

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –January 27, 2017 at Town Hall

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 10 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members, Cindy Herbst, Pat Trunzo III, Bonnie Krupinski, Gene Oshrin, 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. Participating by telephone was Munir Saltoun and David Gruber.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Marguerite Wolffsohn, Town Planning Director, Alex Walter, Executive Assistant to the Supervisor, Zachary Cohen, a member of the Town’s Nature Preserve Committee and Kent Feuerring, the president of the EH Aviation Association, along with several other members of the public.

Michael Waibel and Harold Honey of Baker Engineering 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 10 AM on Thursday February 16, 2017 (moved from the originally scheduled February 17) **with a subsequent meeting for Friday March 3, 2017 at 10 AM [which 10 o’clock general starting time being the preference of many members].**

The draft minutes of the December 2, 2016 meeting, as circulated with corrections to the initial draft was adopted along with the minutes of the January 13, 2017 meeting as drafted but with the clarification on the deer fence height requested by Gene Oshrin.

Harold Honey was asked to present the draft final pavement report from Baker. He explained the basic concept of the PCI based on visual inspection and that the core testing and bore reports were not integrated into it but served separate purposes.

Arthur Malman asked why the section of Runway 4-22 that had been repaved as a taxiway only two years ago showed a PCI of Good (86-100) in the body of the report but a remaining structural life of less than 2 years based on the core and boring data included in Appendix I. Unless someone read the technical material in the appendix they would not suspect from the body of the report that this recently rebuilt section would need almost immediate attention. Pat Trunzo III asked whether the design specifications for this work included appropriate work on the base and levels of asphalt

Harold Honey pointed out that Baker had not designed this new section which was constructed under the direction of the prior engineers, DY, and the Town and that Baker had no information as to the design specifications authorized by the Town. As far as he could tell from the materials in the

appendix on this point, the estimated remaining structural life of less than 2 years was consistent with the testing data.

The members of the committee who had previously served on the Budget and Finance airport subcommittee indicated that they had been told that the town was rehabilitating this section so that it could be used over the long term as part of a revived runway 4-22 if the final decision was that 4-22 would be the secondary runway. Bonnie Krupinski explained that as asphalt sections were pieced together they would have more problems than if larger sections were done at the same time. Gene Oshrin pointed out that, for that reason, and for the overall small incremental cost many members had indicated at the time that a wider swath of 4-22 should be redone but that the Town had refused to reconsider the cheaper narrower solution.

Arthur Malman asked James Brundige to recover the DY 4-22 construction specifications and send them to the committee and Baker to see if DY had missed any important features such as an insufficient base or insufficient asphalt to avoid what appears to have been a structurally deficient job for which the engineers or contractors may have responsibility. Harold Honey indicated that Baker would not want to be involved with a litigation review.

Arthur Malman accordingly redirected the inquiry to focus on lessons to be learned before the Town repeated the same mistakes of structural inadequacies in further repaving projects. It was pointed out that this experience underlines the need for careful testing and review before additional money was wasted on structurally inadequate pavements.

David Gruber felt that all things considered, there appear to be a lot of obvious internal inconsistencies in the draft report that need to be reconciled: for example he felt that it appeared to be wrong that the costs to rehabilitate 16-34, which is in better shape than 4-22, would be higher than the cost of rehabilitating 4-22 which, he felt should be much higher. He also pointed out that there appeared to be critical missing information, including the time ranges for doing things and the expected future costs after they are done, all of which bear on the "all-in costs" of the various alternatives. He wanted to know when major rehabilitations would be required for different pavements, and what expenses can be expected before and after?

Harold Honey indicated that the pavement report was limited to current conditions, current maintenance costs and current rehabilitation costs and the type of lifetime cost information David Gruber was seeking was beyond this type of report and would depend on many local conditions. David Gruber suggested that, even if forecasts of HTO specific aging and costs might not be available until we began to keep our own data over a period of years, there should be standardized data from other similarly sized airport in similar climates that could be useful.

Arthur Malman noted that that as regards the costs to rehabilitate 4-22 the two poorest areas of that runway were irrelevant since they were not being considered for rehabilitation under present scenarios. He felt that the report was misleading to many since it showed data about costs for 4-22 back

to its original dimensions of 2600 feet of runway 100 feet wide which was not in the ALP and not being suggested by any party—he requested that the next draft of the report eliminate all references and charts for 4-22 to its original configuration (including sections of Figure 3) since it may have confused David Gruber and would do so to others as well.

James Brundige and the pilots were asked to comment on the width of a rehabilitated secondary runway. James Brundige indicated for the type and use of the HTO secondary runway the FAA would require only a 60 foot minimum width. Gene Oshrin, Cindy Herbst and Kent Feuerring strongly recommended a minimum width of 75 feet to avoid possible safety issues if a plane veered slightly off the runway. After discussion most members felt that 75 feet would be reasonable request to increase the safety margin even if above FAA minimums.

Arthur Malman also noted that the report was misleading to the average reader since it lumped together repaving maintenance and rehabilitation costs for areas for which tenants, not the town, were responsible. For example the pavements around the Hex hangar were the responsibility of that tenant and the vast majority of the large aprons (except the public ramp) were the responsibility of Sound Aircraft. For example of the \$1.6 Million of recommended local maintenance costs for 2017 in Table 8, about \$1.3 Million the responsibility of tenants and not the town. Likewise in Appendix D, of the \$6.4 Million rehabilitation budget for 2017-22 over \$3.3 Million is for pavements for which tenants and not the town are responsible.

Gene Oshrin pointed out that the East End Hangar association paid for the maintenance and snow removal of its own pavements and had assumed all tenants were doing the same. Cindy Herbst said she felt that the Town was responsible for her large aprons; Arthur Malman indicated that he had seen nothing to that effect in any of Sound's leases and that as part of a 2001 settlement of litigation between Sound and the Town, the Town was specifically required to effect a one-time rehabilitation of a specific portion of Sound pavements which otherwise would not have been its responsibility.

James Brundige was asked to forward to Baker the tenant area survey around the terminal so Baker could back out of all sections of the report those areas for which tenants are responsible, although the recommendations for these areas could be in an appendix to the report or some other format that clearly distinguished between the responsible party for maintenance and rehabilitation of the pavement segment.

David Gruber raised several questions about the way in which costs were computed for several items and asked for a detailed explanation of the assumptions going into them.

David Gruber pointed out that the condition of Taxiway D was already poor and suggested that it be rehabilitated as part of the initial Taxiway A extension project. By contrast he felt that Taxiways B and C were in fair condition and their rehabilitation could be undertaken at a later date.

Bonnie Krupinski supported the integration of Taxiway D rehabilitation with the Taxiway A extension project and felt that the fewer discrete projects the better and suggested that when it became time to rehabilitate the "fair" portions of 16-34, whether as a runway or taxiway, with milling

and overlay, the entirety of 16-34 should be milled and overlaid in order to better maintain the entirety of the pavement.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stated that the questions being raised were beyond the scope of those originally requested from Baker in its original work order which need to be supplemented and asked the members to gather their comments and submit them in a consolidated form so that a further work order could be developed.

Arthur Malman then asked the members to consider the tree clearing and deer fence projects.

After discussion all the members approved the following resolution with respect to trees along Taxiway A:

Resolved that the AMAC recommends that the Town proceed immediately with clear cutting the trees along Taxiway A for the main runway that are a present impediment to the safe use of that taxiway by planes, in order to eliminate the need for back taxiing down the active main runway by the larger aircraft currently using HTO.

With respect to the tree penetrations in the approaches, recognizing that further technical work would be needed by Baker, the surveyors, Marguerite Wolffsohn, Zachary Cohen and James Brundige to identify precise areas and trees, the members approved the following resolution

Resolved that the AMAC recommends that the Town go forward as soon as practical with clearing the approaches of tree penetrations on airport property for a 20:1 approach slope in accordance with Part 77 requirements (with additional attention to removing the TERPS penetrations noted by the FAA in its 2013 fly over), minimizing clear cutting in favor of selective cutting where practical and in all cases having the cutters remove all debris.

Zachary Cohen pointed out that this might not satisfy all interpretations of Terps recommendations. However it was noted that, if subsequent to this 2017 cutting program in the approaches, if further cutting were recommended by the FAA, it would be in addition to and not in lieu of the 2017 cutting program proposed and, at that time, the entire matter could be further considered in light of environmental and other concerns. While it was possible that this approach tree cutting program could be finished before mid-March when bluebird nesting began, it seemed more likely that it would have to begin in the fall, although the Taxiway A project could be completed by mid-March.

With respect to the deer fence at runway ends, members recommended that James Brundige work with Baker to update its fence height calculations and then contact the FAA to elicit its views on the best possible solution. Arthur Malman suggested that James Brundige present a range of solutions for fencing at the runway ends at HTO: e.g. 8 foot fencing with lighting, double four, five or six foot fencing (which may be less effective), with or without lighting or some other fencing alternative. Gene Oshrin did not want to have an 8 foot fence considered. David Gruber pointed out that if we started with an 8 foot lighted fence proposal and the FAA was ok with that, we could obviously consider a lower fence alternative or offsetting a runway further from the road to afford more clearance.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman