

## **BFAC/Airport Finance Group**

### **Minutes of Meeting – July 18, 2014 at Town Hall**

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton's Budget and Financial Advisory Committee (BFAC), called the meeting to order at noon.

The following members of the BFAC/Airport Finance Group were present: Gene Oshrin, Peter Wadsworth, David Gruber, Bonnie Krupinski, Toni Somerstein, Munir Saltoun, Tom Twomey, Mike Diesenhaus and Arthur Malman; Pat Trunzo, Jr. and Frank Dalene could not attend.

Attending the meeting by invitation was Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the BFAC and for the airport and Jim Brundige, Airport manager. Attending for a portion of the meeting was Larry Cantwell, Supervisor. Also attending by invitation for a portion of the meeting was David Yap of DY Consultants, the town's airport engineers, and two associates.

Minutes of the last meeting had been previously distributed and were approved as revised. The attached agenda had been previously distributed.

Arthur Malman reported on a short meeting just prior to our meeting with Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Len Bernard, Alex Walter and Larry Cantwell to discuss the consideration to the Town for the new lease for Phoenix House at an annual rental for its 3 ½ acres at less than recent appraisal of FMV rentals for new leases on Industrial Road. The Supervisor had pointed out that a major consideration for the board was that, in addition to its new rental under the new lease, Phoenix house was giving up its present lease for the property at \$100 per year. As a result the aggregate consideration to the airport was substantially higher than merely the face annual lease rental for the new lease. Therefore the new Phoenix House rental alone would not be a comparable for future appraisals of similar land without the consideration of its surrender of its prior favorable lease.

Councilwoman Burke-Gonzalez updated the meeting on bonding of \$270,000 for runway 4/22 repairs as an interim taxiway and \$354,000 for airport lighting as well as \$59,000 approved for a noise study for a total of \$683,000. When confronted with unfounded charges that the town "was closing the airport" these expenditures were the easiest way to convince people of the falsity of the claimed closing. She also reported on inquiries from the NY Times on airport matters and Arthur Malman reported on inquiries about the Phoenix house lease from the EH Press.

Tom Twomey indicated that one of the recent groups that claimed that the town was going to close the airport had originally called itself "Save the Airport". Tom and Gene Oshrin recounted that they and other pilots had formed a group under that name several years ago which had raised substantial sums for airport matters. As a consequence they had contacted this new group and demanded that it stop using their name and the new group changed its name to "Friends of East Hampton Airport".

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also indicated a broad FOIL request had been received from a Connecticut attorney on the fuel flowage fee increase and other airport matters. Arthur Malman indicated that, he was not a FOIL expert, but, although this was possibly an indication of upcoming litigation, a foil request was different from a request for document discovery in litigation. For example, among other things, if there was to be time of town employees involved to comply beyond two hours, the party requesting the documents could be asked to reimburse the town for the cost of the employees involved as well as the cost of copying up to 25 cents a page and actual out of pocket costs for oversize copies. It seemed that complying with the every item requested (some of which might not be required to be delivered under a foil request) could take very substantial time of town employees, yet the party making the request asked to be advised if the costs could exceed \$200---and these costs could run very substantially higher. He indicated that the Town might decide to direct the requesting party to the town's website and deliver some easily retrievable items and then hear if the requesting party would want to pay these charges before commencing work on other aspects of the request.

The meeting then asked David Yap to explain the work to rehabilitate Runway 4-22 as a temporary taxiway. He explained that the plan was to cut out a 35 foot by 900 foot section of badly deteriorated paving in the middle of 4-22, install joints along the edges and replace the asphalt. This would have an expected useful life for use as a taxiway of about 5-10 years. Peter Wadsworth noted that any bonds for this work could not expire after the expected life of the improvements

Mike Disenhaus asked about the annual maintenance cost for this repaired section of 4-22 as versus a new runway or taxiway. David Yap indicated that it would depend on the quality of the original runway but that a runway that he would design would have a useful life of at least 20 years.

It was pointed out that, from work done previously by the BFAC on highways, it had been learned that rigorous annual maintenance in the early years could substantially increase the useful life of asphalt roads and decrease their long term cost. David Yap agreed and indicated that, although he could not give specific numbers for annual asphalt maintenance reserves he felt the annual costs would increase exponentially over time.

He also explained that long cracks in a runway could be filled but that deterioration to the underlying base was more of a problem. Radiating cracks typically indicated problems with the base and would require more extensive repairs than mere crack filling.

Tom Twomey asked how much of the cost of the proposed \$270,000 4-22 taxiway repair cost would be asphalt and about \$100-120,000 was David Yap's estimate (although responses from the RFP had not yet been received). Tom Twomey noted that the balance was engineering, mobilization and similar costs, that would be substantially the same if the work done was a 60 foot width as versus the currently contemplated 35 feet and furthermore the joints were likely areas for future concerns. It was also noted that the wider repair might also be subject to somewhat less short term deterioration. He and Gene Oshrin pointed out that the ALP showed 4-22 as 60 feet wide and so for an additional \$100,000 or so the town could get to the correct usable width.

David Yap pointed out that the repaired area, in any event, however wide would require crowning and drainage on the sides for long term use as a runway and the whole 900 foot project with those additions (for engineering, asphalt and other work) would be several hundred thousand dollars.

David Gruber asked why a more economical taxiway fix would not be just filling in the missing portion of the 10-28 main runway taxiway. David Yap explained that, since there had been no paving in this portion, besides engineering, there would be an environmental impact study that could be time consuming and expensive, and since there was no existing base it would also require the construction of a new base—all of which could take about 2 years.

David Gruber then asked why a better more economical long term solution for a second runway would not be to rehabilitate runway 16-34 which remains in service and could have an added taxiway by using only seven of the existing tie down spots. David Yap indicated that although either runway 4-22 or 16-34 in combination with the longer runway 10-28 would meet the FAA's requirement for 95 % wind coverage, it had already been determined to choose 4-22 rather than 16-34 in the approved ALP.

Gene Oshrin pointed out that 4-22 was best for prevailing winds in the summer and 16-34 in the winter, but since over 90% of the airport's traffic was in the summer the choice was clear. It was also noted that since the FAA's wind coverage requirements were not weighted by traffic, the fact that both 16-34 and 4-22 met the standard was somewhat misleading. David Gruber pointed out that the GEIS did not give the amount of traffic between summer and winter as a basis for choosing 4-22 and that should not be given as a support for the 4-22 selection without a further study.

Larry Cantwell asked David Yap how he would stage the overall project to disrupt the airport operations least and in the most cost effective method. After discussion David Yap proposed that 4-22 be rehabilitated first as a temporary taxiway, then plan and complete the parallel taxiway for 10-28 and then finally reconstruct 4-22 as a secondary runway. He felt these projects which be done in sequence but with some planning overlap over a period of about 3 years.

A discussion ensued on how long it would take to re-engineer the temporary work on 4-22 for a 60 foot rather than 35 foot fix. David Yap indicated that the engineering work could be done in about a month or so but by the time was rebid you would be into the fall and local asphalt plants might be ready to close for the winter. Bonnie Krupinski indicated that local asphalt plants were open until December 1, so that the project at a wider width could possibly be reengineered, bid and still be completed by December. However whatever the width of the repair, when the final runway work was done it is still only the width of a portion of the base being discussed and additional engineering for the crown and drainage and the construction of these items would be required.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stressed that the bonding resolution for the 35 foot repair had already been approved and the RFP for asphalt had been issued (and until that came back costs could not be finalized) and she would not want to reopen the width issue with the board at this time but would rather get the immediate problem fixed.

Based on David Yap's presentation, most of the members present felt that because of the possible mid-term economic saving for the ultimate 4-22 repaving project, the Board should reconsider the 60 foot alternative.

The meeting then turned to issues about trees penetrating approved glide paths on the main runway. The Yap Consultants explained the FAA regulations and the geometry behind them and showed the areas affected for different classes of aircraft. They also explained the three approach patterns permitted for instrument landings X, Y and Z and that the FAA had confirmed that it had made an error in stating that all three had been closed to use and would be issuing a NOTAM correcting its error and so certain classes of aircraft could use the remaining approach pattern for night instrument landings.

In fact one of the approaches was still usable on a "temporary" basis but that particular one did not cover classes C and D aircraft.

Jim Brundige stated that he did not agree with all aspects of this conclusion and that further review would be undertaken.

The Yap Consultants explained that "temporary" meant the later of 90 days from the time the FAA approved the temporary use (which had passed) or the date that they withdraw the temporary permission—which could be at any time. It was pointed out that in East Hampton instrument approaches were sometimes needed during the day because of fog so this was not only a nighttime problem.

A chart was reviewed of the percentage of aircraft classes actually using HTO which had been designated as open to classes A-D and it appeared classes C and D, which required the widest areas of tree clearing, were less than 2% of HTO traffic.

It was also noted that some of the trees posing a problem were outside the town of EH and some were on private property.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez said she had worked with town departments on assessing removing the particular trees to the extent that they penetrated the glide paths and this would be extremely expensive and the trees would soon grow back. The more practical alternative would be to clear all the trees in the glide path. The work to date indicated that about 20 acres could be affected if the areas for classes A, B C and D were to be cleared. Apparently there were not trees of any particular merit in the affected areas although the understory brush was of concern in the water recharge zone. Starting first with the trees affecting only the class A and B flight path would require initially less clearing

Bonnie Krupinski pointed out that to preserve as much of the understory as practical bulldozing the trees would not be practical and cutting the trees would be needed. She also pointed out that many of the tree cutters were less busy in the winter months and, if the RFP allowed the work to be done during that season, the bids might come in a little lower.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM after having the next meeting set for 9:30 on Friday, August 8th, at Town Hall.

Respectively submitted, Arthur Malman