

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –March 3, 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, Munir Saltoun, Charles Ehren, Gene Oshrin, David Gruber 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 Cindy Herbst. Absent was Bonnie Krupinski.

Joining the meeting were Michael Waibel, Greg VanderMolen and Mathew Wright of Baker Engineering, who had met yesterday at the airport with Zachary Cohen, Gene Oshrin, David Gruber, James Brundige and Arthur Malman for an on-site discussion of tree cutting and the deer fence.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Sylvia Overby, a member of the Town Board and Zachary Cohen, a member of the Town’s Nature Preserve Committee, 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 24, 2017 with a subsequent meeting scheduled for Friday, April 21, 2017 at 10 AM at Town Hall

The draft minutes of the February 16, 2017 meeting, as circulated but with the deletion of Kathee Burke-Gonzalez having suggested a need to go to the FAA on lot line adjustments, were adopted.

Perimeter Fence

David Gruber reported that, based on his emails and discussions with experts at Cornell, shorter double fences were ineffective since deer could leap across a 10-12 foot span with short 4 foot fences in between. He felt that all the deer fence should match the existing fence being 8 feet high mesh with 2 feet of top wire, with lights or whatever the FAA suggested for sections near the approaches.

Zachary Cohen pointed out that the present plan was to set back the fence several feet from the road, but that the Town Highway Superintendent, and other appropriate town officers should be consulted as to the feasibility of moving the fence closer to the roadbed at the approach areas, subject to safety and other requirements. He noted that even a few feet more would ease the height problem slightly. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez said she would check with the town departments on this.

James Brundige pointed out that the main area in which there are generally most deer is in the northwest rather than closer to Daniels Hole Road, but could identify how they entered the airport although he had found some deer digging under a section of fence.

Gene Oshrin repeated that the local pilots' association was opposed to more than a four foot fence even if it was not effective against deer since they felt that maintaining the current approach was more important for aircraft safety and for that reason the ALP had shown Daniels Hole road moved east at the approach ends.

Arthur Malman suggested that the procedure to finalize the fence design at approach ends should be

1. Once the minimum distance from the roadbed was established and Baker redid their maximum fence height calculations at the approaches, James Brundige should consult with the FAA on its recommendations for maximum fence height, lights etc at the approach ends adjacent to the road.
2. Once this FAA maximum was established, this Committee would seek a final recommendation from the Pilots' Association.
3. The Committee would then ask the Friends of East Hampton Airport, and other litigants complaining about the absence of an effective deer fence, to agree to withdraw their objections on the deer fence if one of these solutions to the maximum fence height at approach ends was followed (since it made no sense to build a deer fence on one basis only to have to litigate with these groups if it did not satisfy them –and then perhaps need to rebuild it). If neither solution was acceptable then the Friends et. al would be asked to propose one that was.
4. The Committee would then make a recommendation to the Board (and include the positions of the FAA, the Pilots' Association and the Friends and other litigants)

Runway 28 PAPIs and REILS

James Brundige reported that, given the many interactions expected with the FAA on this project, he recommended that Baker be asked to undertake it in an expedited fashion. The members agreed and asked that the bid spec include extra conduit for possible future use be included in the trench.

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Rehabilitation. James Brundige explained that these projects were being fast tracked and the pavement load design would match the existing sections of Taxiway A

Sylvia Overby expressed her concern that these taxiway projects not be built to a standard that would attract larger, louder aircraft to HTO.

David Gruber explained that the main runway was already built to accommodate jets such as the Citation, but had not been designed for the heavier G5, some of which currently use the airport. However the secondary runway would be shorter and designed solely for the load of the lighter aircraft and therefore it would be too short for jets.

James Brundige pointed out that the G5, although larger is actually quieter than the Citations.

Arthur Malman noted that if we prohibited G5, we might end up with a larger number of the smaller noisier Citations. Therefore if the taxiways were built to take only lighter aircraft than the main runway, the heavier jets would still come but reduce the useful life of the taxiways.

It was noted that the FAA might permit an airport owner to prohibit aircraft above its pavement load design or possibly charge them a surcharge for landing.

Baker was asked if they could do a study, based on the number of heavier jets we currently have to see if there was a material adverse effect on pavement life that could justify a landing fee surcharge beyond the straight weight based landing fee schedule. It was clarified the construction load specifications for the Taxiway A extension and Taxiway D Rehabilitation had already been fixed and that the foregoing study was merely to see the financial effect of use by heavier aircraft and would not affect the current load design or delay Baker's work on the project.

Arthur Malman asked whether some old permits and approvals for the original Taxiway A project (which included the center portion now being built) being useful, as Gene Oshrin had suggested. Mike Waibel pointed out that unless these items were completed within about 5 years (which they were not), the FAA would not accept them and, in any event, ground conditions may have changed in the many years since the existing portion of Taxiway A had been completed.

TREE OBSTRUCTIONS David Gruber reported that based on the results of yesterday's meeting at the airport with Baker, it appeared that little if any clear cutting would be needed to achieve the 20:1 clearance for the approaches only. Baker explained that since the FAA's 2013 TERPS Flyover and its specification of 20-30 trees penetrating the surface, the FAA had changed its rules and a significantly smaller number would be noted today.

The members agreed that since the rules had changed, the committee's prior recommendation that, in addition to cutting penetrations (presently or likely within 5 years) for a 20:1 approach PLUS those trees specifically shown in the 2013 Flyover should be amended to be PLUS those trees specifically noted in the Flyover as adjusted downward for changes in FAA requirements since then.

4-22 Pavement Rehabilitation from 2014 James Brundige reported that he had gotten the DY specifications from the Purchasing Department and would deliver a copy to Baker to see what lessons can be learned for future pavement projects to avoid the structural problems noted from the boring data in the Baker draft Pavement Report. First however Baker was asked to review the boring and impact readings for the 2014 rehabilitated sections to confirm that the data was correct and was correctly being interpreted.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

