

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –December 15, 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, Munir Saltoun, Cindy Herbst, 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 participant was Pat Trunzo III, voting member.

Among others attending were Sylvia Overby, Councilwoman, Alex Walter, Executive Assistant to the Supervisor, Kent Feuerring, President of the EH Airport Pilots’ Association, Steve Tuma of Sound Aircraft, Dave Pedersen of LI Airways, several 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, January 19 [subsequently changed to 1 PM on Thursday January 18]

Friday, March 2

Friday, March 23

Friday, April 20

Thursday, May 17

Thursday, June 28

The draft minutes of the November 17, 2017 meeting, as previously distributed, were approved.

Len Bernard distributed a summary of outstanding airport debt and projected debt and debt service, along with a summary of new and substantially renegotiated leases. He noted that outstanding bonds (about \$2 million) were for 10 years or less as required by then existing law but, with the recently changed state law allowing for bonding for longer terms (depending on the expected useful life of the improvements) for airports of HTO’s size, new bonding (another \$2.4 million expected so far for the fuel farm, deer fence, and engineering) will generally be 20 years or more thus lowering annual debt service. Likewise, approximately \$3 million expected for the new taxiway A extension and related taxiway D rehabilitation and the tower project would have terms of 20 years or more.

Arthur Malman pointed out that, although new indebtedness had been authorized, to the extent that the airport will have received the proceeds of currently pending land sales along with increasing land lease revenues, all or a portion thereof could be used to reduce the amount of third party debt that would be needed. The idea would be to deposit land sales proceeds in a reserve to be used for capital expenditures and then adhere to a policy of adding to reserves each year the amount of debt service saved, as more fully discussed at the last AMAC meeting.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez reported that the Town had chosen consultants for the Part 161 submission to the FAA and would be working with them and stakeholders in the new year to develop the parameters for the noise reduction procedures for which FAA approval would be sought.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also gave an update of the interim partial results shared so far by Suffolk County Water with respect to well testing in Wainscott but noted that there was no indication had been given yet to the Town of where the initial wells tested were located. In addition to testing for the perfluorinated chemicals in the wells the Town had also requested that lead levels also be reported on.

A map was exhibited which showed the borders of the areas being tested. David Gruber noted that when the results were made available, depending on apparent vectors of chemical infiltrations, it may be appropriate to expand the testing areas. Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also stressed that at this early stage there has been no determination of the source of the pollutants.

Kathee Burke-Gonzalez also explained that, in response to the notice from the DEC of a need to test for the perfluorinated chemical infiltration to Wainscott water that might be related to operations at the airport from operations and/or the industrial area, the Town had authorized the DEC to act on its behalf to conduct follow up testing. Expected DEC testing protocols are to be presented for review by the Town in early 2018 and the testing and analysis would proceed during the spring and summer. Arthur Malman and Bonnie Krupinski recommended that the Town hire its own environmental testing professional to comment on the initial protocols that will be submitted by the DEC since there may be alternative or additional items that should be investigated and/or more effective methods available and it is unlikely that the town or the public would have the technical background to fully critique the initial protocols.

Bonnie Krupinski urged that the Town get ahead of these issues, rather than waiting for the DEC, by promptly starting additional extensive testing at the airport and comparing the results with readings from existing test wells in other areas of the Town unaffected by airport activities. She noted that certain items found in current Suffolk County and the DEC test areas may also be found in other areas of the Town unaffected by the airport and could result from historical farming or other activities around the Town or naturally occurring containments rather than airport operations or industrial operations along Industrial Road.

It was noted that some years ago there had been test wells near the airport entrance but no one knew why they had been closed and members suggested that they be promptly reopened. Steve Tuma stated that he had tested wells in his airport facilities but no elevated levels of lead or perfluorinated chemicals had been reported.

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

With respect to the addition of the nearly completed fuel farm, it was recommended that a generator not be installed now, but the farm should be completed with the added ability to handle the addition of a temporary or permanent generator in the future.

As to raising the tower, James Brundige reminded the meeting that the FAA rules that were in effect at the time the tower was originally sited would have made it difficult to raise the tower to the height now being suggested. Moreover, the first year of the tower's operations was a test and the focus was to keep the investment for it to a minimum. With more experience and some relaxation of the FAA rules, he and the controllers recommend that the tower be elevated so that controllers would have a view above the trees to the south which does not now exist. Among increased safety considerations, it would also enable controllers to bring in helicopters over preferred approach routes during bad weather rather than having them land after flying over heavily populated areas—this would not increase helicopter flights since they would come either way but would mitigate noise.

David Gruber again questioned the need to raise the tower which had been approved by the FAA and the Town at its present height and was working adequately and asked that we have further discussion to better understand whether the benefit would justify the expense, especially when there might be more pressing projects or a reduction in helicopter traffic which would diminish the helicopter related concerns.

As to the perimeter deer fence, a discussion ensued on displacing the approach to the main runway from the east about 130 feet to allow the fence in that area to be raised to 8 feet. Steve Tuma and others stressed the need to add the difference to the west end of the runway with a similar displacement to keep the usable length of the main runway constant. Gene Oshrin stated that the displacement on the main runway for the deer fence should not take place before the additional "make up" portion is added on the west end of the runway.

Others questioned the need to maintain the runway's present usable length and noted that shortening it might somewhat reduce traffic and noise. It was pointed out that many of the newer, quieter jets could use a slightly shorter runway. Since there had not yet been any estimate of the costs of an adding pavement to the west end and the steps for its approval might take significant time, it was recommended that the deer fence project go forward with only a four-foot section for now at the main runway end.

Bonnie Krupinski noted that if this small paving project were to go forward in the near term, efforts should be made to accelerate it so it could be combined with other paving projects to save significant mobilization costs which could reduce its cost by up to 30-40%.

Arthur Malman asked Steve Tuma and Dave Pedersen to report on switching HTO to unleaded fuel for piston planes. While some piston planes currently using 100LL could be adapted to use the currently available 94 UL from the Swift company, they would need to be recertified by the FAA and could not thereafter continue to use 100LL if they needed to refuel at other airports not selling 94 UL.

As David Gruber had pointed, we are not talking about just a finite single airport problem, but need a system-wide approach.

Dave Pedersen explained that he had studied the issue and wanted the transition to take place as soon as possible. Since only about 3% of all fuel sold at HTO was 100LL, and only about 30% of based piston planes could use 94UL, he felt that HTO should not offer unleaded fuel until 102UL was approved by the FAA. However, he pointed out that he was concerned that the FAA would not move swiftly to approve 102UL which could be used interchangeably by all piston planes now using 100LL without modification. It was noted that, while the FAA and EPA had expected the approval process by the end of 2018, with the Trump administration's recent cutbacks and redirection at the EPA, that process might take longer.

Arthur Malman noted that the new fuel farm now had 3 tanks (2 for jet fuel and 1 for 100LL), it was designed for the possible addition of a fourth tank which addition would cost about \$300,000 whether it is added now or in the future. A fourth tank could be used for 94UL and then converted to 100UL when approved with the old 100LL tank converted for storage of jet fuel. However, since only about 3% of all fuel sold at HTO is 100LL, Swift should be consulted about supplying 94UL in alternative containers on an interim basis.

Steve Tuma also wanted to see the new fuel adopted as soon as possible but was concerned that there could be damage to planes or injuries to passengers if both the Swift 94UL currently available and the current 100LL were offered simultaneously. He explained that there were already practical difficulties of asking ground crews, especially on busy days, to be careful to not fill up a plane with jet fuel when it needs 100LL or vice versa. He felt the problem would be compounded if two different fuels for piston planes were offered at the same time without certainty as to which planes were able to use each.

A discussion ensued on the possibility of offering only no lead fuel at HTO at this time. It was pointed out that air traffic operates as a network and, even if HTO did not sell 100LL, planes would get it elsewhere and fly into HTO with it. Moreover, there could be some increase in operations if HTO based aircraft would have to fly elsewhere to fuel up with 100LL. James Brundige pointed out that some high performance, piston planes based at HTO could not be adapted for 94UL and therefore would be a continued need for 100LL until 102UL were certified by the FAA.

Nonetheless it was pointed out that even small quantities of lead are harmful to people, especially children, and the Town has a responsibility to stop selling leaded fuel as soon as possible.

Gene Oshrin felt that without a nation-wide major re-structuring of the piston plane fuel industry, any changes at HTO would simply be symbolic, ineffective and costly in resolving any concerns over lead contamination. Others felt the "symbolism" itself would be important.

Pat Trunzo III noted that California airports will soon be mandating only no lead and we should be actively organizing regional airports to move ahead with a prompt conversion rather than waiting for the FAA to approve 102UL since lead is recognized as harmful to people, especially children, in even

small quantities. [Arthur Malman subsequently asked Munir Saltoun and Jim Brundige to check further with Swift which currently offers 94UL and airports selling it to see how they are handling two fuels for piston planes and to report back at our next meeting].

Arthur Malman explained that, as noted at the last meeting, a working group including James Brundige, Steve Tuma, Bonnie Krupinski, David Gruber and he had met at the airport to begin to understand the needs of the airport over the next 5-10 years. The major problems were congestion in the ramp area around the terminal and inadequate parking areas for newer planes with increasingly wider wing spans.

David Gruber noted that there had been an error in the most recent ALP which identified one type of aircraft as the “design aircraft” for the crosswind runway on the cover page but which was different from the design aircraft discussed in detail in the analysis. The result was that the required distance from the center line of runway 16-34 to the parked or taxing aircraft would not be 150 feet as the engineers had noted (based on the erroneous design aircraft specifications) but only 65 feet, thereby eliminating less aircraft parking areas than originally understood. Based on the FAA criteria for the proper design aircraft, the secondary runway should be 75 feet wide rather than the possibility of 60 feet as had been an alternative under consideration. The 2000-foot length was adequate for the design aircraft for the secondary runway.

Arthur Malman noted that James Brundige had found operations data from 2006/7 that showed, surprisingly that when both 16-34 and 4-22 were still available about 3000 operations were on 16-34 and only about 2000 on 4-22. Moreover, the use of the runways in the southerly direction had been only 974 operations on 22 as versus 1960 on 16. Gene Oshrin did not think this comparison was dispository since by 2006/7 runway 4-22 was in terrible shape and pilots were avoiding it and also the data might contain helicopter operations which are not relevant to the current discussion. While earlier data and/or data specifically helicopters could be more helpful, it was apparently not available. Arthur Malman suggested that perhaps this data should not be used as one reason to choose a secondary runway. David Gruber disagreed and felt that while the 2006/7 data could be questioned as Gene Oshrin suggested, it was the only data and should be considered, albeit with the caveat about reliability based on the then condition of 4-22 and the possibility of helicopter inclusion.

Although the Wainscott Citizens Advisory Committee had been told that a final recommendation on a secondary runway would not be made until after the AMAC’s February 3 meeting with them, Arthur Malman summarized the reasons during the preliminary future airport needs planning to stay with 16-34 as follows:

- a. the wind study gave only a marginal advantage to 4-22 in the summer
- b. more significant housing south of 4-22 than 16-34 which is largely over the sand pit area— with resulting noise and lead considerations
- c. while the summer winds were generally southwesterly, James Brundige’s review of the actual readings for 2017 were that there were only about 10 summer days that at any time had effective

crosswinds of over 10 mph which would have suggested the need for a crosswind runway. Moreover, while a pilot would be more apt to use a crosswind runway for landings which are more troublesome than take offs in a substantial crosswind, since the crosswind runway is shorter than the main runway, for take offs in the same wind conditions many pilots would opt for the main runway.

d. lifetime cost to rehab 16-34 and extend its use would be less than to rebuild 4-22

e. the FAA recommended 60-foot centerline separation from 16-34 to parked or taxing aircraft was substantially less than the 150-foot separation originally thought required—based on the error in the design aircraft on the front-page chart of the ALP---therefore there would be less loss or ramp and parking area than initially feared

f. the 2006/7 usage data—although it may have been influenced by the poor condition of 4-22 and intermingling of helicopter operations (Gene Oshrin felt that this data should be disregarded entirely since there was no specific reference to type of aircraft or runway pavement conditions).

Once the choice of the secondary runway was finalized by the Board and processed with the FAA, some additional aircraft parking areas could be located at the north end of the de-activated runway.

Generally, the working group had found that planes with smaller wing spans should be relocated further away from the public ramp with the newer larger wing span planes assigned to those nearby areas vacated. While there needed to be more aircraft parking in the area of both terminals, David Gruber pointed out that more adequate airport parking would not lead to more traffic at HTO since people were not flying to HTO because of parking. By contrast when there is inadequate aircraft parking at HTO, some aircraft will increase operations –and noise- slightly by dropping off passengers and taking off to park at West Hampton or another nearby airport and then coming back rather than just parking during this down time.

Bonnie Krupinski felt that the area immediately to the south of the present car parking area should be thought of as potential expansion of car parking areas, if and when demand increases from rental car companies or private car parking.

Arthur Malman asked Steve Tuma and James Brundige to come back to the AMAC with some preliminary ideas for future reconfigurations based on these criteria but keeping in mind that we are not suggesting an increase in airport operations rather a rationalization of aircraft parking areas to meet the need of the current fixed wing fleet---parked helicopters can be more easily accommodated and may become less of a problem if their operations are decreased as a result of a successful part 161.

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

EXHIBIT A

AMAC Meeting Airport Update December 15, 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:
 - 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
- Timeline:
 - NTP: December 18, 2017
 - Final Design Submittal 7 wks
 - Advertise and Award 4 wks
 - Fabricate and Deliver 6 wks
 - Erect and Commission 3 wks
 - FAA Certification 2 wks

Total: 22 weeks

Estimated Opening Date: End of May, 2018

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. Obstruction lights only mitigate Part 77 surfaces according to FAA. Only remedy: displaced threshold.
- 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. Then the question is, what to do with Daniels Hole Rd.?

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Overlay Project

- Drawings complete
- Funding will be completed next week
- Going out to bid in January
- Construction in the Spring
- Estimated cost: \$2.1 million

Runway 28 Tree Obstructions

- Trees identified in the Baker survey based on FAA information removed
- FAA informed me that Airport Sponsor is responsible for ensuring all obstructions were removed. I will discuss with Baker.

Fuel Farm

- Transfer pad and tank pad complete.
- Electrical work complete
- Canopy footings have been built and Canopy structure erected.
- Tanks and fueling skids have been delivered and are being installed today (12/15/17)
- Looking to have the new fuel farm up and running within the next two weeks.
- Removal of existing fuel farm to begin as soon as all “bugs” worked out of new farm.

Fuel Farm Generator Transfer Switch

- Engineering Services for wiring of Transfer Switch: \$(Waiting for quote from McLean)
- Fuel Farm Transfer Switch Estimated Electrical Contractor Cost: \$ 8-12,000. Includes electrical manpower and equipment. In order to be outside the NEC explosion zone the temp roll up generator would have to go outside the fence unless we extended the fence a little which would be \$3,500 more for gravel and additional fence.
- Total cost of generator transfer switch project: \$. \$15,000-19,000.
- Fuel Farm Budgeted at \$1,650,000. Actual cost: \$1,289,000. Difference: \$361,000

Runway 16/34 Cleaning and Sealing Cracks

- This was done April 2014 at approximate cost of \$15,000 Needs doing again
- Rosemar Paving quote: \$29,000
- Rosemar no longer on State, County or Highway contract, so we must go out to bid

Removal of Old Runway 4-22 Markings

- This work was mandated by FAA. This pavement will now become Taxiway H (Hotel)
- Markings will be removed on Monday.
- Baker is in the process of providing engineering for installation of new Taxiway H signs and markings.

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.