**Airport Management Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting –May 20, 2016 at Town Hall**

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 11 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members, Peter Wadsworth, Pat Trunzo III, Cindy Herbst, Bonnie Krupinski, Charles Ehren, Gene Oshrin, Munir Saltoun, 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. Voting member David Gruber joined the meeting by telephone.

 Among others attending were Bruce Miller, chief tower controller, Supervisor Larry Cantwell, Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association and Jonathan Sabin.

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

The attached agenda had been previously distributed.

The minutes of the March 24 and April 21 meetings, as revised, were approved.

Arthur Malman indicated that the main focus of this meeting would be to discuss with the tower controller’s runway closures and other operations questions and asked that members work through other agenda items quickly to leave adequate time for this discussion.

**The next meeting was scheduled for 9 AM on THURSDAY JUNE 23 at Town Hall.**

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that the Board had approved the contracts with LKMA to complete the zone cutting survey and with Baker for engineering on the tree cutting RFP and project oversight. Pat Trunzo III asked about why Waldbridge was not completing the survey and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez explained that Waldbridge could not start the survey completion for about six weeks. She also reported that LKMA had completed the leased areas survey which was now being reviewed by the legal department.

She also indicated that authorizations would be forthcoming for Baker on establishing the critical design aircraft for the secondary runway, wind study and fence work.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also stated that oral argument had been scheduled for June 20 on the Federal District Court case. Arthur Malman stated that it was likely that the losing side would appeal.

Arthur Malman then asked Bruce Miller to join the discussion and explained that we had been told that runway 16-34 was closed at busy times to accommodate helicopters traversing it from parking areas to the terminal.

Bruce Miller first explained that the runway was never “closed” but rather was designated by the tower as “not in use” during the busiest times of the season, such as afternoons on Thursday, Friday and Sunday and mornings on Monday. Even during these times it was up to the pilot and, if one told the tower he or she wanted to land on 16-34, the pilot would be accommodated although probably put into a short holding pattern until there was a break in traffic.

Bruce Miller explained that the “not in use” designation was not caused by helicopters but rather by the volume and type of fixed wing aircraft at these times. Even if there were no helicopters at these busy times the tower would still use the “not in use” designation.

He explained that a good part of the problem was that many jets were afraid to use the parallel taxiway to the main runway because of tree obstructions and made 180 degree turns and taxied back up the runway. The tree clearing (which Jemille Charlton stated had been started by airport employees) this year and the eventual completion of the main runway taxiway should lessen the congestion problem.

With respect to parking on the Sound apron or taxing on Sound’s or the town’s aprons too close to runway 16-34, David Gruber had stated that the minimum distance from the center line to other parked or taxiing aircraft being used in the discussion was much too large, that the proper separation for the Beech Baron, the critical design aircraft and a B-I type, was 150 feet under the FAA’s Airport Design Circular, rather than the 240 feet that had been mentioned previously. Since there was a difference of opinion on the standard separation distance from the runway center line to the taxi-lane center line clear area, Arthur Malman stated that this critical measurement should be further reviewed by Baker.

Cindy Herbst, Gene Oshrin and Kent Feuerring discussed several problems at the terminal area, including that planes with larger wingspans turning around in the town’s ramp area and taxiing alongside 16-34. There was an exploration about moving the first couple of rows of Sound’s tie downs to accommodate these larger aircraft. Cindy Herbst also noted that some of the smaller town-retained short connecting taxiways on the south side of the terminal would not accommodate these larger planes.

The members reviewed with Bruce Miller various alternative helicopter parking and landing sites, including the executive terminal across the field, which had limited aircraft parking and vehicle parking spaces at present—although these areas could possibly be expanded.

Arthur Malman stated that since there were so many short and long term issues about the terminal area, the next project for the committee should be to examine improving the long term layout around it.

While pointing out that he had no authority to make recommendations for runways, in answer to a question, Bruce Miller stated that he would prefer 4-22 as the secondary runway.

Bruce Miller also stated that there were parts of the field that were not visible from the present tower location and would not be materially improved (and might possibly be worse) if moved to the top of the main terminal. He noted that if the tower could be moved to the top of the executive terminal it would be a much better location. He had been up there but did not know if the present steel structural members of the building could support it. Bonnie Krupinski stated that she did not know the weight bearing ability of those building members but would try to find out. Arthur Malman noted that if we went further with this suggestion, there could be consideration about adding some additional steel supports.

Jemille Charlton reported on the status of paid parking for the summer season. He questioned even the delayed target date of late June because of time needed to work out payment remittance details and other contractual issue, indicating that the owner of meter company was often not reachable. Jemille Charlton and Len Bernard explained that the problem was that meter company had wanted to remit payment data on a daily basis. Munir Saltoun indicated that reconciling data so often would be unnecessarily time consuming. Len Bernard agreed and stated that the payments issue had been resolved satisfactorily.

Jemille Charlton explained that the bolts could not be set in the concrete pads for the meters until we had the final template for the meters which would come after the contract is finalized. Likewise the signage from the meter company and Passport Parking which would be functioning as a subcontractor to the meter company, would follow contract signing.

Arthur Malman suggested that the meter company owner be told that she may lose the contract if it is not signed this week so that installation is completed in June, noting that we had already lost the possibility of a beta test period prior to the summer rush. Several members also suggested that preliminary backup work be started with the second bidder if we have to change in order not to lose the summer. Jemille Charlton state that it would take significant effort that he would like to avoid if the present contract can be completed shortly.

 Cindy Herbst reiterated her concern that on peak days there could be inadequate parking, especially for people dropping off rental cars and that the grass strip on the right side by the fence be used for parking rather than being no parking. It was suggested that if this problem materialized suddenly that perhaps the police could be lenient ticketing car illegally parked on this strip and/or the rental car companies could temporarily move some of their illegally parked cars down or up Daniel’s Hole road where no parking areas end. It was also noted that once parking was no longer free a good number of car owners, especially those not using the airport or the car rental companies, would free up spaces now used.

 Arthur Malman stated that in connection with its design of the fuel farm, LKMA had indicated that there was not presently three phase electric current to the area. LKMA indicated that PSEG would charge about $23,000 for bringing in three phase to the fuel farm area. With single phase the fuel farm would pump about 100-120 gallons per minute but with a 3 phase pump it would be about 200 gallons a minute. Jemille Charlton explained that at the lower rate it would take about 45 minutes or an hour to fill a larger on airport delivery truck.

 David Gruber asked why, if this cost were merely for the convenience of the FBOs selling fuel, the cost should not be borne by them, installed at their cost if they thought it worth it to them and not installed at all if they do not.

 Pat Trunzo III explained that there was a device that could change single phase to three phase at a much cheaper cost of about somewhat less than $10,000.

Bonnie Krupinski felt that three phase would be highly important for tenants in the airport’s industrial park and the cost should not be looked at as one just relating to the fuel farm. Jemille Charlton indicated that the other airport equipment uses could benefit from having 3 phase. Cindy Herbst pointed out that it was odd to break out 3 phase as a separate decision when designing a new modern fuel farm.

Bonnie Krupinski also pointed out that nearby users such as the tennis club might already have three phase or would want to have it and so might share the cost of bringing it into the area. Charles Ehren asked if the $23,000 cost was just to bring it to the fuel farm or to bring it into the area from some other point. Arthur Malman thought the PSEG cost looked small if the three phase line were to be extended any appreciable distance such as from around route 27. Jemille Charlton said he would get back to the committee with answers to these questions [he subsequently reported that the tennis club already had three phase].

It was explained that if three phase power were brought to the fuel farm it would also be available to the terminal and could be extended to the undeveloped 5 acre parcel north of the airport, which is earmarked for future industrial use. Peter Wadsworth and Charles Ehren both requested that someone summarize the advantages (and disadvantages) of a three phase electrical hookup other than the ability to pump fuel faster.

Jemille Charlton reported that he had gotten an equipment trailer on a rental that would accommodate a small repair area as well that would meet OSHA and other relevant standards.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman