**Airport Management Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting –June 23, 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, Pat Trunzo III, Cindy Herbst, Bonnie Krupinski, Charles Ehren, David Gruber ,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.

Among others attending were Supervisor Larry Cantwell, Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association and Jonathan Sabin. Mike Waibel and Navin Nataragan of Baker engineering, Ron Price of Quedron and Jeff Smith of the Eastern Region Helicopter Association 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 May 20 meeting, as revised, were approved.

**The next meeting was scheduled for 9 AM on THURSDAY JULY 28 at Town Hall.**

Arthur Malman asked that the Baker Fence proposal be discussed first since Mike Waibel and Navin Nataragan of Baker Engineering and Ron Price of Quedron were standing by on the line. He indicated that all of the email comments made by members of the AMAC to the original Baker proposal had been forwarded to Baker and Baker had revised its proposal to lower the overall price.

Arthur Malman confirmed with Baker that their present proposal was just for the portion of a perimeter fence along Daniels Hole Road and Industrial Road, ending in each case slightly to the west of Runway 16-34 where it would join the existing fence. As such, he suggested that there should be no need to consider an expensive cyclone fence for the new portion, but rather typical EH deer fencing materials as used in the existing fence. Peter Wadsworth asked if perhaps the fence need not go all the way to the Daniels Hole/ Industrial Roads intersection, but rather just follow the eventual cleared tree lines southeast of the intersection of runways 16-34 and 10-20. It was determined that since the savings in fence would be minimal and this tree area may subsequently be considered for aeronautical uses, we should follow the path set out by Baker.

Jemille Charlton noted that although he had hoped to have had the holes in the old fence fixed, this repair job was not yet begun. Some members thought that he had previously stated that it had been completed and, when so completed, had not been effective to keep out deer—but that premise was mistaken.

Arthur Malman noted that the Baker proposal had omitted a new electronic gate at the entrance to the Executive Terminal where the existing gate in the old fence was seldom closed—bringing the number of gates to 7 if all six on the Daniels Hole road envisioned by   
Baker’s proposal were necessary.

Arthur Malman indicated that all gates should close automatically and sound some kind of signal by a horn or notification to the management office in the terminal if left open (noting that the office is not manned 24/7). Arthur Malman noted that ice or snow could prevent the closure or someone could just prop a gate open “temporarily” and then forget to remove the prop---any of which could give deer an entry point. David Gruber thought this would be ineffective and suggested as an alternative security cameras on the gates that could be monitored in the airport office.

Arthur Malman recommended that the issue could be studied further, but that the gates should have telecom and electric spec’d into their design so these safeguards could be easily added at a later date

A discussion ensued on the use of cattle crossing bars, with, or as additions to, automatic closing gates. Some doubts were expressed about the efficacy of the cattle crossings especially in winter and the safety of pedestrian access over them.

A discussion followed on the need for all four entrances in the vicinity of the terminal in Baker’s plan. Since each gate would probably cost about $30,000 with electronics etc., Arthur Malman suggested that perhaps the gate opposite the Hex Hangar could be omitted. Cindy Herbst and Jemille Charlton explained that because of aircraft parked it was often not possible to get to the Hex Hangar area from the gate on the south of parking lot or vice versa. This area was poorly designed and there was a small next to Hex Hangar that limited traffic flow.

David Gruber suggested that the small hangar near the larger Hex hangar might be moved or condemned so that traffic flow could be rationalized. Jemille Charlton noted that the owner of the small hangar had recently improved it. David Gruber suggested that the cost of paying the owner to move, or if necessary condemning the small hangar, would be very modest compared to the other costs and also contribute to the rationalization of the apron.

Arthur Malman asked Jemille Charlton, Bonnie Krupinski and Cindy Herbst to review the use of the area around Hex Hangar to see if there could be a substantial gain in traffic flexibility by better utilization of this entire area—considering cutting existing trees, moving the small hangar and possibly even Hex Hangar, although that was less likely. These alternatives would also need to be considered if 16-34 were to become the secondary runway and existing ramp and aircraft parking areas were to be cut back for safety concerns.

Peter Wadsworth raised the question of why any low double fencing would be needed at runway ends given the requirement for 34-1 clearances discussed previously by Ron Price. Ron Price explained that Peter Wadsworth was mistaken in his calculations since the 20-1 and 34-1 elevation requirements do not both start at the ends of the paved runway but further out and therefore an 8 foot fence on the west side of Daniels Hole Road would not be permissible under FAA guidelines.

Pat Trunzo III asked why sophisticated airport engineering was needed for the entire deer fence when much of it was just standard EH deer fencing. David Gruber suggested that Baker limit its proposal to just the areas at the runway ends where FAA considerations come into play and that the town send out RFP’s for the simple sections and gates that do not require any aviation expertise.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez asked how much that would decrease the Baker cost proposal and Mike Waibel indicated that that change might not have a substantial effect on costs but asked that the AMAC come back to him with which fence portions they would be working on. Arthur Malman noted that Baker was more qualified than the committee to figure out areas of FAA concern and that Baker simply figure out the sections that would need FAA approval and we could all then move forward on their recommendation.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported on the progress of various lease negotiations with the car rental companies and tenants for land on Industrial Road. It appeared that anticipated lease rental increases are now above those previously expected.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez explained that the tenant of two of the lease parcels had a right to buy the parcels at fair market value, and even though the town would prefer to continue with them as leaseholds, it would be obligated under the leases to seek FAA approval for their sale. David Gruber suggested a finer analysis of the leases to see if the town was required to actively support their release for sale or merely submit a request to the FAA. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez was not sure that the leases were clear on this issue but would review it with the town attorney. David Gruber suggested that we ascertain the lease revenues that would be lost due to the purchase so that the airport capital financing capacity can be adjusted downward for the lost bonding capacity and upward for the cash proceeds of sale.

Charles Ehren asked what the status was of standard lease revisions after the AMAC’s recommendation on changes to the form which it had reviewed. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez was unsure of where this was in the process and Charles Ehren asked that a current lease form be distributed to the committee before more leases were negotiated on what could be a defective form presenting problems such as those referred to above regarding unclear guidance on matters requiring FAA submission. Pat Trunzo III also asked for some explanation of what changes were being made to what the AMAC had been asked to comment on. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez said she would look into this.

She also reported that she and the Supervisor had attended the oral argument before the Second Circuit panel and had distributed a summary.

Jemille Charlton reported that the meters were being delivered and he was waiting on a date from the Town to go live with paid parking. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez noted that the start date would not be until after July 4 weekend [Wednesday July 13 was subsequently chosen with the expectation that through the end of July only warnings would be issued to those who failed to follow the new payment instructions].

Jemille Charlton also noted that he was expecting the alternative surveys for tree cutting so that the town board could decide on clear cutting or zoned cutting. Some members thought that it had been decided that zones would be used but that seems to be still an open issue. It was noted that by the time the Board makes a decision, an RFP is published and responses come in and contracts are signed, it would probably be the fall when tree cutting starts. It was noted that Bonnie Krupinski had always suggested fall and winter after the leaves dropped for better pricing but that everyone had hoped that it would have been winter 2015/16 rather than winter 2016/17 as now the case.

In response to questions about bringing in three phase power for the fuel farm raised Ehren and at the prior meeting, Jemille Charlton reported that the $23,000 estimate for bringing three phase in for the fuel farm reflected the utility company’s price of bringing it from the EH Indoor Tennis facility, where it now terminates, to the fuel farm site. Bonnie Krupinski said that this would be very desirable for many industrial and other users of major machinery and would represent an important long term capital investment for the airport beyond the fuel farm need. If and when the 5 ½ acre industrial parcel in the north of the airport is leased, it could be further extended from the fuel farm site if needed. It was noted that, if possible, the path of the three phase extension for the fuel farm should be set out to facilitate possible later extensions.

Arthur Malman asked the meeting to consider all of the items to be studied by Baker in order to run down all the issues raised with respect to the choice to be made by the board of the secondary runway. Each of these items would require Baker to submit a formal work order and then have the town approve the work.

1. **A monthly crosswind coverage analysis at HTO using 10 years of certified wind data in accordance with standard FAA. As in the Airport Master Plan Report, the analysis should include each runway separately and the three runway pairs.**

Gene Oshrin pointed out that the town board voting on changing the secondary runway from 4-22 as shown on the Airport Layout Plan is not a mere “pen and ink change” as is being suggested to board members by some members of this committee and is an assumption not supported by FAA requirements for revisions to an ALP. He felt that the board was being deliberately being misled by erroneous information. The FAA has specific procedures for amending plans that have already been approved and accepted and become part of the public record. He pointed out that the 2010 Master Plan and ALP have survived numerous attempt to block or overturn them by individuals trying to resurrect the 1989 plans and felt that the current attempt to change the secondary runway was merely an attack from a different direction.

David Gruber disagreed and indicated that his view is that, under the terms of the Settlement Agreement wherein the FAA agreed with private litigants not to enforce certain grant assurances after December 2014, the Town is no longer obligated to maintain an ALP and no longer obligated to maintain the airport in accordance with the last approved ALP.  However, he felt that the Settlement Agreement explicitly confirms the authority of the FAA to prevent any change to the airport that would compromise safety. He felt that changes would not include ordinary maintenance and repair.  Even if there were still an obligation to maintain an ALP and to maintain the airport in accordance with the ALP, he felt there is no obligation to implement the projects shown on the ALP on the part of the either airport or the FAA.  David Gruber felt that the ALP is permissive in that regard and that the airport is permitted to undertake approved projects without further FAA consent, but is not obliged to do so.  He felt that since the ALP shows both an existing and proposed airport layout, no change to the ALP is required to continue to use an existing facility and to undertake ordinary maintenance and repair of that facility and no SEQRA compliance at all would be necessary for ordinary maintenance and repair of an existing facility.

Gene Oshrin reiterated his own disagreement with these comments by David Gruber.

1. **A month by month study would be appropriate so that the final determination of coverage could be weighted toward the heavier traffic months of the summer, recognizing that the stronger winds are in the winter. The traffic data should be organized so we could exclude curfew times**, times when only the main runway is in use due to heavy traffic, can adjust traffic for future noise restrictions, and a methodology for estimating the traffic that would require use of either secondary runway, month by month, given the wind coverage of the main runway.

Gene Oshrin stated that such a study had been made in the past. David Gruber pointed out that the data relied upon previously had been for WH airport (FOK) since HTO had its AWOS functional since only January and repeated his earlier suggestion that the monthly analysis also be done with the current AWOS data for HTO and the current AWOS date for FOK to see if there is any material difference.

He believed that the certified data used had come from NOAA which had been WH readings. Cindy Herbst stated that she had been taking readings at HTO daily for several years and reporting them to NOAA. It was determined that Baker should first clarify with NOAA which readings they were reporting for HTO: those from WH or those being reported to them from Sound.

Arthur Malman asked if Sound had been continuing to monitor wind readings after the AWOS went into operation in January since, if so, Baker could compare the results from the two---and, if very similar, Baker could also consider prior Sound wind results. Cindy Herbst noted that Sound had stopped taking wind readings and reporting them to NOAA a short time after the AWOS became effective. Arthur Malman indicated that even if the overlapping readings were only for a short period of time it would be instructive to see if each source produced the same results. Cindy Herbst said she could review her files and send along to Jemille Charlton and Baker these results.

Arthur Malman indicated that once Baker reviewed them, if there were found substantially the same, even for this very short period, it would helpful to the analysis and may indicate that prior Sound wind readings could be useful. The focus for Baker would be to determine if there were some other data either from WH and/or Sound, that were reliably close to that being reported by the HTO AWOS, so that Baker could reasonably rely up them to calculate wind coverages prior to the installation of the HTO AWAS in January.

1. **The need for a parallel taxiway for either of the possible secondary runways.** Arthur Malman indicated, that although this issue had been raised by someone at some time, he did not think that there was any support to expend time on researching this because of the significant cost compared to the need. None of the members saw a need for Baker to work on this item at this time. However, David Gruber suggested that we should solicit Baker’s opinion on whether this is or is not a safety issue given the secondary runway utilization since the 2010 Airport Master Plan Report had claimed such a full parallel taxiway as a necessary safety feature.
2. **The necessary separation between the secondary runway and tied down and taxiing aircraft on aprons etc.** There had been conflicting statements on this issue and Baker should come back with definitive answers (which might depend on the CDA) and then indicate on a drawing the portions of existing ramps etc. that would become unusable for their current purposes. This would include an evaluation by Baker of whether the existing substandard separation for 16-34 and adjoining aprons and taxiways poses a current safety threat that should be addressed promptly.
3. **A rough estimate of the cost of paving presently unpaved areas to relocate present tie down that would be lost (either directly or as a result of moving taxi lanes).** This item would include an alternative rough estimate to properly grade an unpaved area and then install seasonal grass tie downs.
4. **Depending on the answer to item 3, alternative layouts for lost taxiways and tie downs if 16-34 were to become the secondary runway.** As noted above in connection with location of fence gates, Jemille Charlton. Bonnie Krupinski and Cindy Herbst were to develop some proposals for possible improvement for aircraft traffic flow and tie downs around the terminal, including cutting some trees in the area and the possible relocation of a small hanger and the Baker work would consider these suggestions in their first analysis**.**
5. **A comparison of the areas that would be available for possible future development depending on which of 16-34 or 4-22 is chosen, both north of the secondary runway to the northeast of Daniels Hole Road and south of the secondary runway along Industrial Road .** Peter Wadsworth stated, while development is not presently anticipated in this area, a change in intended use could possibly be considered in the future, once more of the land along Industrial Road and the 5 ½ acre industrial tract on the north became leased. Baker should develop the data for the town on the alternative areas affected so that the land use economics of choosing either 16-34 or 4-22 as the secondary runway could therefore become part of the overall financial analysis.
6. **Whether a choice of 4-22 or 16-34 would facilitate further aeronautical uses.** Arthur Malman reiterated his question to Kent Feuerring if there were any concrete plans by local pilots to lease land and build additional hangars in the near term. Kent Feuerring said he personally did not know of any ready to move forward in the near future. It seems that there is no need for Baker to do any substantial work on this item at this time.
7. **An estimate of the number of homes that would be overflown by southern take offs from 16-34 as versus 4-22.** Kent Feuerring noted that an alternative for Baker to consider would be a requested immediate right turn when taking off on 4-22 southbound to decrease homes affected. While it is recognized that small aircraft of the type using a secondary runway are nosier on take-off than glide-in landings, is there some standard altitude on take-off for these types of aircraft where the effect of overflown homeowners is no longer considered substantial?
8. **Annualized lifetime paving costs of alternative secondary runways.** This question will be addressed after the final Baker pavement report has been received and reviewed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman