

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –February 16, 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, Pat Trunzo III, Bonnie Krupinski, Gene Oshrin, 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 were Munir Saltoun and Charles Ehren. Absent were Cindy Herbst and David Gruber

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were 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.

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 Friday, March 3, 2017 with a subsequent meeting scheduled for Friday, March 24, 2017 at 10 AM at Town Hall

The draft minutes of the January 27, 2017 meeting, as circulated, were adopted

Arthur Malman noted that the Committee had recommended that no airport land be sold, but rather only leased, to assure long term non tax revenues to support the airport. Recognizing that there were some existing leases which contained purchase options for these tenants---and some tenants were already exercising these options, he asked Len Bernard how to keep net proceeds from airport land sales set aside as a revolving fund for airport capital improvements--to simulate how airport land lease revenues would otherwise be available in perpetuity to cover debt service on capital improvement bonds.

Len Bernard explained that, to the extent that the airport fund has a surplus at the end of year (which it should have in the years in which land sales close), the town board could set up, or add to, a capital improvements reserve, to the extent of the surplus. This capital improvements reserve could then be debited from time to time to cover all or part of the costs of particular capital improvements.

Thereafter, the town board **could** annually replenish this fund in an amount that would approximate the debt service that would be due during each year had a capital improvements bond been issued in lieu of a debit to the reserve. However Len Bernard did point out that there was no way to force a future town board to replenish the reserve—even if the funds were available in the general airport fund—and so they might decide not to do so. While there might be some public pressure on a town board to follow this principle, of replenishing the reserve, as Len Bernard pointed out, they might

still refuse. Thus, it seemed that, while setting aside a reserve would get us close to leasing, it would not be as good as refraining from airport land sales—land should be leased only and the town board should make reasonable efforts to persuade tenants with existing purchase options not to exercise them.

The meeting then turned to additional questions to be posed to Baker after the committee's review of the draft of the final Baker pavement report. An outline of questions had been distributed prior to the meeting and additional items and clarifications were discussed.

Pat Trunzo III wanted Baker to adjust downward somewhat the costs of a secondary runway (now shown to accommodate Gulfstreams) to reflect that it would only be designed for propeller planes since it would not be used by heavier jets except in an emergency. On the other hand, taxiways would have to be designed to bear the heavier weight of jets since they would travel along them. James Brundige explained that the heaviest impact was not when an aircraft was landing (since its wings were still providing some lift), but afterwards when its full weight was on the pavement during taxiing.

[Subsequently two additional questions were added: (a) to explain the difference in similar pavement repair cost charts in the Baker report and in an FAA circular and (b) on the availability of software recommended by the FAA to help HTO understand lifecycle pavement cost alternatives]

At the last meeting members had been very surprised to find that the structural strength readings in the Baker report for the recent section of runway 4-22 that had been reconstructed as a taxiway only a couple of years ago, already showed only an expected life remaining of only about 2 years. As a result, the committee had asked James Brundige to try to find the engineering drawings for the work to see if the engineers had miscalculated the base needed or some other item. He reported that he had not yet found the drawings, but that during a recent conversation with the then engineers, DY, they said they had recommended at first a more expensive longer-lasting repair but the town board had not wanted to spend the money and they cut back the specifications. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez said this had definitely not been the case.

James Brundige was asked to continue to try to get the DY papers so we could all have a better understanding of the problems to be avoided in future paving projects. James Brundige did find several drawings and records of other pavement projects in the terminal attic that he would forward to Baker so they could supplement their final report.

In this connection it was recommended that the town scan all historical airport drawings along with other materials and post them on its website so that they would be readily available when needed and that the town would reduce the chance of them being lost or misplaced.

Pat Trunzo III also suggested that the airport get a large flat filing cabinet so that large format plans can be securely retained and easily consulted, when needed, in their full size format for subsequent study. Even though it might be a little hard to find a place for this in the airport management office, all committee members recommended that such a cabinet be acquired promptly since it would be useful to engineers and contractors working on the upcoming capital improvement projects.

Arthur Malman asked that the draft AMAC procedures for airport projects be considered in the form previously distributed. He noted that these procedures had been worked out with Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, James Brundige and Supervisor Cantwell with an eye to minimizing detailed engineering drawing and consulting costs being run up while project specifications were still being refined. The idea was to save time and money over the project's life by giving the AMAC several opportunities to vet a project and its specifications during the planning stage before turning it over to the Airport Director and Town for implementation. Pat Trunzo III did not think that AMAC involvement had been the cause of delay in several recent projects and noted that the critical pavement report was already almost a year late.

The members in unanimously approved the following procedures:

1. *The AMAC, the Airport Director and the Town Board Liaison determine that a new project should be undertaken.*
2. *AMAC and engineers and/or other consultants discuss the project scope and general outlines— may take more than one meeting.*
 - a. *Airport Director consults with engineers and/or other consultants to define project parameters.*
3. *Engineers or other consultants draft a proposed scope of work, including milestones to completion.*
 - a. *Airport Director consults with engineers and/or other consultants to refine scope and outlines.*
4. *AMAC reviews draft scope and, as presented or with amendments, formally recommends to Board.*
5. *Board authorizes scope of work as recommended by AMAC or with changes sent back to AMAC for further consideration.*
 - a. *If sent back, AMAC gives a second recommendation to adopt or suggests further changes.*
 - b. *Board makes its final decision.*
6. *Engineers or other consultants submit proposed general specifications and general design to AMAC (not yet detailed drawings or other work) for comments-- may take more than one meeting.*
 - a. *Airport Director consults with engineers and/or other consultants to define specs and design.*
7. *Engineers or other consultants submit drafts of specifications and detailed drawings to AMAC for review -- may take more than one meeting.*

8. *AMAC reviews drafts of specifications and detailed drawings, together with milestone charts and, as presented or with amendments, formally recommends to Board.*
9. *Board authorizes bid packages to be prepared by the Purchasing Department based on final specifications and drawings, together with milestone charts.*

(at some point late in the process the Budget Officer prepares bonding resolutions)

10. *Board awards contracts.*

11. *Airport Director determines who (himself, another Town employee or outside person) should be owner's representative for the project, in daily contact with contractors, subcontractors, engineers and, vendors and, periodically, keeping Liaison, other town department heads, if applicable, and AMAC up to date with progress and delays noted against milestone chart.*

James Brundige then updated the committee on several pending projects:

Tree Obstructions

The clear cutting of trees along Taxiway A was out for bid and would be completed this spring.

Baker was working on trees to be cut at the ends of runway 10-28 and it appeared that no cutting might be needed on the western side to comply with a 20:1 approach. Zachary Cohen showed a tree height plan that he had recently received from Baker but thought it was still missing some data needed for the project. He also reported that he and Marguerite Wolffsohn were arranging a field visit, with some device she reportedly had, to mark the actual trees to be cut or trimmed for the minimum 20:1 approach plus each of the trees specifically noted in the FAA 2013 fly over. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez questioned whether their trip was needed since Baker was already working on the issue. Pat Trunzo III pointed out that, given past problems and delays, it would be very beneficial to have the two groups independently and simultaneously determine what needed to be cut and then compare the results. Arthur Malman noted that, in any event if Baker would be limiting its work to only the 20: 1 approach penetrations, the additional FAA noted trees would need to be marked at some point for cutting.

Safety Fence There were two proposals from contractors on the pre-qualified list and one would be chosen shortly. James Brundige explained that this fence would, around the terminal, be a decorative fence like the one around the patio but higher and then a normal height deer fence. Arthur Malman noted that a similar safety fence should be considered around the Long Island Airlines terminal as well.

Perimeter Deer Fence James Brundige reported that he was working with Baker on updating permissible fence heights at runway ends and would meet shortly with the FAA to get its reaction to various alternatives. Gene Oshrin reiterated the need to have a low fence(s) even if not as effective in keeping out the deer. Arthur Malman pointed out that, once we had the FAA recommendation on maximum heights, HTO might still consider a lower alternative if more appropriate.

Fuel Farm Bids were to be opened next week and the farm completed over the summer

Runway 28 PAPIs and REILs James Brundige reported that the cost of this project had grown to around \$250-300,000 as it was found that the old electric cabling would need to be replaced from the terminal to the runway end. Bonnie Krupinski pointed out that before the town contracts for the electrical conduit work for this project, we should understand what other projects in the general area will need similar electrical work at some time in the near future and do all the work at the same time to reduce costs. It was determined that among similar long cabling runs that would be needed are: among others would be electric for the tower (which was drawing its power from the Long Island Airlines hangar) and for a new telephone line for the tower directly to TRACOM that had been just laid temporarily on the top of the ground and could be easily cut. Even with the additional cabling runs, it was stressed that this was a critical safety project and James Brundige should proceed with it on an expedited basis.

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Rehabilitation. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that she was waiting for Baker to get a work authorization for the Taxiway D Rehabilitation portion to get it all authorized at once. The members cautioned, that if the engineering authorization for the Taxiway D Rehabilitation would delay the start of the Taxiway A extension portion, the Taxiway A extension portion should move along immediately (and the Taxiway D portion added along the way) since it would take more start up time and permitting time than Taxiway D which is merely a rehabilitation of an existing pavement. James Brundige explained the FAA and other permitting

Gene Oshrin pointed out that all of the permits for the Taxiway A Extension had been obtained years ago when it was been part of the original Taxiway A project. The extension portion was eventually not done at the time to cut costs but the approvals should already be in place. James Brundige was asked to look into the status of old permits and approvals and coordinate with Baker.

Security Cameras and Equipment James Brundige reported that contracts were being awarded to replace all of the cameras and equipment around the main terminal and aircraft parking and hangar areas and that he had added a camera at the Long Island Airways terminal

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that, to help it with the FBO negotiations, the Town was engaging the consulting firm of Frasca which had been recommended to it by NYC and which had assisted Westhampton in its own FBO negotiations at Gabreski airport with Sheltaire. Frasca would help the town with FBO financial modeling and other aspects of the negotiations.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that preliminary negotiations were underway for additional airport land with several non-aeronautical users.

Gene Oshrin objected to the process still being followed by the Town which is resulting in leasing, for non-aeronautical uses, parcels that are adjacent to aviation facilities.

Bonnie Krupinski pointed out that the two lots at the northern corner of Industrial and Daniel's Hole roads were to have been reclassified as not being available at this time for non-aeronautical uses but were still be offered for such non aeronautical uses by the town.

Arthur Malman noted that at a prior meeting Kathee Burke-Gonzalez had been requested by Bonnie Krupinski to have the leasing chart color coding changed for these two lots to avoid this type of confusion.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez explained that several potential tenants had parcel size or shape needs that were not satisfied by vacant parcels south of Industrial Road and so were being shown some parcels adjacent to aviation facilities. Pat Trunzo III and Arthur Malman reiterated their prior statements that the lot lines in the industrial areas could easily be adjusted to satisfy specific tenant requests.

It was suggested that FAA approval might be required to change lot lines in the approved plan. Members disagreed, and pointed out that the FAA had designated the particular areas as industrial and would have no interest in the internal borders of particular parcels within the areas designated for industrial use—as long as building heights did not interfere with aviation. James Brundige was asked to verify this with the FAA.

Arthur Malman reiterated the view of several members that a large leasing sign should be placed at the corner of Industrial and Daniel's Hole Road; he noted that a roofing contractor who had been working on his own house needed local space and had no idea any space was available at the airport. Waiting for a final subdivision plan for the north 5 ½ acres before publicizing any of the lease opportunities made little sense in his view since a simple sketch would suffice until real tenants express a need for particular layouts; once the actual tenant need were understood, with the town itself the landlord, subdivision approval from the town should not be a major problem as long as the tenant uses were expected to be in conformity with town and FAA requirements.

Munir Saltoun asked for the town to give the committee updated airport financial forecasts. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez indicated that she would get the budget and year to date results.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman