

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –November 21, 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, David Gruber, Gene Oshrin, Munir Saltoun, Charles Ehren and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, James Brundige, interim Airport Director, and Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer. Present by phone was Peter Wadsworth.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Larry Cantwell, Town Supervisor, Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association, Zachary Cohen, a member of the Town’s Nature Preserve Committee, and Jonathan Sabin, a local pilot, along with several other members of the public.

Michael Waibel and Greg VanderMolen of Baker Engineering, and Catherine van Heuven, outside aviation counsel to the Town, also joined the meeting by telephone.

Arthur Malman invited all members of the public to join the discussion. The agenda had been previously distributed by Kathee Burke-Gonzalez.

The next meeting was SCHEDULED for 9 AM on Friday, December 2, 2016.

The minutes of the October 28 meeting, as circulated, were approved.

Arthur Malman stated that before getting into the agenda, he would like to give the public attendees some perspective on the airport litigation. Until now, he could state unequivocally that no member of the committee favored closing the airport. However he felt that the Circuit Court decision was a loss for the aviation interests as well as the noise affected interests, since, if the public could get no meaningful noise relief, pressure would mount to close the airport which the decision included as a possible remedy.

He felt that under the court’s decision, the Town could not control airport noise without following the procedures of ANCA, which would be time consuming and expensive, with little likelihood of substantial relief, especially if opposed by aviation interests. *Certiorari* to the Supreme Court was a long shot and, even if cert were accepted, we have no idea of how narrow a decision might be and a decision could mean more proceedings in the lower courts. New federal legislation granting noise controlling powers to smaller airports was possible, but might take years.

He stated that, to diminish the possibility of eventual closing of the airport, it would be smart for local aviation interests to suggest meaningful voluntary guidelines that could be supported by the noise

affected. If effective, such voluntary guidelines could be the basis to seek enforcement support from the FAA.

With respect to financing airport capital expenditures which would be effected through bonding, Arthur Malman noted that a possible eventual closing of airport operations would not cause a problem for the town. The airport already has significant revenues from leases for non-aeronautical purposes and that rental stream is rising rapidly through the leasing efforts of the Supervisor. There are only about \$2 million of airport related bonds outstanding now and, even with an \$8-10 million capital improvement program, the debt service on such an amount of bonds could be serviced easily with the non-aeronautical lease revenues if all aeronautical revenues and expenses were to end.

Arthur Malman stated that he did not want the meeting to divert into a discussion of these issues at this meeting but had merely wanted to give the public some perspective on the issues touched upon.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez passed out updated and corrected Obstruction Removal Exhibits 3 (Part 77 34:1 analysis) and 4 (Part 77 20:1 analysis) prepared by Baker and showing areas suggested for clear cutting and selective tree cutting.

Since the 34:1 analysis showed 214 acres being affected and the 20:1 analysis showed only 120 acres being affected and the 34:1 analysis showed substantial clear cutting off airport property in the town of Southampton, the committee members determined to waste no time on the 34:1 analysis since it had little hope of eventual community approval.

A discussion ensued about the differences in cutting plans for approach and transitional areas on the 20:1 approach Exhibit. The general sense of the meeting was that it seemed, unlike the exhibits presented at the prior meeting, that these revised exhibits were more properly showing transitional areas along with areas affected outside airport property.

David Gruber questioned the rationale of Baker for the extensive red cross-hatched areas that were suggested for clear cutting even in the 20:1 example. In particular he stressed that in areas where only a few trees penetrated the approach surface, it did not make environmental sense to clear cut larger areas.

Arthur Malman stated that an example of excessive recommended clear cutting would be over the town border in Southampton where the FAA's 2013 fly over pinpointed only about 3-4 trees penetrating the 20:1 surface—some as little as six inches or a foot—and yet the Exhibit recommends about 10-15 acres of clear cutting in this Southampton area.

Since the Baker Exhibits did not show heights of individual trees, it was not possible to discern from them the degree of penetrations in proposed clear cutting areas.

David Gruber noted that, except for some fringe area at the end of runway 28, most of the areas being discussed were full grown forests. As such he felt that a few small samples with measurements from the ground could give us a good estimate of tree heights across the larger areas.

Bonnie Krupinski suggested ways that surveyors could plot actual heights of small numbers of trees. Zachary Cohen noted that some of the topographical maps in the town's archives could aid this investigation.

Arthur Malman asked Bonnie Krupinski, David Gruber and Zachary Cohen to meet with surveyors and recommend where the several sample areas should be located and how the measuring should proceed [Larry Cantwell called Waldbridge surveyors during the meeting and they and the three committee members met immediately following the close of this meeting to finalize procedures].

James Brundige was asked to clarify what instrument approaches were now available to the town with the addition of PAPI navigational aids. He confirmed that 4 of the 5 original approaches (that the FAA had temporarily suspended after the FAA's 2013 fly over showed tree penetrations) had been reinstated and that the 5th was not available for instrument landings at night.

Arthur Malman asked James Brundige to confirm that jets coming from the west, that would use the 5th approach not reinstated, could still use some of the other 4 to land at night with instruments—and this was confirmed.

Cindy Herbst stated that these 4 approaches had been reinstated only on a temporary basis by the FAA which could rescind the reinstatement. David Gruber pointed out that only temporary reinstatement was no longer the case: the FAA had recently changed its policy nationally and, as a result, as long as the penetrations and PAPI's did not change, the reinstatement was now permanent. Catherine van Heuven agreed that the reinstatement was now permanent unless conditions changed.

James Brundige had noted that the PAPI's needed repair/replacement and the members recommend that he proceed immediately to get this done.

The meeting then turned to the deer fence. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez passed out two Baker fence diagrams: one showing the areas at the runway ends that could not have the standard high fence and the other showing suggested gates.

James Brundige noted that there would need to be an additional gate at the executive terminal and it was noted that the need had been previously conveyed to Baker at an AMAC meeting a couple of months ago.

David Gruber reiterated his question why two gates were needed in the vicinity of the Hex hangar and parked aircraft. Cindy Herbst explained that the hex hangar people did not want to drive around the parked aircraft and did not want the owners of the parked aircraft to drive along their driveway.

Cindy Herbst did not think the difference in cost for a second gate would be material but was surprised to learn that each gate, with its electronics, would probably cost about \$30-40,000. She requested clarification on the new pricing of the gates as it was being discussed since it may not be necessary to have the "bells and whistles" such as a telephone, prior to deciding whether that particular gate should or should not be removed from the plan.

Bonnie Krupinski suggested that code punch in stations be used rather than card readers which would require issuing cards which could be lost; the codes could be changed when needed and still be easier for users.

James Brundige noted that the entranceway to the Hex hangar from Daniels Hole Road was leased to the Hex hangar tenants who could prohibit pilots of parked aircraft from using it.

Arthur Malman suggested that James Brundige talk to the Hex hangar owners and tell them it was their choice: whether to allow ingress and egress to others over their leased area or to access their own hangar from the gate near the parked aircraft but the town was not prepared to pay for two expensive redundant gates to protect them from deer strikes.

David Gruber reiterated his question about the efficacy of the lower double fence at runway ends. Zachary Cohen stated that the 4 foot double fence with intermediate plantings would be effective but that a higher double fence would be better. Moreover slanting outward the entire section adjacent to the road would make the double fence more effective.

Arthur Malman noted that the choice was really one for decision by the local pilots since a higher fence at runway ends would protect them better from deer but could be more of a hazard to navigation. Gene Oshrin and all of the other active pilots present said that they would choose the 4 foot fences. Baker was asked to come back with an estimate of the difference in cost for the slanted double fence with plantings and the higher fence with navigation lights for the areas at runway ends.

Arthur Malman noted that he had seen nothing on the safety fence around the terminal which was to have been part of the whole fence engineering workup. Pat Trunzo III stressed the importance of this project which had been discussed for some time. James Brundige stated that, even before he had left, he also had been stressing the importance of a fence to keep people from just walking around the terminal and on to the tarmac. Cindy Herbst noted that over the summer temporary pylons and ropes had helped the safety fence working group (of the Airport Director, Bonnie Krupinski and Cindy Herbst) discussed how to work out the path of a safety fence around the patio.

James Brundige was asked to work with Baker for the final plans for the safety fence. Gene Oshrin suggested that this safety fence should be a separate project that could be finalized and completed faster than the deer fence—all of the members supported fast tracking this safety project.

Arthur Malman then asked if any members of the committee had any comments on the first data collection procedures outlined by Baker in preparation for the wind study. Since the only member who had made technical comments on this phase was David Gruber, he was asked to speak directly with Baker on these items.

James Brundige updated the meeting on several pending projects:

--Taxiway A—he had reviewed a preliminary design from Baker and asked that they remove from consideration rebuilding the Segmented Circle and Tetrahedron as they are not necessary with a Control Tower and AWOS.

-Fuel Farm—final plans had been submitted to the SCHED with a reduction of the low lead tank from 15,000 to 12,000 gallons as the SCHED recommended. Moreover an eye wash station and containment pit for waste fuel barrels are being added.

-Paid Parking App—being launched and he handed out small cards to be distributed on how to access and use it.

-Hertz Signage—although Hertz had been contacted by him, no signs have yet been posted. Arthur Malman noted that when someone parks in an unmarked Hertz space, the Town loses a parking fee. He suggested that the Airport Director make up some temporary signs signifying the Hertz reserved spots and that cars could be towed. He suggested that no effort be made to use the Hertz logos which are trademarked or make the signs too artistic (simple signs typed on standard 8 ½ X 11 paper can be composed in house, printed on a standard printer and then laminated and posted). This would reduce the number of non-Hertz customers parking in these “free” spots and possibly provide a spur for Hertz to replace these home-made signs with proper signage more in keeping with its corporate image.

--Security Cameras—he would be specifying what equipment and placement was needed since the prior requests for vendor submissions had not been too open ended. A subcommittee was formed consisting of Bonnie Krupinski, Cindy Tuma and Peter Wadsworth to help with proper placement of cameras and selecting vendors.

--PAPI/REILs—as noted above the members recommended that the repairs/replacements proceed immediately.

--Survey/repainting the Public ramp—he explained that the FAA had strict rules on what the design and markings could be—those would be followed but would not prevent the public ramp being clearly outlined

Len Bernard reported on the change in the state bonding legislation for airports being sought by East Hampton to allow it to bond improvements for longer periods than 15 years even though the airport was less than the 1000 acres specified—currently, longer maturity bonds were only permitted for airports of over 1000 acres, with no rationale given. The legislation had passed the state legislature and was awaiting signature by the governor. He noted that the new provisions would allow bonding for all items to extend for up to 30 years but the town would bond for shorter periods for equipment that would have shorter useful lives.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Arthur Malman