flowage fee. So the
15	actual net revenue that the Town realizes is, you
16	know, 115, \$120,000 today, as opposed to well
17	over a million dollars in landing fees, and then
18	the rest is I mean, you can see what the rest
19	is. But, you know, rentals rental income is a
20	significant part of the total.
21	The tougher part, and I took out the
22	numbers, because this is an old slide, and while
23	the pattern is true, the numbers weren't exact,
24	so I didn't want anybody catching me up on it.
25	This basically shows you how we got the cash

1	flow, what we took out. And the one thing this
2	really highlighted here in red is the cost of the
3	control tower, which gave which caused you to
4	take a hit to cash flow when it was first
5	installed. You recovered pretty nicely from
6	that.
7	And one thing I didn't mention on the
8	previous slide is your debt service coverage
9	today is a little over five times, so you covered
10	debt very well. That would make any rating
11	agency proud.
12	The next slide, I'm not
13	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Back, yeah. Yeah,
14	there you go.
15	MR. WADSWORTH: This is a slide I'm not
16	going to talk about.
17	(Laughter)
18	But this is just to let you know what we
19	did
20	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Even Arthur is
21	clapping over there.
22	(Laughter)
23	MR. WADSWORTH: Arthur is, yeah. But,
24	basically, we took you probably know that if
25	you've looked at airport financials for a while,

that outside professional and subcontracts, the vendors were woven between those two for a while, and you really couldn't tell what was operating expense and what was not. So we had to unravel that in order to build the model in order to be able to project forward, and that's just what this shows.

These, if you care to go into it, are the underlying assumptions with numbers attached to them. I think, you know, again, we've reviewed this with Len and Charlene and convinced them, maybe, that it was conservative. Basically, most expenses we expect to grow by 3% a year, not an aggressive number, but employee benefits, 8.4%.

I already told you what the helicopter, jet
-- what the flight growth was going to be by
type.

Again, no new sources of revenue were assumed, no FAA funding was assumed, no litigation expenditures were assumed, and we did 15-year general obligation bonds.

So the only thing left is to tell you why we think this is preliminary, and Arthur already kind of introduced that. There's a concern that we haven't been able to express the numbers, that

1	we may not have the appropriate level of fund
2	balances to address contingencies and nonbondable
3	expenditures. So that's something that we need
4	to work on going forward. I'm not sure we're
5	going to have an answer, it's a very difficult
6	question to answer, but it's a judgment that you,
7	as a Town Board, will have to make.
8	The level of capital expenditures was not a
9	decision for this committee to make. We've
10	looked at different schedules. There's a range
11	that we've looked at from 10 million, which was
12	approved last year, to five-and-a-half, which is
13	bear bones, and the answer is probably somewhere
14	in between. There are probably additional
15	maintenance costs that need to be done on a
16	regular basis that are operating costs, really.
17	And then there's a whole potpourri of revenue
18	enhancement opportunities, increasing fuel
19	flowage, which I think Kathee might be addressing
20	soon, paid parking, and so on and so forth. We
21	could go on.
22	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Why don't you just go
23	through that list real quick.
24	MR. WADSWORTH: Huh?
25	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Why don't you

1	complete that list real quick?
2	COUNCILWOMAN BURKE-GONZALEZ: Out loud,
3	read it out loud.
4	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Complete the list out
5	loud.
6	MR. WADSWORTH: Oh.
7	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Yeah.
8	MR. WADSWORTH: Okay. Well
9	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: So we and the public
LO	have some understanding of the kinds of things
L1	we're going to be looking at.
L2	MR. WADSWORTH: I understand. We have
L3	looked at of course, we've talked about the
L4	fact that fuel flowage fees at many airports are
L5	up around 30 cents, so we can probably.
L6	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Yeah. We don't
L7	necessarily need an explanation of each one of
L8	them, but I would like to know
L9	MR. WADSWORTH: Well, they could be
20	increased at a modest level without affecting the
21	cost of fuel to the end user, because prices of
22	fuel have more than doubled since this fuel
23	flowage fee was set.
24	Paid parking is something that's Jim's
25	idea, and I think is a good one to explore, which

1	is at reast during the summer, the parking rot
2	fills up, and people start parking along
3	illegally along Daniels Hole Road. So we're
4	exploring the possibility of a low-cost solution
5	to, if nothing else, assess the demand, but
6	perhaps eventually to generate some significant
7	amount of revenue. And one of the keys to that
8	will be adequate enforcement, because otherwise
9	people are going to abuse the privilege.
10	At the other end of the spectrum, as,
11	Larry, you've sat, along with Tom Twomey, on a
12	commission back in the 1990s that suggested an
13	LIRR stop at the on airport property, which
14	would be become a transportation hub, and
15	might solve some of the regional parking problems
16	here, long-term parking. Arthur Malman
17	and others have
18	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: Again, this is
19	really Peter, if I could suggest, I really
20	would like you to list those, so the public has
21	an understanding of what enhancement
22	opportunities there might be that you will be
23	looking at in the future, not necessarily an
24	analysis
25	MR. WADSWORTH: Don't go any further with

1 it, okay. 2 We know that there's an opportunity to 3 bring some leases up to full market value that 4 aren't, and to, in general, assert more 5 discipline in the way leases are administered, so 6 they're consistent among different leases. 7 -- we are exploring certain loopholes, if you 8 want to call them that, or opportunities for 9 improvement and landing fees. There may be --10 we've already eliminated certain -- well, okay. 11 There are other opportunities to increase landing 12 fees. There's a possibility of new hangars for 13 14 existing tenants at the airport that are now using tie-down space. There are 15 vacant lots 15 16 on Industrial Road that represent an aggregate of 17 about 30 acres. There's a parcel north of the 18 airport that's designated for airport uses, but 19 not having been used yet. And I think you will continue to hear about a possible solar farm at 20 21 the airport. 22 That's it. Questions, any? No? 23 MR. MALMAN: I just want to wrap up with a

couple of concepts that some of the public may

not be totally aware of. One is the size of the

24

25

airport. When you go out there, you see a bunch of runways and buildings, but the airport is actually much larger, it's about 600 acres. Much of that acreage is fallow. Much of that acreage is zoned industrial, which is in short supply for the Town. So there are opportunities to use those -- that acreage for other purposes.

Another very important concept, which really hasn't been discussed very much, is that everyone pretty much knows at this point that in December, the first group of our grant assurances from the FAA run out, and people think we can have more control over noise when those run out. However, there's a second group of grant -- grant assurances that are possibly even more important to the long-term health of the Town, and those run out in 2022.

Right now, there's 600 acres of airport, is almost a silo. Money that is developed there has to stay in there, expenses, obviously, have to be paid by the airport. But in 2022, that changes if we don't take FAA money, and that becomes just a normal Town asset. That's good news and bad news. The good news is that it may become, if the airport is properly run, a very significant

source of non-tax revenue for the Town, which is in short supply. The other bad news, and Gene Oshrin and some of the pilots are sitting here saying, "My gosh, if we make money out there, they'll take it and use it for broomsticks and garbage cans, and we'll have an airport that falls apart."

So there has to be a little thought given, and we have plenty of time, since we have until 2022, to think about it as to how you set this thing up to make sure that the airport is maintained as an asset, and a cash-generating asset for the entire Town.

It sounds like what we're doing is thanking everybody, but we want to make everybody aware that we're not sitting in a glass cage here trying to come up with numbers. We've spoken to a bunch of other airports, Westhampton, some in New Jersey, some in Connecticut. We've spoken to various fuel suppliers. There are essentially three FBOs, or Fixed Base Operators, at the airport that are really the face of the airport. There's, of course, Sound Aircraft, which is the biggest, there's Myers Fuel, there's Long Island Aircraft, and we've had all of these folks

Τ	involved in our discussions, because anything we
2	do is going to impact them. And, quite frankly,
3	they also have tremendous historical knowledge
4	and present knowledge of how the airport operates
5	that we'll ever get.
6	Also in the Town, and he escaped, John
7	Jilnicki was a person we've been, you know,
8	hammering away at for the last few months, and
9	he's been very helpful getting us a lot of
10	information, and will be going forward.
11	And again, also, in the idea of
12	inclusiveness, there are these 600 acres, but
13	they happen to be over a water recharge area.
14	And so we've already been talking to Marguerite
15	Wolffsohn and Kim Shaw about the problems that
16	are caused, or the difficulties and the hurdles
17	that have to be overcome in dealing with land in
18	that area. Even though we have land that may be
19	very valuable, there's a whole Planning
20	Department review that has to be upheld before we
21	get into it.
22	So those are my wrap-up comments. And I
23	think the only other person here is Frank, who
24	might want to say a couple of words about the
25	solar. No? You're shaking your head.

1	SUPERVISUR CANTWELL: We've covered that
2	ground already with Frank. But, Kathee, did you
3	want to say something?
4	MS. BURKE-GONZALEZ: Well, I just want to
5	say, there's 11 members on the committee, six are
6	here today. Some folks walked in when we got
7	started. So I just want to thank Arthur, he's
8	been tremendous. And Peter Wadsworth, Pat
9	Trunzo, Michael Diesenhaus, Gene Oshrin is here
10	as well, and Frank Dalene. And, you know,
11	they've all of these folks have brought a
12	wealth of experience. I think we have four
13	attorneys, we have CFOs from corporations, we've
14	got major builders on the committee. The depth
15	of experience and knowledge is incredible. And I
16	have to also say they're also very amusing and
17	crack themselves up at meetings. So it's been
18	it's been a tremendous ride.
19	And I have to tell you, I got back from my
20	first meeting at the airport when the group first
21	met and I was giddy. You know, it was just
22	incredible how everybody has been working
23	together. And some folks, as Peter said, never
24	thought it would happen, and it's I guess I
25	had a thought it would happen, which is why my

hand went up and volunteered to take on the airport. And I just want to thank you all for the work you've been doing.

COUNCILMAN VAN SCOYOC: I just want to add that, you know, I've sat on this Board, and I'm now in my third year, and this is finally a process that's taking place that we had hoped that would come to pass. And I just want to thank Kathee and everyone on the committee who's been involved, working very constructively to get to the bottom of what the real financial numbers are, find out what our options are. And I just think it's so very important for -- as a Board Member to know where we stand and what our options are going forward, so that we can make the best possible choices for the community. So I want to thank you all very much.

MS. BURKE-GONZALEZ: Well said.

SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: I would say, first of all, thanks to each one of you, Peter, especially you. I know you're the one that, you know, dug into the details and the finances, and put together, you know, a terrific report, financial report, and thank Len and Charlene for helping you with that, and Arthur for bringing -- keeping

1 everyone together on the committee.

I wanted to say two things quickly. Yeah, I'm very encouraged by this process. Kathee, I congratulate you as well for being, you know, the author of these committees and putting those together.

You know, I don't -- it's amazing to me that -- and it's a model. I don't want to say it's amazing to me. There's something of a model that's occurred here that is really a terrific statement, I think, and to the credit of the people that are working on this committee. I mean, you know, to take people with such strong opposing points of view and put them in a room together, working constructively to try to find answers and goals is inspirational to me. And it's a credit to the people involved that you've hammered these issues through and come up with a unanimous resolution.

I mean, not to throw personalities into this, but, Arthur, you mentioned it. I mean, to think that, you know, principal opponents like Tom Twomey and David Gruber, you know, working together around the same table, agreeing unanimously on a resolution, I don't know that a

1	year or so ago that anyone would have thought
2	that that was possible. And it's to their credit
3	and the credit of this committee that, you know,
4	you've put together an effort and come up with a,
5	you know, common answer that you can agree on,
6	and I couldn't be more pleased that that's
7	happened. It shows what can happen when you put
8	people together who have opposing points of view
9	and truly want to try to find what's best for the
10	community, and I congratulate everyone on the
11	committee for what you've done to this point.
12	Now, that doesn't mean that there won't be blood
13	on the floor on other issues in the future
14	(Laughter)
15	with respect to the airport and
16	everyone won't walk out of the room, but, you
17	know, you've started a new beginning here, and we
18	certainly are going to do everything we can as a
19	Board to encourage you to continue.
20	The other point I wanted to make is this:
21	You know, over the past year, and, you know,
22	listening to both sides with respect to the
23	airport, you know, you get a lot of strong
24	opinions about what can what you can and you
25	can't do. And some people held, you know, the

1	conclusion that, you know, the airport would fai
2	apart if you don't take FAA money. This report
3	shows that that's not the case here. Now that
4	doesn't end the argument of whether some time in
5	the future FAA funds should be used or not used,
6	I'm not reaching that conclusion at this point.
7	But, clearly, your financial analysis shows that
8	we can move forward, at least in the immediate
9	and interim future, that we can finance the
10	airport, we can keep it safe, we can make the
11	improvements that are absolutely necessary, and
12	we can do that for some period of time without
13	taking FAA money, which only leaves our options
14	open, which is a good thing.
15	So I personally want to thank everyone on
16	the committee for outstanding work.
17	COUNCILWOMAN OVERBY: Thanks.
18	SUPERVISOR CANTWELL: I think we'll move
19	on, unless there are other questions of either
20	Peter or Arthur. Thank you both.
21	(END)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
2	
3	
4	
5	I, Lucia Braaten, a Court Reporter and
6	Notary Public for the State of New York, certify
7	that the foregoing transcript of the videotaped
8	meeting of the May 20, 2014 East Hampton Town
9	Board was prepared using the required electronic
10	transcription equipment, and is a true and
11	accurate record to the best of my ability.
12	
13	
14	Signature:
15	Lucia Braaten
16	
17	
18	Date: December 9, 2014
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	