

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting – March 24, 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, Gene Oshrin 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. Absent was ex officio member, Jemille Charlton, Airport Director, who was on temporary active duty with the Air Force but Patrick Manzo of the airport staff joined in the meeting. Voting members Munir Saltoun joined the meeting by telephone and Bonnie Krupinski was absent.

Among others attending were Supervisor Larry Cantwell, Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association and Navin Natarajan of Michael Baker Engineering. Mike Waibel of Baker Engineering joined the meeting by telephone.

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 but with additions suggested in emails to the committee by Navin Natarajan, David Gruber and Pat Trunzo III. [The final minutes with these insertions were subsequently emailed to all members without further comment]

The next meeting was scheduled for 9 AM on THURSDAY, April 21 at Town Hall.

David Gruber noted that he had a problem with the simplifying mathematical processes (taking averages of averages of subsets) used by Baker in a recent email on wind coverage that suggested an error in the reported 94.5% coverage by runway 4-22 and a discussion ensued on the more fulsome updated wind study that Baker had been asked to start.

It was explained that the former wind study findings incorporated in the 2011 ALP had used 10 years of wind data, the FAA standard, from Westhampton Airport, the closest certified weather station at the time—assuming it was substantially similar to that at HTO where certified wind data was not then available. With certified wind data now available at HTO, the first step would be to compare recent wind readings at WH and HTO to see if, on a daily basis, they were fairly similar.

If a relatively constant deviation (e.g. a few degree westerly bias at WH) were found between the two airports, assumed HTO wind data might be adjusted accordingly for periods where actual HTO wind data was not yet available; if there were inconsistent deviations we would have to assess the effect of them on the prior wind study data based only on WH data to determine if they were acceptable or

not reliable for the study of wind at HTO. Cindy Herbst noted that she might also have historical HTO data from Sound's own wind readings that could also be used in these test and she would check and get them to Baker.

In any event, the new Baker wind study would be using actual HTO data for the most recent periods in its 10 year study.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez gave a short summary of the consultant noise reports given at the recent public meeting [the full report had been emailed to all members].

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also reported that the Supervisor's discussions with Hertz and Enterprise on their paid parking needs should soon be concluding

Arthur Malman noted that Waldbridge Surveying had complete its initial field work to survey and mark the areas for tree cutting and suggested the upcoming wood cutting RFP should include tree cutting along the main runway taxiway as had been discussed at the last meeting. He suggested that Baker should also be asked to send the map for this to Waldbridge so they could also mark this area. Pat Trunzo III questioned whether there was a need for Waldbridge to bother marking this additional area since it would be straight clear cutting-- X feet from the center line of the taxiway.

Arthur Malman noted that while McLean Associates had been engaged for surveying leased areas, they had run into a problem since one of the Sound leases referred to a leased parcel's area but not its dimensions. This particular parcel would abut the new fuel farm and therefore the boundary needed to be fixed. Cindy Herbst indicated that her architect had assumed (albeit presumably without any agreement as yet from the town) a square for this area which, according to McLean, still made the proposed fuel farm workable. However a designed tree line to cut wind and rain hitting the fuel farm would have to be eliminated. Arthur Malman suggested that Sound might want to amend it supposed square, fixing a slightly different boundary with the Town that would accommodate the tree line, with the "lost" area being made up in another dimension. Cindy Herbst indicated that she was favorably disposed to this suggestion but just wanted to check with her architect and would confirm with McLean after she did.

Arthur Malman reiterated the BFAC's prior recommendation that all of the Sound leases and amendments, along with the economic provisions in the court settlement between Sound and the Town, as well as the final shape and boundary of this parcel next to the fuel farm, be encompassed in a new lease as had been required by the settlement—or at the very least a written document signed by Sound and the Town confirm both sides' agreement on the shape and boundaries of this parcel so it could be properly incorporated in the McLean survey of all the airport's leased properties.

Navin Natarajan confirmed that with regard to the planned deer fence that if the Part 77 (34:1) surface is penetrated by the proposed fence, it could be mitigated by providing FAA Approved Obstruction Lights. Baker was asked to confirm that advice with a drawing which would indicate their calculation of the highest fence permitted at HTO at the ends of the runways (with and without lights)—

and if an 8 foot fence could not be used at those spots, to calculate the highest lower parallel fencing that could be used.

Baker had been asked to review FAA separation requirements so that the Town could get a more definite understanding of the dimensions of the apron areas that would not be used for tie downs or taxiing aircraft if 16-34 were to be the secondary runway. Navin Natarajan distributed a diagram which showed potential additional aircraft parking areas around the main terminal if 16-34 were opened as the secondary runway or if it were closed and 4-22 became the secondary runway.

Arthur Malman noted that this was just a preliminary analysis since it showed potential aircraft parking areas that were already dedicated to the new fuel farm and those that were leased to private owners and did not yet consider any parking areas around the executive terminal.

David Gruber asked why the critical aircraft specifications for the 4-22 runway and 16-34 runway differed. Navin Natarajan explained that this came from the ALP. It seemed that once a decision was made for 4-22 to be the secondary runway on the ALP no one went back to update the critical design aircraft assumptions on the ALP as regards 4-22.

David Gruber noted that as there is no basis for assuming a different Critical Design Aircraft (CDA) for one secondary runway or the other and the Category B-II, Twin Otter, the aircraft previously designated as the Critical Design Aircraft, is no longer in use at all at HTO, this appears to be an oversight. The CDA for the secondary runway designated in the ALP is the Beech Baron, a Category B-I aircraft. Cindy. As the aircraft used for Navin Natarajan's presentation was the former CDA, he will revisit the necessary separations in light of the designated CDA.

Navin Natarajan explained that to find the critical design aircraft for an airport runway, you look to the largest aircraft type which have had at least 500 annual operations using that facility and would be expected to continue so using that runway prospectively. Baker was asked to review recent data at HTO and come back to the town with updated CDA information for each of the three runways.

Cindy Hebst said she felt that the Cessna Caravan, a seaplane, was probably now the most frequent larger aircraft using the airport. Charles Ehren noted that the increase in noisy seaplanes was creating an increase in noise complaints that should be addressed from a policy standpoint.

Cindy Herbst asked why this focus on parking aircraft, since all were accommodated now. It was explained that several times over the summer the Tower would close 16-34 because aircraft were parked too close to it and HTO could not properly operate with its sole secondary runway closed. Therefore, since some taxing and parking areas on the existing apron would be lost, our focus is to find alternate parking areas for those that will be lost. If 16-34 is the secondary runway the lost area is larger (subject to verification of the correct CDA) than if 4-22 is the secondary runway (also subject to verification of the correct CDA) and the costs of these relocations will need to be factored into the ultimate cost comparisons of the choice between the secondary runways.

Baker had also been asked to give to the committee a preliminary cost comparison for various combinations of new taxiways. Arthur Malman explained that the meeting had to adjourn so members could attend the alternative parking meter demonstrations and that the Baker materials on this would follow by email.

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman