

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –March 24, 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, Cindy Herbst, Bonnie Krupinski and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, and Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer. Participating by telephone were David Gruber, member, and James Brundige, interim Airport Director.

Also joining the meeting by phone was Jeff Smith of the Eastern Regional Helicopter Council.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Larry Cantwell, Supervisor, Alex Walter, assistant to the supervisor, Kent Feuerring, President of the EH Airport Pilots’ Association and Jonathan Sabin, 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, April 21, 2017 at Town Hall with subsequent meetings scheduled for THURSDAY, at 9 AM at Town Hall on May 18, June 15, July 20 and August 17

The draft minutes of the March 3, 2017 meeting, as circulated were adopted.

Arthur Malman gave a short report of the FLY NEIGHBORLY seminar given earlier in the week at the Melville Marriott by the Eastern Regional Helicopter Association which he attended along with James Brundige and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez and about 75-80 others: airport managers, pilots, carriers, NYC aviation police, FAA representatives, local governmental officials and members of the noise affected public . He complimented Jeff Smith on his portion of the program devoted to all of the thought given to the development of 2017 voluntary noise reduction guidelines for HTO. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez asked Jeff Smith to repeat his portion of his presentation at a Town Board work session on Tuesday April 18 at 10 AM to which he accepted.

Arthur Malman explained that the ERHA had exhibited a chart of noise complaints for the NYC, NJ and Long Island region which included no complaints in NYC, Queens or the East End. However the presenters had explicitly noted that these only represented direct complaints to the ERHA hotline and had not integrated the complaints to the separate complaint hotlines maintained by HTO and some of the other regional noise affected areas. In response to a question on the omission, the ERHA presenter had explained that he had no budget to include these other data but would be open to discussing inclusion with budget support.

Charles Ehren and Pat Trunzo III were particularly upset that the detailed HTO complaint data had been left out, and felt that even with an explanation the chart would be misleading to government decision makers and members of the press and the public. Jeff Smith explained that ERHA felt secure in including only its own data but was open to further discussion on how to possibly include complaint data from HTO and other collectors.

Arthur Malman pointed out that ERHA was not trying to ignore HTO problems at its Fly Neighborly program, on the contrary while only about 5 minutes were devoted to Teeterboro, but ten times that time to HTO.

James Brundige updated the committee on ongoing projects

Pavement Report Baker would be submitting a spreadsheet on our additional comments and questions and noting those that would require a supplemental work authorization.

Perimeter Fence James Brundige had contacted the FAA NY ADO and given them a heads up that he would shortly have plans for a fence for further discussion and feed-back. In preparation for the meeting Baker and Walbridge were doing additional work to pick up the comments made at the last meeting and revising drawings.

Arthur Malman noted that the first step would be to ascertain the FAA's reaction to a fence 8 foot high mesh with 2 feet of top wire, with lights or whatever the FAA suggested for sections near the approaches. The next would be to have the EH Pilots' Association, which has generally been in favor of fencing being no more than 4 feet high at the approaches, give their recommendations.

Arthur Malman suggested that the third step should be ascertaining the reaction of The Friends of East Hampton Airport and other litigants against HTO who had complained about deer fencing and elicit their reactions to fence alternatives so as to avoid having them object to the fence built, only after the fact. David Gruber disagreed and felt that the only submission to these litigants should be the fence design approved by the board without any request for their reaction. Gene Oshrin stated that he felt that various litigants were not focused on what kind of deer fencing was to be built as long as at least some reasonably designed deer fence was built.

Terminal Safety Fence A purchase order is being submitted and James Brundige expects the project to be completed in April.

Runway 28 PAPIs and REILS James Brundige reported that the purchase order had been approved and the engineers and Walbridge are confirming the precise PAPI locations after which work will begin shortly.

Wind Study Although the contract was approved on March 7, Baker had not received the contract until earlier this week but has now started work. James Brundige will be researching why and how the contracting process got interrupted.

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Rehabilitation. James Brundige explained that these projects were being fast tracked with construction expected to begin in the fall. James Brundige reported that the FAA would not require a special environmental review, but David Gruber stated that a SEQUA was needed in any case. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez thought Marguerite Wolffsohn had already completed this before the board authorized the engineering, but she would confirm and let us know. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stressed that the bidding for this project should be proceeding this summer so that work could start in the early fall.

Tree Obstructions along Taxiway A. The removal work should be completed in April.

Tree Obstructions in the Approaches. Baker is expected to have revised drawings done this week for work to be done in the fall.

4-22 Pavement Rehabilitation from 2014 James Brundige reported that, although he had gotten the DY specifications from the Purchasing Department, they seemed to have only been focusing on pavement thickness and he had been unsuccessful in getting a substantive response from DY on base specifications and other questions.

Arthur Malman explained the good analogy used by Baker to explain the importance of the base: a brick may be strong but if it is sitting on top of a birthday cake it is going to sink into it.

Bonnie Krupinski noted that the runway had been built years ago and the base would have been good at that time, but there should be current boring reports and a survey layout of the borings to show what the current situation is.

Arthur Malman explained that at the last meeting (at which she at which she had been absent) it was noted that the Baker boring report survey had shown that the borings in this area showed base problems. Before going further, Baker was asked to review their boring and impact readings for the 2014 rehabilitated sections to confirm that the data was correct and was correctly being interpreted.

Bonnie Krupinski also pointed out that there had been problems with the quality of asphalt at other locations and the asphalt delivery reports should be reviewed. Len Bernard thought that these reports should have been attached to payment requests and will follow up.

Security Cameras The Contractor had ordered parts and installation will proceed quickly once they are installed. Additional cameras would be relatively cheap to add but some portions of the airport do not have sufficient internet coverage to hook them into a central monitor.

Parking Lot drainage in Car Rental areas Town engineer surveyed the situations and submitted a purchase order; work will proceed once the Board approves the purchase order.

Financial Reports Arthur Malman noted that, in accordance with its standard practice, the Town only reports on actual results through 2016 and budgeted items for 2017, plus debt service on current bonding in the out years. The committee would try to develop forecasts for years 2018 through 2020

at subsequent meetings, but would need first to understand the 2016 results and the Town's 2017 budget assumptions.

David Gruber asked a question about one of the capital items in a first draft of the longer term forecasts distributed by Munir Saltoun and Arthur Malman. Arthur Malman said that there was no reason to focus on any of the plug capex numbers at this point since they would be refined over the coming weeks. This first cut was just to set up a format in regular corporate financial reporting as versus the town's munis reporting system which is difficult for those out of government to understand. It also just tries to see the maximum capex that could be supported—not what specific capex should be undertaken

Len Bernard gave a report of operating results for 2015 and 2016 and the budget for 2017 along with the status of capital projects and bonding.

Cindy Herbst asked why the assumption for sales of 1 million gallons of fuel had been included in the 2017 budget when it was so much higher than the 754-813,000 gallons sold in recent years. Len Bernard explained that they had budgeted fuel flowage fees at \$300,000 for 2017 and then he had merely backed into 1 million gallons on the assumption that the fuel flowage fee remained at 30 cents a gallon, but that if the fee were to be increased then the gallons would be lower.

Cindy Herbst noted that the fuel flowage fees in recent years, were they to continue, would more than pay the cost of the new fuel farm. It was pointed out that this observation was not accurate since out of the fuel flowage fee the town also covered maintenance expenses, insurance costs, operating costs etc. for the farm as well as the airport generally. David Gruber stated that the whole fuel operation should be reviewed to ascertain if the sharing of fuel profits to the town through the fuel flowage fee should be increased.

Munir Saltoun noted that the lease rentals in the town's 2017 projection were about \$200,000 lower than actual 2016 although additional areas were being rented and wondered if this reflected a fall off from rents from those tenants who were buying their properties under purchase options. Len Bernard explained he was just being very conservative and the rentals from these potential purchasers were quite low and would not have a material effect on overall rental receipts once the properties were purchased.

Len Bernard said he did not include the sales from these properties in 2017 projections since the FAA still had to approve them.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez read a letter just received from the FAA on this subject. Once certain administrative procedures were followed and forms submitted, the FAA was inclined to approve two of the potential sales. As to the third, since this property could be affected if the town were to approve 16-34 as the secondary runway, the FAA was withholding further comment until the town made a final determination on whether the secondary runway would be 16-34 or 4-22. The two properties moving forward toward sale would bring the airport fund about \$2.91 million and the third, about which the FAA is not yet prepared to opine without clarification as to the final secondary runway, is another approximately \$1.6 million

It was stressed that these proceeds coming from the sale of capital assets should not be used to cover current operating expenses.

Arthur Malman noted that the town's 2017 budget included no material amount for ongoing annual maintenance and guessed that the proper number might be as high as \$2-400,000 to keep all assets in good condition and maximize their useful lives. Len Bernard agreed that a proper maintenance budget should now be developed. Bonnie Krupinski gave an example of how annual cleaning of the many dry wells on the airport would make them more efficient and prevent the need for major repairs. Another was annual crack filling as recommended by Steve Lynch for the town's highways should be included in this annual preventative maintenance budget. The final Baker pavement report and the choices made by the Town would be a major factor in the development of the maintenance budget.

The committee would work with Len Bernard over the next few weeks to develop a good annual maintenance budget.

Passenger Survey Arthur Malman pointed out that the town lacked any hard data on numbers of passengers passing through the airport and where they were going to and coming from. As a result, critics north of the highway often complained that they were subjected to aircraft noise when people south of the highway were using the airport. On personal knowledge he knew that airport passengers include those going to north of the highway locations in EH, to destinations in Southampton and other locations but there are no data to substantiate any of this.

Cindy Herbst felt that people were in a hurry and would not want to be bothered with taking surveys nor would they want their personal information made available.

Bonnie Krupinski pointed out that people interested in keeping the airport operating, once the need for the information was explained to them, should want to affirmatively help the data gathering.

It was pointed out that simple passenger counts may be available already through flight plans James Brundige will be asked to look into having access to this.

Arthur Malman suggested that a simple survey could be voluntary and simply ask people arriving or departing where they were going, asking them to check off one of about a dozen general locations such as Noyak, EH village, Springs, Sagaponek, Watermill, Southampton, MTK, NW Woods, Sag Harbor, etc.

It was suggested that the helicopter and charter companies could help by giving the survey cards to passengers boarding and asking them to check items off during the trip and drop the cards in a box as they leave. Arthur Malman undertook to contract Blade to see its interest in cooperating.

Clearly many people would not bother to complete a card but we should be able to make reasonable assumptions based on the cards turned in and the total passenger counts we hope to get from flight plans.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez noted that a professional firm should be engaged to help develop the survey and then administer it so that there would be more confidence in the results. She was asked to look into engaging a professional firm so that we could have a simple survey ready for this summer.

The meeting adjourned at noon

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman