**Airport Management Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting –September 18, 2015 at Town Hall**

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 9 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members- Bonnie Krupinski, Peter Wadsworth, David Gruber, Pat Trunzo III, Gene Oshrin, Charles Ehren, Cindy Herbst and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members- Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer and Jemille Charlton, Airport Director. Absent was voting member Munir Saltoun.

Attending by telephone was Mike Waibel of Baker Engineering.

Arthur Malman invited all members of the public to join the discussion.

The attached agenda had been previously distributed.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved as drafted.

Arthur Malman thanked Michael Waibel for sending the projects chart and several committee members asked questions about its formatting and organization. With respect to the pavement analysis, Michael Waibel indicated that the test machinery should be operating on site by October 13.

Michael Waibel indicated that Jemille Charlton had been discussing meeting dates with the FAA for discussions on the tree cutting and deer fence but a date had not yet been set. Arthur Malman asked if the FAA was ducking the meeting but was told that the FAA people wanted to review the questions internally first to make the meeting more productive.

With respect to the preliminary fuel farm layout so that alternative locations could be discussed, Michael Waibel explained that they were finishing a work authorization for the town board on the fuel farm and should have it shortly. A discussion ensued on the need for a narrow perimeter road for aircraft fuel service trucks if a different location were picked for a new farm. While there was plenty of room on the east side of Daniel’s Hole Road, it was explained that aircraft fuel service trucks were not built or licensed for travel on public roads and there would also be insurance questions if they were to cross the public road.

Arthur Malman asked about the responses to the Fuel RFP. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that there had been only one response, possibly because pre mixed Prist inclusion was required. Arthur Malman asked if the committee could have a copy of a list of vendors who received notice of the RFP.

He then asked Cindy Herbst where the FBO’s were on a term sheet to take over direct fuel purchases from the town with the town operating the fuel farm. She indicated that, with the Labor Day rush over, they should have it shortly.

With respect to the status of the form lease, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stated that an aeronautical lease form and a non-aeronautical lease form had been prepared by the Kirsch firm and that there was a new attorney in the legal department who was working on airport leases. Arthur Malman noted that the Kirsch firm attorneys were aviation lawyers but may well lack the practical knowledge of how real estate leases should work for a major multitenant project such as the airport aviation areas and industrial park, with multiple tenant accounts to be administered. He asked that the committee have a chance to review the new proposed standard forms before they are used. He noted that members of the committee had reviewed the old leases and had outside knowledge of practical leasing operations that the form lease preparers do not.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that the attorneys did not want the committee to see the lease forms because of the pending litigation. Bonnie Krupinski indicated that standard lease forms are constantly evolving and it seemed foolish to exclude those members familiar with the area from reviewing the forms before they get sent out. Charles Ehren did not understand the “pending litigation” argument that the committee not be able to see the proposed form since it would soon become a public document. David Gruber reiterated the prior committee’s recommendation of a standard body with a cover sheet or two with variables—and no changes to the body—like an insurance policy or homeowners set and asked exactly how the new proposed forms were set up.

Pat Trunzo indicated that the non-disclosure of the proposed standard forms does not seem warranted, the committee members would not be getting involved with individual negotiations but merely wanted a chance to see the forms before they are put into use and suggested that the committee could FOIL the forms.

Len Bernard indicated that he did not understand a problem with the committee seeing the proposed form as versus a lease in negotiations. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that she would check again with the legal department.

Arthur Malman then asked about the status of getting paid parking working this winter in time to shake it down for the summer and whether an RFP had been issued for a consultant as the Supervisor had apparently preferred. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez he indicated that a proposal had been received from a traffic consultant for a preliminary study for about $11,000 and that the Board would need an itemized breakdown of the steps to implement paid parking. Peter Wadsworth indicated that the prior committee had already done this last spring and offered to resend it and went on to explain the general outlines of a simple test system that had been recommended at only about a $60,000 budget [Peter later confirmed that those estimates had varied from about $42-89,000] to test the concept with a single ticket dispensing meter, restriping of the existing paved lot, adding signage on paved and grass areas and setting up no parking areas on Daniel’s Hole Road for about ½ mile in each direction.

Gene Oshrin asked about the typical gate system used at Islip and other airports. It was explained that this may well be the ultimate system once we have a year or so of the low-cost test system to better understand demand for paid parking.

Cindy Herbst asked why the airport could not just issue season passes or sell tickets manually. It was explained that these alternatives had been rejected by the prior committee because of the burden on manual processing at the airport, enforcement, limited revenue potential, the time need for a hurrying traveler to get a permit, etc.

David Gruber asked what expenses would be entailed and could these be minimized during the test year and Peter Wadsworth explained the minimum expenditure. At this point the members questioned the need for a traffic flow consultant and attendant expense and delay for just the test system.

A discussion of rental car needs ensued and it was pointed out that Hertz would be signing shortly an interim lease but only through December 31. Arthur Malman noted that it would be good if we knew the needs for paid spots for Hertz and Enterprise and while Jemille Charlton should discuss needs with them it was up to them to come forward now or just paid the regular rates. It was pointed out that Enterprise was a sub-lessee of Sound and so Sound should follow up with them as well.

Bonnie Krupinski recommended that even if major parking areas were not being developed at this time, some consideration should be given to how the eventual parking plan, if developed, might work together so that we don’t do work now on parking or the fuel farm that could cause problems later. The members agreed with the need for at least some rough free hand schematics at this time but stressed the point that 2016 parking was just a low budget test to get a better handle on needs and operations.

Bonnie Krupinski questioned whether a consultant was necessary to scope and design this minimal test project, but suggested that perhaps the Supervisor wanted to make sure that there was a project manager. Jemille Charlton stated that he could easily assume the duty of project manager and save the expense of the consultant.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stated that she would confirm with the Supervisor that he was satisfied with Jemille Charlton performing the project manager function for the test system. It was also pointed out that no matter which way we went, the Board should set up the no parking zones and pass the related enabling resolutions as soon as possible if the project were to be running by year end. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez asked for a detailed outline and Peter Wadsworth said he would resend this [after the meeting Peter Wadsworth sent this material to Kathee Burke-Gonzalez and the other committee members].

Arthur Malman then asked where the Town was on pending leases and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez answered that there were several in negotiation but none yet signed. Arthur Malman asked where the Town was on an RFP for a lease broker for non-aeronautical leases, the substantive sections for which had been provided to the town by the prior committee several months ago. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that this would be worked on by the new attorney in the legal department in charge of airport matters.

Jemille Charlton then updated the committee on the status on the status of integrating flight data and complaints and indicated that significant progress had been made and the project seemed to be nearing completion. Charles Ehren wanted to know when all the historical data would be available to the noise affected groups for analysis.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that the Town had said it would report on the situation in October and wanted to have the noise consultants review the data first. David Gruber indicated that the backup data was 15-20,000 pieces of information and felt that those who had the expertise to review the underlying data should have the chance to review the backup data as had been the practice in the past.

Several members felt that this data should be available to the public. Peter Wadsworth suggested that it could at least be made available to committee members who had analytical expertise and would be willing to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

Jemille Charlton indicated that the AWOS was moving forward but that the cost for installation had increased significantly because of the desire to have a hard wired connection between the AWOS and the seasonal control tower, which would be a long run of cabling and require going under a runway. A discussion ensued on the desirability of having the entire run and not just the portion under the runway put into conduit that could be used for multiple purposes. It was explained that there would just be naked cable for now but when the runway was rebuilt there would be several channels underneath it in a section for rerunning this cable as well as possible future underground crossings for other needs.

Jemille Charlton reported that he was still working on getting the missing sections of the existing deer fence replaced. Arthur Malman asked whether the working group of Jemille Charlton Bonnie Krupinski and Cindy Herbst had finalized locations for the deer fencing and a lower passenger control fence and gates around the terminal. There had been tests over the summer of varying locations for the passenger control fence and the members concurred that a high fence was not needed for this purpose but rather one blending in with the existing gates should be considered.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman