**Airport Management Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting – January 8, 2016 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, Peter Wadsworth, David Gruber, Pat Trunzo III, Cindy Herbst, Charles Ehren, and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, and Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer. Attending by telephone was Bonnie Krupinski. Absent were Voting Members Munir Saltoun and Gene Oshrin and ex officio member, Jemille Charlton, Airport Director.

Among others attending were Supervisor Larry Cantwell, Kent Feuerring, the new president of the EH Aviation Association and Jim DeKoning of L.K. McLean Associates consulting engineers. Mike Waibel of Baker Engineering and Ron Price of QED were available to join the call if needed but the need did not arise.

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.

The next meeting was scheduled for 9 AM on Friday, February 26 at Town Hall.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that the needed noise and complaint data were being reviewed but since the time of a complaint call or email did not match the time about which the complaint was being made, a little more work was needed to sift through the data manually rather than relying on the time stamp of the call or email complaint. She indicated that data in a form useful for the committee should be available shortly.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also reported that contractual matters such as those relating to on-field fuel truck leases and the like were being discussed among the winning fuel supply bidder, the Town and the FBO’s -- but those items should be finalized shortly.

She also indicated that Jemille Charlton had been seeking surveyors who could incorporate FAA requirements and had found a couple interested. Arthur Malman noted that getting a surveyor in the field was a critical next step to seeking bids from tree cutters and knowing the boundaries of existing tenants so that the airport does not plan to start projects that would infringe on them before getting their consent.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that Jemille Charlton had given to Baker the working group’s recommendation for a safety fence around the terminal and that Baker was starting the engineering work. David Gruber asked to see a sketch to understand what Baker was being asked to do and Arthur Malman said he would contact them and ask that a copy be sent to everyone before more detailed work was started.

Arthur Malman noted that Baker was receiving bids from additional contractors for the core borings as the first bidder had not been responsive and that a preliminary draft paving condition report (without core data) was to be delivered before our next meeting.

With respect to recent board actions on the airport Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported

1. a resolution to retain L.K. McLean Associates, P.C., Consulting Engineers, to provide professional services for the Engineering Design, Permitting and Construction Administration/ Inspection services for the removal of the existing fuel farm and replacement of it with a new facility. Arthur Malman noted that several committee members and Jemille Charlton had already met with McLean to review various aspects of the project.
2. Authorization for an option to lease two industrial road parcels to Landscape Details subject to a public hearing noticed on its proposed lease, a copy of which she had attached to her email to the committee late yesterday.

While reviewing a map locating the proposed lease parcels Cindy Herbst pointed out that this was for non-aeronautical uses and that parcels should be retained for hangars or other aeronautical uses.

Arthur Malman noted that no potential aeronautical users had been forthcoming although about a year ago, after the forerunner of this committee had determined that building new hangars by local pilots would not be an expansion of the airport, he had met and held detailed discussions with Elliot Miesel of the EH Aviation Association about a possible lease of land for additional hangars. While the Town seemed willing to consider reasonable compensation for unamortized costs of building the hangars if the airport were to be closed to type A and B aircraft (since that did not seem a possibility), the formula that Elliot had wanted, for essentially lost profits as well, was not practical and no further negotiations ensued.

It was noted that some remaining vacant parcels adjacent to existing hangars were still available for lease to groups of pilots who wanted to build hangars and Kent Feuerring was encouraged to get back to the town with a concrete proposal if there was serious interest in such a project.

The Supervisor noted that other additional potential non-aeronautical users were negotiating with the town for vacant parcels and the Town was looking at whether additional land around the airport could be leased for other commercial purposes.

Since the Town wanted to postpone engaging a commercial broker it was suggested that large signs be posted in the terminal and at the intersection of Industrial and Daniels Hole Roads advertising the land for rent. Bonnie Krupinski recommended that the town run ads (as versus merely legal notices) in the Star real estate section for several weeks similarly advertising the availability of parcels for lease -- as a broker would be doing if one were engaged.

David Gruber indicated that, in response to his recent FOIL request, he had been told that the town had no form lease for airport properties and asked if the lease attached to the recent email was just such a form lease. Charles Ehren asked why the committee still had not been given a chance to review the form. Pat Trunzo III was particularly indignant that precisely what had been repeatedly warned against—having a lease go out once again without knowledgeable people with industry experience in leasing looking at it—was happening again. Bonnie Krupinski reiterated once again that there had to be well thought out standardized leases with front pages showing all the variables which could be easily administered.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez said she had invited committee members to suggest clauses to be considered for a lease. Pat Trunzo III reminded the group that this suggestion had been rejected immediately when originally made since it was pointless to suggest additions or changes to a document no one had seen.

Larry Cantwell suggested that the interested members of the committee should review the proposed lease that had been emailed yesterday, combine their comments and submit them to the Town.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that resolutions on no parking on Daniel’s Hole road for about a half mile north and south of the airport entrance were being finalized, but they would not prohibit stopping on the road near the end of the runway by cars that would like to watch planes land and take off.

Arthur Malman noted that since Jim DeKoning had sent a draft of the parking plan with multi spot meters, there had been active email discussions among committee members about the benefits of a lot with access gates (which was the system that LAZ parking had originally recommended about a year ago). However, given the time and cost for the additional engineering and site work that would be needed to accommodate such a system, Arthur Malman felt the committee should continue with its plan for the initial experimental season.

He pointed out that the preliminary plan showed presumably free staff and FBO parking along the fence line but that the prior meeting had agreed that the only exemption from paid parking would be for town airport staff, but that staff parking should be at the far end of the lot not the most sought after spots next to the terminal. Arthur Malman indicated that hangar owners generally park at their hangars

Cindy Herbst indicated that her staff needed parking and that she did not feel she had sufficient room on her leased area. Likewise, people who leased tie downs from Sound did not have room to park at the tie downs and would need to use the paid lot. David Gruber pointed out that the concept was that all airport users should pay for airport operations and Sound’s lease and those of other tenants did not assure them free parking on town property.

It was pointed out that for many years Hertz had been leasing desk space in the terminal and using the lot for $750 per month. Now, for an interim from the summer through December 31, 2015 they had agreed to increase the monthly payment to $5,000 with 15 spots allocated to them. A discussion ensued on how much they would be willing to pay and how many dedicated spaces Hertz and Enterprise would want going forward.

The draft plan showed dedicated rental car parking on the grass along the fence line. Some members thought the rental companies would prefer paved parking and it was suggested that they pay for paving. Alternatively, depending on their needs and willingness to pay, some of the paved spaces in the existing lot could be reserved for them The Supervisor undertook to call Hertz and find out their needs and the amount they would be willing to pay for 2016. Jemille Charlton had indicated that he was already in discussions with Enterprise. The Supervisor indicated that Sound like the rental companies could negotiate for prepaid spots if they were needed.

Another suggestion was to consider higher priced prepaid annual reserved parking for a limited number of spots closest to the terminal where the first draft had originally shown staff parking

Since the plan for the first year was to charge to charge $10 per 24 hours part thereof (except for free 30 minute parking) Peter Wadsworth suggested that enforcement could be accomplished in the evening to pick up overnight parkers. However, it was pointed out that this would quickly encourage those who were not staying overnight to not bother paying. The Supervisor felt that the police could arrange to enforce paid parking at least twice per day.

David Gruber suggested that the meeting consider gating further since it should not be particularly more expensive for the equipment and would simplify enforcement, resulting in higher collections since utilities were being extended anyway for the multisport meters. Jim DeKoning pointed out that the meters would have solar panels and cell phone connections so long utility runs would not be necessary.

At first a discussion ensued on having the gates at the entrance to the airport on Daniel’s Hole Road but the problem would be to provide for cars backing up at crowded times on to a main road waiting to access the gate. Another alternative was putting gates at the entrance to the current paved parking area. One question on this location would be was there sufficient space in the existing curb cut to put both an in gate and an out gate and payment islands or would more site work and utilities be needed.

There was also a discussion of the need and cost for 24/7 offsite monitoring of the gates if problems develop; also the desirability of a second gate each way in case one fails.

David Gruber thought there was still enough time for a simple RFP for gated parking, giving bidders just the present parking lot layout and a google earth shot and asking for initial responses. Charles Ehren thought that we could proceed on both gated and multi spot meters paths simultaneously and quickly.

However, Len Bernard pointed out that without details for a gated system, prospective bidders would have a myriad of questions that would significantly slow down the bidding process. Jim DeKoning gave examples of the need for detailed specifications in a bid request, especially since the equipment supplier may or may not be doing the site work and/or the 24/7 offsite monitoring. Bonnie Krupinski pointed out the need for precise specification on any bid request and recommended that before site work were commenced a short, medium and long term parking plan should be developed as she felt strongly that parking needs would continue to grow over the years.

Although some members felt that the gated option could also be pursued in the alternative for 2016, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Larry Cantwell and most members recommended continuing only with the multi space meter option for 2016 test season, given the additional time and expenses for the engineering work needed to create a detailed RFP for a gated system, the goal of having paid parking working by April so that kinks could be worked out before the season and leaving some time for normal slippage. However all agreed, assuming that parking demand met expectations, a gated system would probably be the logical system for subsequent years

The meeting adjourned at 11:30.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman