Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –May 18, 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, Cindy Herbst, Gene Oshrin, Bonnie Krupinski and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex officio members, Kathee Burke-Gonzalez, Councilwoman and Board liaison for the AMAC, Len Bernard, the Town's Chief Budget Officer and James Brundige, interim Airport Director. Participating by telephone were David Gruber and Munir Saltoun, members. Absent was Charles Ehren, member.

Among others attending (some of whom attended only part of the meeting) were Alex Walter, assistant to the supervisor 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.

The next meeting was SCHEDULED for *THURSDAY, at 9 AM*, on June 15 at Town Hall with subsequent meetings scheduled for *THURSDAY, at 9 AM* at Town Hall on July 20 and August 17

The draft minutes of the April 21, 2017 meeting, as revised and recirculated, were adopted.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that a new lease was being negotiated with PODS (which had started inquiries about a year ago) for about 2 ½ acres for $90,000 per year and that Maven (a GM affiliate competing with Zip Cars) would be leasing 2 parking spaces for $4,000 per year.

Arthur Malman complemented the town on the progress on rentals but reiterated the request that the Town post a large land for rent sign at the intersection of Daniels Hole and Industrial Roads which seems to have fallen between the cracks. A question was raised about expanding the proposed 5 ½ acre industrial area on the ALP in the north of the airport; the layout for the 5 ½ acre parcel was being worked on by the Planning Department.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez explained that the owner of the Air Noise Report (ANR) had not been willing to grant the town a license to improve the system but had stated that he would try to work on improvements that would be relevant to HTO noise issues.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez stated that the town hired a new law firm, Morrison Foerster (which had been successful in a Santa Monica noise proceeding), to represent the town in the ANCA process with an initial budget of $50,000 and that the Purchasing Department asked for suggestions on recipients of the RFP for the 2017 survey since the Town had no list of firms that could be interested; Munir Saltoun said he would check the web and return with some suggestions.

On the pending question of the limits of use of airport funds, Len Bernard stated that he was still waiting to hear from the last of the experts he had reached out to answer a few further questions for a

final report. However, he explained that the airport was not a special district but had been set up as a special revenue fund, although the debt issued for airport projects were general obligations of the town. As such, while airport revenues were being used to service debt issued for airport projects, as long as the airport was being operated by the town as an airport, airport revenues were required to be used for airport projects.

James Brundige reported on ongoing projects—see attached Exhibit A for his update distributed to members. He also reported on a further call with Baker which clarified that the wind study should be available in late summer/early fall and the pavement report personnel are finishing other Air Force inspection projects and should be able to return to our questions in the next week or so. The perimeter fence path and the Taxiway A extension are waiting both the surveying and the contractor to mark out the underground utilities.

With respect to tree obstructions, at his meeting with the FAA NY ADO, they confirmed Baker's advice that clearing to Part 77 standards would most likely satisfy airport design criteria and TERPS and gave him a list of 15 trees that would need removal or trimming (it was noted that data used was based on a 2013 fly over and trees would have grown since then) See attached Exhibits B and C

As to the deer fence the ADO confirmed design criteria as noted on Exhibit B. It appeared that a six-foot fence would be the highest without navigation aids that could be built at the end of the main runway because of Daniels Hole Road—if the road's path were adjusted per the ALP a full 8-foot fence could be built there too. [Jim Brundige subsequently clarified this: "*As a result of my visit with the FAA, it is confirmed that an 8 foot fence would be allowed along most of Daniels Hole Road in its current location. The height gets reduces to 6 feet on a small section on the north side. So, continuing with 8 feet would only require a small obstruction light on that north side and maybe a small amount of Runway threshold displacement…So, to say it another way, an 8 foot fence along Daniels Hole Road in its current location does not penetrate the Part 77 20:1 surface for most of its length.*"]

Gene Oshrin reiterated that the pilot's association opposed any fence higher than 4 feet in this section and explained that deer were seldom seen in this area and the chance of a crash during an emergency landing was felt to be greater danger than a deer strike. It was noted that just because deer were not seen in this area of the main runway near the road did not mean that they would not enter at this juncture and then move to other sections of the airport.

David Gruber reiterated that the advice from Cornell's experts that any fence lower than 8 feet (or any low double fencing) would be ineffective and questioned the benefit of a fence with a section that would not keep out the deer, and wondered if the need for any new deer fence at all was a real concern.

It was pointed out that the town could build the fence initially with the 4-foot section as proposed by the pilot's association and review options later if it proved to be ineffective

After further discussion Arthur Malman asked that the members indicate whether they would recommend going forward at this time with a fence of only 4 feet in this critical section. The members (with Charles Ehren confirming, as expected, his opposition subsequent to the meeting) divided 4-4 on

any recommendation at this time; discussion would continue among members and the matter will be considered further at the next meeting.

Cindy Herbst noted that the missing section of the existing deer fence that had been removed by the fire department several years ago to get to the site of a plane crash, had still not been repaired. Arthur Malman recalled that Jemille Charlton had reported about a year ago that, after a lengthy wait, all the missing and broken sections of the existing old fence had been repaired, but asked that the matter be looked into.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

Exhibit A

Airport Director's AMAC Meeting Airport Update
May 18, 2017

Tree Obstructions Phase I (Abeam Taxiway A)

- Anderson Tree Service from Deer Park (lowest bidder) will remove the trees Tuesday, May 30th.

Airport Drainage Repair

- Complete and working well.

Terminal Fence-Controlled Access Gates

- All supplies for the job will be delivered this week.
- Work to start Friday, May 19th or Monday, May 22nd
- Contractor assured me that it will be completed before Memorial Day Weekend.

Paid Parking

- Have asked Techtronic to re-design step by step instructions for kiosk. Some folks have found it very confusing and have complained that the machines do not work.
- Hectronic, to date, still unable to reprogram 10 free spots to produce a time stamp. I have asked Jim DeKoning from McLean to help with this.
- Cincinnati Timekeeper Co. unable to quote a price for time-stamp machine. Discussion as to whether that is needed.

Control Tower

- Fully functional
- Training in progress—Tower operating in training mode.
- Official start date: May 26th.
- End date: September 10th.

Runway and Taxiway Striping

- Will be done by Seneca Paving (Highway Contract) $12,535.00

4-22 Pavement Rehab

- Finally reached Dennis Yap. He says per the Town's instructions; the paving was done only as a maintenance project—mill out and replace in kind for Design category AII aircraft. He will research supporting documents for that assertion.
- Theory per DY and Baker: Pavement failing because it is often used by much heavier aircraft for taxiing purposes.

Fuel Farm—Report from Jim DeKoning of McLean Associates

- Currently we are in shop drawing and prep mode.
- Town Permits for the canopy and the fire suppression are underway.
- Shop Drawings are being submitted for review.
- Coordination with PSEG LI is occurring to extend the 3-Phase power to the site.
- Shovel in the ground for the concrete and site work may be in the middle of June?
- There will be a lot of work happening behind the scenes since the tanks and pumping equipment will arrive preassembled.
- New Farm useable approximately Aug 15

Runway 28 PAPI/REIL Project

- Engineering complete
- Resolution to authorize a bond for the project on the agenda for Town Board approval Thursday, May 18th.
- Pre-bid meeting with contractors, 1pm Thursday, May 18th. Timeline for completion will be determined at this meeting.
- Bids opening May 26th.
- Contractor instructions: Work can be done only Monday afternoon thru Thursday morning and/or after 9pm any weekday. Details will be worked out in Pre-construction meeting.

Baker Projects to be Updated by Mike Waibel by phone

Wind Analysis Phase II

- Pending

Pavement Analysis

- Pending

Perimeter Fence &Taxiway A Extension and D Repave

- Baker still waiting on Walbridge to complete survey for both projects.
- Baker still waiting for Precision Mark-out to complete utilities mark out.
- Per Baker, upon completion of these two tasks, design work can be completed quickly.

Exhibit B

AMAC Report—FAA Visit May 4, 2017

I met with the NY ADO May 4th to discuss perimeter fencing near approach surfaces of Runways 28, 16 and 34 and tree obstruction mitigation. Here is a summary of our meeting:

- With regard to perimeter fencing for wildlife control, they look at Part 77, Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A and Advisory Circular AC 150/5370-10G, Part 8-Fencing.
    - Part 77 deals with approach surfaces

- AC 150/5300-13A deals with Airport Design—i.e.: Runway and Taxiway Object Free areas and Runway Protection Zones
- AC 150/5370-10G defines fence designs.

We must submit our proposed design (height and design of fence) on Form 7460 for FAA evaluation. The FAA will make a determination based on those 3 documents. If there are any penetrations of surfaces, we must

- 1. Lower or Remove the obstruction or
- 2. Displace the threshold and provide lights or markings identifying the obstruction

Penetrations to approach surfaces must be lighted or marked (AC 150/5300-13A Para. 306g.)

In analyzing the Runway 28 approach end according to the 3 criteria, it appears we can have a fence as high as 10 feet in the center, but the height is reduced to 6 feet on the north side as the road curves around closer to the approach end. This conforms to Baker's drawing on 3/1/2016. AMAC, with advice from deer management experts at Cornell University, has determined that an 8 foot fence would suffice to discourage deer from entering the airport. If we go with an 8 foot fence all along Daniels Hole Road, the Runway 28 threshold will have to be slightly displaced. The only other solution is to move Daniels Hole Road back far enough so that an 8 foot fence would not penetrate any of the surfaces. The amount of distance to move the road is shown on the 2011 ALP (attached). How the design would affect instrument approaches would be determined by Flight Procedures (another FAA line of business) after the design is approved by the ADO.

[Jim Brundige subsequently clarified this: "*As a result of my visit with the FAA, it is confirmed that an 8 foot fence would be allowed along most of Daniels Hole Road in its current location. The height gets reduces to 6 feet on a small section on the north side. So, continuing with 8 feet would only require a small obstruction light on that north side and maybe a small amount of Runway threshold displacement…So, to say it another way, an 8 foot fence along Daniels Hole Road in its current location does not penetrate the Part 77 20:1 surface for most of its length*."]

- Tree mitigation: Again, they are guided by AC 150/1500-13A and Part 77 and confirmed, as Baker has said, that clearing to Part 77 standards would most likely satisfy Airport Design criteria and TERPS. The ADO gave me a revised list of tree obstructions for HTO which I have attached.

Paul Whelan, who led the discussion made a blanket statement at the end of the meeting. He essentially said, the FAA uses their tools such as ACs and Part 77 criteria as guidelines in an

effort to keep airports safe and that there are other influences that may keep airports from acting on certain obstructions—some of which may be outside of the airport sponsor's control. It is the FAA's role to provide guidance and advice to keep airports safe to the maximum extent possible, but that they recognize these limitations. I think that is akin to saying, "Do the best you can. Not all obstructions can be mitigated and therefore may result in displaced thresholds or instrument approach adjustments."

Exhibit C PORTION ONLY OF 1/13 TABLE FROM FAA ENTIRE TABLE WITH AIRPORT DIRECTOR

NACO Number	Obstacle Type	Latitude	Longitude	Runway End Designator	Risk Level	Penetrates	Penetration Amount	Requires Mi
36-021014	TREE	N 40 57 47.83	W 72 15 10.37	16	High	20:1 Surface(s)	32.56 feet	YES
36-021095	TREE	N 40 57 23.88	W 72 14 51.32	34	High	20:1 Surface(s)	27.43 feet	YES
36-021018	TREE	N 40 57 49.80	W 72 15 6.17	16	High	20:1 Surface(s)	25.31 feet	YES
36-021096	TREE	N 40 57 24.21	W 72 14 45.72	34	High	20:1 Surface(s)	24.79 feet	YES
36-021100	TREE	N 40 57 26.13	W 72 14 47.39	34	High	20:1 Surface(s)	23.42 feet	YES
36-021020	TREE	N 40 57 50.25	W 72 15 12.64	16	High	20:1 Surface(s)	22.58 feet	YES
36-021092	TREE	N 40 57 22.83	W 72 14 44.63	34	High	20:1 Surface(s)	17.65 feet	YES
36-021064	TREE	N 40 57 36.34	W 72 14 27.45	28	High	20:1 Surface(s)	15.09 feet	YES
36-021087	TREE	N 40 57 29.60	W 72 14 27.94	28	High	20:1 Surface(s)	14.57 feet	YES
KHTO0055	ROAD(N)	N 40 57 48.94	W 72 15 6.26	16	High	20:1 Surface(s)	11.86 feet	YES
KHTO0013	ROAD(N)	N 40 57 24.60	W 72 14 51.02	34	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	10.96 feet	YES
KHTO0057	ROAD(N)	N 40 57 49.29	W 72 15 8.65	16	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	7.62 feet	YES
36-021023	TREE	N 40 57 54.14	W 72 15 8.66	16	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	6.57 feet	YES
36-021090	TREE	N 40 57 33.93	W 72 14 22.19	28	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	5.13 feet	YES
36-021088	TREE	N 40 57 30.13	W 72 14 25.65	28	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	4.74 feet	YES
36-021071	TREE	N 40 57 34.28	W 72 15 57.20	10	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	4.14 feet	YES
36-021072	TREE	N 40 57 34.97	W 72 15 59.20	10	Medium	20:1 Surface(s)	3.53 feet	YES
KHTO0050	GROUND	N 40 57 47.60	W 72 14 8.42	16	Low	20:1 Surface(s)	1.41 feet	YES
KHTO0017	GROUND	N 40 57 26.08	W 72 14 51.54	34	Low	20:1 Surface(s)	1.4 feet	YES
KHTO0033	GROUND	N 40 57 32.83	W 72 14 38.54	28	Low	20:1 Surface(s)	0.94 feet	YES

36-021050	TREE	N 40 57 28.75	W 72 15 53.24	10	Low	20:1 Surface(s)	0.84 feet	YES