

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –November 17, 2017 at Town Hall

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 9 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members: Charles Ehren, Bonnie Krupinski, Gene Oshrin, David Gruber, Cindy Herbst, Pat Trunzo III 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.

Telephone participants were Munir Saltoun, voting member and Bruce Miller, head tower controller.

Among others attending were Alex Walter, Executive Assistant to the Supervisor, Kent Feuerring, President of the EH Airport Pilots’ Association, Steve Tuma of Sound Aircraft, members of the Wainscott Citizens’ Advisory Committee (WCAC) along with several other Wainscott residents and other members of the public.

The agenda had been previously distributed to members and copies were distributed to attendees.

The next meetings were SCHEDULED for the following 9 AM, at Town Hall:

Friday December 15

Friday, January 19

Friday, March 2

Friday, March 23

Friday, April 20

Thursday, May 17

Thursday, June 28

The draft minutes of the October 25, 2017 meeting as previously distributed (with the minor clarifications suggested by Kathee Burke-Gonzalez’s email to all members) were approved.

Arthur Malman explained that the AMAC had recommended to the Board that parcels of airport property not be sold but rather leased (with the tenant to build its improvements on them) to provide long term revenue to the town and that new leases, which could be long term and have extension options not have any purchase options. The current Board has followed this procedure.

However, about a dozen or so of the existing leases of airport property for non-aeronautical uses along Industrial Road, which had been signed by the Town many years ago, do have pre-existing purchase options which were generally at the market value of the airport property at the time exercised. These options were generally exercisable on or before the end of the base lease term when the leases generally provided that the rent for the option terms would be based on the then appraised rental value.

During the last couple of years, the appraised rental values have generally been about \$30-50,000 per acre per year and the appraised sale price at about \$6-700,000 per acre, with some variations depending on parcel size, location and dates of the appraisals.

By contrast the original annual rent for these parcels had been dramatically lower and some of the tenants, faced with steep increases for renewal terms and the prospect of further increases in the future, had decided to exercise their purchase options. Three parcels were now being sold pursuant to these pre-existing purchase options for about \$4.75 million and it is likely that many of the additional tenants with these pre-existing purchase options will exercise their options as their leases come up for renewal over the next few years.

It has been the recommendation of the AMAC to the Board that proceeds from airport land sales not be used for operating expenses, but rather put into an airport capital reserve that can be used from time to time for airport capital expenditures. However, if the reserve funds were insufficient for the capital expenditures needed at the time, there could still be a need for traditional bonding, assuming that the town would no longer be seeking FAA grants to cover the substantial costs of rebuilding runways and other pavements.

The AMAC also recommended that, since were it not for the use of funds from this reserve the Town would have to bond for these capital expenditures, the Town Board should include in each future annual airport budget an addition to this capital reserve, in an annual amount that would approximate the annual debt service that the Town would have paid had bonding been used for the particular capital expense paid for out from this capital reserve.

Len Bernard supported this capital reserve and annual addition procedure which would reduce the need of the Town to issue bonds for airport capital improvements, but noted that, if the Board were to use funds from the capital reserve for a particular capital expenditure with a useful life of more than 5 years, the Board resolution would have to provide a 30-day window for the possibility of a permissive town-wide referendum—although it is unlikely that there would generally be a call for such a referendum.

While the present Town Board appears to support such allocation of land sale proceeds to such a capital reserve and the annual additions to it as described, it should be recognized that there would be no way to force future Town Boards to deposit the proceeds of future land sales in such a capital reserve fund nor to continue to make annual additions to the capital reserve as described.

James Brundige then reviewed his monthly update (a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A).

With regard to the estimate for a back-up generator to be installed at the fuel farm, David Gruber repeated his questioning of the need for any generators at the airport. Pat Trunzo III and Bonnie Krupinski questioned the cost of the installation, although Bonnie Krupinski strongly supported the addition of an emergency generator. Arthur Malman also supported the addition of the generator but pointed out that it may be possible to purchase it from an existing approved supplier list at a substantial savings. James Brundige would follow up with the Town Purchasing Department and the engineering firm and get back to the AMAC with more details.

On the deer fence, the FAA had objected to an 8-foot fence so close to the main runway end on the Daniels Hole road side. As had been discussed previously, one way around the problem would be to prohibit landings on a portion of the eastern end of the main runway. About a 130 ft. long section would be affected to clear the 8-foot fence obstruction and about a 230 ft. long section if both the fence and the possible passing truck (although trucks are usually 13 ft. high, the FAA uses 15 heights for passing trucks) on Daniels Hole were to be avoided. It was pointed out that the FAA had considered the truck clearance a low-level problem and, as a result, the discussion centered on the 130 ft. alternative.

Steve Tuma was concerned that shortening the runway for landings from the east, would cut out the use of HTO by some jets and could also adversely affect fuel sales. James Brundige reported that he had spoken to Net Jets and some of the other companies and they did not think they would have a problem with a slight shortening or the runway for landings from the east.

Arthur Malman suggested that James Brundige get an estimate from Baker of the cost to add a 130-foot or 230-foot section to the west end of the main runway that would be open only for aircraft landing from the east and suggested that, to minimize mobilization costs, this might be done as part of the Taxiway A extension planned for this spring.

James Brundige also described a more decorative 8-foot deer fence for the section near the terminal and public parking and the members agreed that this had been part of the original plan.

The need to raise the Tower was then discussed, with Bruce Miller explaining the limitations on safe and efficient operations posed by the fact that there is not 360-degree visibility from it because of the trees and Executive Terminal hangar to the south. The Tower had been built on a low base initially as a cost saving measure when it was not yet certain that a seasonal Tower would be continued at HTO. James Brundige also explained that, when the tower was originally built, raising it higher would have run into height limitations under then existing FAA policies—those policies had changed and the Tower could be raised now with simply a warning light on top.

Questions were raised on the alternatives presented in drawings of building the tower cab platform with an open steel superstructure as versus piling up about 3 containers for the supporting base which could also contain bathroom and break areas. Bonnie Krupinski pointed out that the Tower staff now used the bathroom facilities in the Executive Terminal and there would no problem for that use to continue. James Brundige would follow up with these questions and report back to the AMAC.

Arthur Malman opened up the discussion, which he expected to proceed over multiple meetings, of the need open more public ramp space around the main terminal, increasing the set back from 16-34, providing more aircraft parking areas as an increasing percentage of jets now had wider wing spans, each requiring a larger parking area, than they did many years ago when the ramp and tie down areas were originally designed and related changes. After an initial discussion, it was determined that a working group would meet first with James Brundige and Kathee Burke-Gonzalez and present initial recommendations to the full committee.

The meeting was then updated on the local unavailability of unleaded fuel for piston planes, and procedures to modify engines and recertify planes for its use. Gene Oshrin described his own test of unleaded fuel for one of his piston planes a couple of years ago and the engine problems that developed from it.

It was the sense of the meeting that the AMAC would recommend the discontinuance of 100LL at HTO as soon as practical. Arthur Malman pointed out that the fuel farm was being completed now with two large jet fuel tanks and one smaller 100LL tank, but there was room to install a fourth tank for new unleaded fuel to replace 100LL when available. James Brundige and Kent Feuerring were asked to follow up on what could be done to accelerate the transition away from 100LL.

Some members of the public advocated that HTO stop selling 100LL immediately even if that left many of the smaller based aircraft with no fueling source. Arthur Malman indicated that such a decision was a policy matter for the Town Board and not something about which the AMAC has been asked to make a recommendation but suggested that it could be taken up directly with the Board.

Other members of the public were concerned about how and when the AMAC would be making its decision on a recommendation for re-opening 4-22. Arthur Malman explained that several members of the AMAC had originally been under the impression that 4-22 was essential for summer cross-wind landings which could not be accommodated by 16-34. The results of the extensive wind study presented at the last meeting by Ron Price indicated that the benefits of 4-22 for summer cross wind landing were only marginally better than 16-34 and therefore other considerations should be weighed before a final decision on the cross-wind runway is made.

The strong opposition of Wainscott residents to the re-opening of 4-22 prompted a suggestion that members of the AMAC attend a WCAC meeting on February 3rd and that was now planned.

Local pilots had suggested that if 4-22 were re-opened, pilots could be asked voluntarily not to use it unless the cross winds were at least 10 mph and, if used, to make an immediate turn to avoid the housing concentrated to the South. However, it was not likely that the FAA would quickly make such voluntary measures mandatory and there would be no way to limit 4-22 to the small aircraft anticipated.

As a result, for now the focus of the AMAC's work would be on the assumption that 16-34 would be continued for now as the cross-wind runway.

A few members of the public advocated that that HTO eliminate both cross wind runways—referring to a comment in the wind report that HTO could possibly operate as a single runway airport and some members of the public wanted the airport closed entirely. Arthur Malman again indicated that such decisions were policy matters for the Town Board and not something about which the AMAC has been asked to make a recommendation, but suggested that they could be taken up directly with the Board.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez then updated the meeting on the findings to date from initial Wainscott well tests and cautioned that determinations on the source and extent of the problems should await completion of the current round of well testing.

A question was raised by the public about why two test wells at the airport were no longer operating. No one knew the answer to that question but Bonnie Krupinski and other AMAC members felt the Town should be proactive on broad environmental testing at the airport so that a better understanding of what problems, if any, existed and how they could be addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

EXHIBIT A

AMAC Meeting Airport Update **November 17, 2017**

Control Tower

- Baker WA 15: Consideration is being given to raising the height of the Control Tower to provide controllers improved visibility and to enhance “Special VFR” procedures
 - Estimated cost of raising the Tower: (See Handout)
 - 30 ft. Height: \$617,300-623,000
 - 50 ft. Height: \$646,500-723,300
 - Engineering Services: \$85,000
 - Approximate Total depending on type of base including Engineering cost: **\$703,000-808,000**

Perimeter Fence

- FAA has confirmed that an 8-foot fence at the approach end of Runway 28 violates 20:1 surface and cannot be mitigated by obstruction lights. Only remedy: displaced threshold. Obstruction lights only mitigate Part 77 surfaces according to FAA.
- Baker confirmed that they can only repair the 4-foot fence that is already there—they cannot replace it with a deer fence of any height.
- Possible alternative remedy: regrade the RSA (Runway Safety Area) to the level of the runway and install a deer fence at that grade level. I would have to get authorization for Baker to engineer that option.
- Airport users do not want deer fence near the Terminal. They would prefer the same style fence that was installed on the Terminal building last summer—white decorative. Baker will cost the project out both ways.

Runway 28 PAPI/REIL Project

- Complete

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Overlay Project

- Drawings complete
- Bid Specs and Bid Schedule will be complete the end of Nov.
- Bid award expected in December
- Estimated cost: \$2.1 million

Runway 28 Tree Obstructions

- All bids in. Coastal Arbor, Inc from Southampton lowest bidder--\$6,500. All references came back extremely positive.

- About 9 trees will be removed in the areas designated by Baker. All are pines. Only pine trees poke up above the canopy of oaks.

Fuel Farm

- Transfer pad and tank pad complete.
- Electrical Work for the wiring of the fuel farm is on schedule
- Canopy footings have been built and Canopy structure erected.
- Tanks and fueling skids are in manufacturing. **Expected at the Nov 21.** This is three weeks later than reported last month. Several pieces of equipment are backordered.
- Coordination with PSEG LI is occurring to extend the 3-Phase power to the site.
- Storm water Leaching Pools are installed.
- Looking to have the new fuel farm up and running in **mid- December.**
- Removal of existing fuel farm to follow starting in **mid- December.**

Generator Fuel Farm

- Engineering Services for Fuel Farm Generator: \$12,950
- Fuel Farm Generator Estimated Cost: \$71,800
- Fuel Farm Budgeted at \$1,650,000. Actual cost: \$1,289,000. Difference: \$361,000
- Total cost of generator project: \$84,750.

New Pickup Truck for Airport

- 10 year old Ford failing fast. Electrical problems have resulted in many visits to the shop
- Being purchased with surplus funds
- The larger, heavy duty newer truck will go to maintenance mechanic. New vehicle will be smaller, more fuel efficient for office staff.

Runway 16/34 Cleaning and Sealing Cracks

- Asking for quotes from local paving companies.
- This was done April 2014. Needs to be done again.
- Approximate cost: \$15,000

Removal of Old Runway 4-22 Markings

- All bids in. Lowest Bid: \$9500. Contractor got high marks from other airports.
- This work was mandated by FAA. This pavement will now become Taxiway H until a determination is made on which runway will be selected as the crosswind runway.

Reduced Lead in Aviation Gasoline

Some aircraft engines can use 94 octane unleaded. Those that can do not need an engine modification, however the aircraft owner may need an STC, Supplemental Type Certificate, allowing them to use a lower octane fuel.

- Because many higher performance engines cannot use 94 UL, 100LL Avgas would still have to be available for sale.
- Our supplier, World Fuel does not sell 94UL.
- Neither Gabreski nor Islip sell 94UL.