**Airport Management Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of Meeting –July 28, 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, 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, and, Jemille Charlton, Airport Director. Present by phone was Peter Wadsworth. Absent was Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer.

Among others attending were Alex Walter, assistant to the Supervisor, Bruce Miller, HTO tower supervisor, Jeff Smith of the Eastern Region Helicopter Association, Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association and Jonathan Sabin. Navin Nataragan 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 next meeting was RESCHEDULED for 9 AM on FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 30 at Town Hall].** With the conflicting demands of the end of the summer season the August 25 originally set was postponed

Arthur Malman asked for approval of the minutes of the June 23 meeting, as circulated and with the addition of comments of Gene Oshrin and David Gruber as noted in their emails of July 25 with respect to the ALP. Cindy Herbststated that email exchanges subsequent to meetings should not be included in emails. Arthur Malman said that her concern was appropriate but indicated that he had not sought to do so; however members often appropriately note in emails, after a first draft of minutes are circulated, that some statements they had made were inadvertently omitted or should be corrected to reflect better the gist of their comments and he tried to include these clarifications. When a specific question raised at the meeting is answered shortly thereafter he said he often includes the answer in square brackets in the minutes with an indication that it was reported subsequently but tried not to include new materials from subsequent emails. Most members felt that subsequent, often lengthy, emails chains among members not directly reflecting comments at the meeting were not being included. The June 23 minutes as corrected with the addition were approved.

Arthur Malman indicated that James DeKoning was travelling but would try to call in about 9 15 to discuss the fuel farm plans and that Navin Nataragan would call in at about 10 to discuss the revised fence proposal and secondary runway related items.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez updated the meeting on the status of curfew violations in 2015 and to date in 2016. She indicated that there had been 65 curfew violations in 2015 of which 17 were of the stricter noisy aircraft curfews and 42 were of the general curfews. In 2016 to date there had been a reduction to 15, as apparently more aircraft are becoming familiar with the curfews.

She noted that these violations are prosecuted through the courts and no fines had as yet been assessed since the initial hearing scheduled for 2015 violations was postponed because of weather and the adjourned hearing will be held shortly.

Arthur Malman asked if there were repeat offenders by tail number or by address (since Net Jets and other fleet owners had multiple tail numbers). Jemille Charlton indicated that there had been some multiple violators based on these criteria.

Cindy Herbst noted that sometimes an aircraft becomes an inadvertent curfew violator –for example if it is ready to take off before the curfew and is on a ground hold from the tower because of local traffic or regional traffic problems and then ends up taking off post curfew. Arthur Malman asked if the operations cameras for landing fees would record ground holds such as this. Jemille Charlton responded that the information would be archived and retrievable.

Cindy Herbst asked if there could be a procedure set up to cover these situations of unintended violations. Jemille Charlton responded that he does not make judgments as to the reasons for curfew violations but reports the data to the attorney’s office.

David Gruber noted that the town attorney has prosecutorial discretion and could consider these types of circumstances if brought up by the curfew violator and likewise a judge could consider the circumstances when assessing a fine.

The members generally thought that there should not be an attempt at this point to construct intricate exceptions and that the process for airport management should stay simple with exceptional circumstances being considered, if appropriate, by the attorney’s office and judges on a case by case basis.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that, with the clear cutting and zone cutting surveys in hand, the board will soon be finalizing the plans for tree cutting with the target date to start cutting in the late fall once the leaves have fallen and pricing should be most favorable.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also reported that the town was organizing and would report soon on 2016 noise data. David Gruber asked that the public be given access, without the need for repeated FOIL requests for underlying data on operations, route-tracking and noise complaint data. Charles Ehren asked if the data could be available in real time to the public.

Jemille Charlton explained that the airport management office reviews the data monthly and corrects manifest errors, such as several cameras recording movements of a single aircraft within a few minutes as multiple operations. This basic data, after correcting for manifest errors is given to the board on a monthly basis. He felt that, if the board approved, within a couple of months he could set up a system so that the corrected data could be made available to the public also on a monthly basis.

The members felt that simultaneous access by the public to the underlying data would be very desirable and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez was asked to check with the board and the attorney’s office to see if there would be an objection to this change.

Jemille Charlton reported that the holes in the old deer fence are likely to be finally repairs shortly but that he had not yet sought bids for an updated security camera system. His primary focus was now on getting paid parking working and coordinating with the two vendors and car rental companies with a new target date for mid-August.

Cindy Herbst noted that, because of no parking zones and car rental parking spot set asides there could be instances when travelers arrive at the airport with no place to park. She suggested possible interim measures to have some of her employees temporarily park cars that found no available spaces on an unused section of the field. Jeff Smith and others felt that having private cars parked on the field could lead to safety and liability problems, even if the car owners did not themselves drive on to the field. Others felt that travelers could easily get used to a free valet service.

Some members felt that once auto owners had to pay to park, there would be at least a small reduction in parked cars to offset to loss of spaces. Eventually parking charges could be increased and/or more spaces created. Bonnie Krupinski felt that the airport would soon want to increase its paid parking areas but that would obviously not solve a short term problem.

One idea was to have the flexibility of parking cars in the “no parking” area on the grass on the northern side of the lot, but Jemille Charlton noted that the engineers had warned that the space left for cars legally parked to back out safely would become too reduced opening the town to liability.

Another idea was to temporarily park overflow cars in the no parking zone along Daniels Hole Road and possibly give them temporary space numbers so they could pay at the meters. Jemille Charlton thought that the temporary space numbers could be accommodated by the meters but questioned whether this would be legal without a further board resolution. Since it appeared to be the most feasible short term fix if the need arose, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez was asked to check with the attorneys’ office to see what further official town action would be needed.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that James DeKoning could not call in but had emailed her an update on the fuel farm project:

- The Project is set up so that the existing fuel farm can remain online during construction which will provide a little leeway on the completion date.

-  The plans are in to the SCDHS office for a permit.

- The tank level monitoring system will run wirelessly to Jemille’s office

-  The pump equipment manufacture, Millennium has specified “fuelmaster” equipment for revenue tracking.  This can be evaluated further.

Arthur Malman noted that the payments processing system should be coordinated with Len Bernard to conform to the system now used with the Town/Village joint auto fuel farm and give real time information to the FBOs He also asked if the height of the fences and equipment conformed to FAA requirements for the location. Jemille Charlton responded that LKMA had confirmed that was the case and that there would be separate hoses for Jet Fuel and LL100.

In terms of operations, Jemille Charlton confirmed that while a fuel delivery truck could drive up to the fuel farm fence, the driver could not unload until an airport management office employee came to open the fence and test the load. Because the larger tank capacity would eliminate the need for last minute deliveries outside of normal business hours, this acceptance protocol would no longer be done by having a Sound employee fill. The town had ultimate liability and therefore only a town employee would be required to be in the acceptance chain

Bonnie Krupinski said that she and her brother had done a preliminary review of the fuel farm plans and they appeared appropriate. Arthur Malman noted that the Town engineers would likewise need to review them in detail and that Cindy Herbst, Pat Trunzo III and other members should review them in detail and forward to the Committee any comments which could be consolidated and passed on to LKMA.

With respect to the Baker deer fence resubmission, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez noted that, since the Town engineer had indicated that his office did not have the resources to monitor the design and construction of the non FAA sections of the deer fence, Baker and LKMA were asked to submit bids to design and monitor theses sections, which would be a separate work order from the revise FAA section of the fence which will be Baker’s responsibility.

Arthur Malman noted that the revised Baker proposal still called for a 10 foot chain link fence in its cost summary and thought this was just a missed correction. Navin Nataragan confirmed that this was just a hold over and would be appropriately corrected. Arthur Malman guessed that the double lower deer fence at runway ends would probably have a cost in the same ball park so that the overall estimate is not likely to be significantly affected.

Navin Nataragan noted that Geotech report is expected to be finalized next week and the Non-Destructive testing report by the end of August with the Pavement Management Report expected to be delivered in mid-September.

The meeting next reviewed the several proposed projects for Baker set forth in the June 23 minutes and sent to Baker. Navin Nataragan clarified that the 5 items in his July 27 email actually had grouped together several of the discrete items in the minutes.

There were no suggested changes to items 1 and 2 of the minutes covering the wind study.

However Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stressed that rather than spending funds for Baker studies of other items of questionable present need, the committee focus on those projects that have been identified as priorities including perimeter fence, tree obstructions, the fuel farm and the pavement evaluation

Bruce Miller described specific problems on a recent busy day on which the tower was trying to keep aircraft moving on the ground and the backups that were experienced by lack of maneuvering space to accommodate the larger aircraft now using HTO. As Jeff Smith observed that one of the unintended consequences of HTO’s focus on noise mitigation was that many travelers were now using newer quieter but larger aircraft. Pat Trunzo III noted that many of them could have also chosen newer smaller quieter aircraft and wondered why HTO should be catering to those that chose aircraft harder to accommodate.

Bruce Miller confirmed that congestion would be reduced once the main runway taxiway was completed, as recommended by both the noise committee and the pilots.

Cindy Herbst and Bonnie Krupinski described congestion problems with the present pavements around the terminal even without having these areas reduced as a consequence of expanding the safety corridor next to 16-34 if it were to become the secondary runway. Cindy Herbst stressed that even if “only seven tie downs” were lost by a choice of 16-34, the effect on ground operations would be much more substantial because of the balance of the pavement loses that would adversely affect the maneuvering areas for larger fixed wing aircraft and cost of redesigning and constructing alternatives in the vicinity of the terminal.

Arthur Malman asked that, as had been suggested in our prior meeting, Cindy Herbst, Bonnie Krupinski and Jemille Charlton should meet, as time permits after the August rush, to begin to review the entire area around the terminal, including the area of the hex hangar and the small adjoining area and adjacent treed area to come up with initial proposals to reorganize the use of these areas to safely handle the present and expected mix of aircraft. Once these suggestions were forthcoming later in the fall, they could be reviewed preliminarily by Baker.

Once alternative proposals were presented, both taking into account lost pavements if 16-34 were chosen as the secondary runway and retaining all of the existing pavements if 4-22 were chosen, then it could be determined if the hex hangar and/or the adjoining hangar should be relocated. Pat Trunzo III noted that moving a metal building and creating a connector to an existing taxiway should be a manageable expense if part of a well thought out long term operations improvement plan.

After discussion, beyond the wind study, the committee felt that the only appropriate additional projects for Baker’s immediate work at this juncture would be to begin engineering to complete the main runway taxiway as early in 2017 as practical and to determine the locations and square footage of the aprons, taxiways and tie down areas that would be lost if 16-34 would become the secondary runway

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman