

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –January 18, 2018 at Town Hall

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 1 PM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members: Charles Ehren, Gene Oshrin, David Gruber, Steve Tuma, Pat Trunzo III, and Arthur Malman and non-voting *ex-officio* members: Sylvia Overby and Jeff Bragman, Councilpersons and Co-Board liaisons for the AMAC, James Brundige, Interim Airport Director.

Telephone participant was Munir Saltoun, voting member. Absent were Bonnie Krupinski, a voting member and Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer, a non-voting *ex-officio* member.

Among others attending were JoAnne Pilgrim, Executive Assistant to the Supervisor, Kent Feuerring, President of the EH Airport Pilots’ Association, 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 at Town Hall, at 9 AM except at noted:

Friday, March 2 CANCELLED

Thursday, March 22 at 1 PM

Friday, April 20

Thursday, May 17

Thursday, June 28

The draft minutes of the December 15, 2017 meeting, as previously distributed (with Dave Pederson’s remarks confirmed), were approved.

Munir Saltoun reported on his discussions with Swift fuels on the possibilities to offer 94UL at HTO while awaiting FAA/EPA approval of 102UL which, since 2014, has been targeted for the end of 2018—although, especially considering the Trump administration’s priorities and the FAA administrative processes, might take longer. Arthur Malman noted that Canadian aviation authorities were also independently testing 102UL and could have recommendations prior to the FAA/EPA.

Jets and Helicopters use no lead jet fuel and only piston planes use 100LL. 100LL accounts for less than about 3% of all fuel sales at HTO (about 30,000 gallons annually). Based on data as to HTO based piston planes still using 100LL, shared by Steve Tuma with Swift, it appears that only about 30% of HTO based piston planes could use 94UL. The piston planes with high compression engines could not

use 94UL and most of those with low compression engines would have to be recertified with the FAA (after a mechanic's certification and a filing cost of a few hundred dollars, depending on the engine's horsepower). The estimate was that HTO, in 2018, would sell less than about 5,000 gallons of 94UL—if it were competitively priced with 102 NL, although once 102UL were approved, substantially the entire piston fleet would switch to it.

Munir Saltoun reported that Swift was willing to work with HTO to make 94UL available even if the quantities were small. Swift would lease a small on field fuel truck for a short term for use with 94UL. However, spending about \$200,000 at the new fuel farm for a new fourth tank to be dedicated to 94UL would not be cost effective, especially since once the FAA approves 102UL, the existing third tank at the fuel farm used for 100LL could be converted to 102UL use.

Swift could also deliver 94UL in 350-gallon stainless steel totes from which fuel could be pumped into planes. Munir Saltoun had also spoken with the airport at Great Barrington which was using the totes with no major operational problems. The price of the 94UL delivered in small quantities would be somewhat higher per gallon than 100LL.

James Brundige thought that Suffolk County and/or the EH fire marshal could have problems with the totes and there could be requirements for a new fuel spill containment area for the totes.

Pat Trunzo III stressed the need for HTO to make every reasonable effort to move forward the transition to unleaded fuel as quickly as possible. Arthur Malman suggested that HTO could subsidize 94UL sales to make it economic for the FBO's to offer 94UL in 2018.

He suggested that a group of James Brundige, Steve Tuma, Bonnie Krupinski and Munir Saltoun follow up with Swift and report back on the best way to offer 94UL at HTO as early as this summer.

Sylvia Overby updated the committee on the status of the Part 161 submission to the FAA. She noted that there would be public meetings on proposals for regulations and a Board meeting with the attorneys in executive session on the submission. Pat Trunzo III objected to an executive session on the Part 161 since there was no basis for an executive session without pending litigation---which is not the case at this point on the Part 161 process. Arthur Malman noted that this same point had been addressed by the Town Association in its treatise on Town Law. Jeff Bragman indicated that he generally favored meetings open to the public.

Sylvia Overby also gave an update of the interim partial results shared with the Town so far by Suffolk County Water with respect to well testing in Wainscott but noted that the no final map had been given yet to the Town of where all the initial wells tested were located and their results. Arthur Malman noted that Paul Giardina, formerly a manager with the EPA had, in a recent letter to the Star pointed out that while 70 parts per trillion is the current EPA endangerment level for perfluorinated chemical infiltration, 14 parts per trillion may soon become the revised level. Jeff Bragman reported that NYS and some neighboring states were already using or will soon be moving to 13-20 parts per trillion.

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. Sylvia Overby stated that the preliminary data did not yet show clear vectors of concentrations and stressed that at this early stage there has been no final determination of the source of the pollutants.

Sylvia Overby reminded the AMAC, 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 and/or at 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 noted that he and Bonnie Krupinski he had 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.

Arthur Malman reported that he had spoken with an old friend, a very experienced environmental lawyer who was familiar with perfluorinated chemical problems who had pointed out that Honeywell and St Gobain had been manufacturers of this type of fire-fighting foam that contained perfluorinated chemicals and were therefore deep-pocketed potentially responsible parties. This lawyer also very strongly recommended that the town take back the lead in the environmental testing from the DEC, using its own consultants to develop and implement appropriate protocols.

At a prior meeting, Bonnie Krupinski had urged that the Town get ahead of these issues, rather than waiting for the DEC, by promptly starting additional extensive testing at the airport not only of perfluorinated chemicals but also lead in the air and other potential contaminants and comparing the results with readings from existing test wells in other areas of the Town unaffected by airport and Industrial road tenant activities. She had 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.

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

As to raising the tower, James Brundige reminded the meeting that among reasons to raise the tower were that it would also enable controllers to bring in helicopters over preferred approach routes during bad weather rather than having them land after flying (and circling) over heavily populated areas—this would not increase helicopter flights since they would come either way but would mitigate noise.

David Gruber asked James Brundige if he could prepare data showing the number of helicopter flights in prior years that would have been better directed over less populated areas had the tower been raised

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 Gene Oshrin 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 before any displacement occurred. Steve Tuma explained that there could be a material loss of jet traffic, if the displacement took effect before the “make up” addition, because insurance requirements and/or corporate operating policies could prohibit landings on a shortened main runway for certain types of jets. James Brundige did not think that the loss would be too substantial.

David Gruber asked James Brundige if he could prepare data showing the number of jet flights that would likely be diverted to Westhampton if the displacement took place without the runway “make-up” addition.

Although the Taxiway A extension (and the related taxiway D rehabilitation), were ready to go out for bid, Sylvia Overby stated that the Town was not prepared to go forward with any major airport projects before a final decision by the FAA on the 161 application and the results of water well testing.

Pat Trunzo III asked Sylvia Overby and Jeff Bragman if they were ultimately in favor of closing the airport if the FAA did not offer the Town material relief from noise. Both answered that closure was not their objective.

Arthur Malman explained the Taxiway A extension was a project originally recommended in the very first report by the Noise reduction subcommittee, supported by the Airport Director and subsequently highly recommended by 100% of the AMAC.

David Gruber noted that additional planes will not fly into HTO because Taxiway A is completed but rather it is an important project to improve safety.

Arthur Malman added that during the AMAC’s recent research on recommendations for reducing lead in the air at airports, reducing taxing times for aircraft is one of the two most highly recommended strategies ---completing Taxiway A will substantially reduce taxing times for aircraft that are now taxing out of their way to run over runways 4-22 and 16-34-- thereby needlessly increasing the quantities of lead in the air.

David Gruber also noted that using a runway as a taxiway decreases its useful life and is therefore more expensive in the long run.

Jeff Bragman explained that he was new to detailed airport matters and asked the AMAC to develop a short memo explaining its support for the prompt completion of the Taxiway A extension (and the related taxiway D rehabilitation). Arthur Malman asked David Gruber and Gene Oshrin to work on a first draft of this memo.

The meeting adjourned at 3 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

EXHIBIT A

AMAC Meeting Airport Update January 18, 2018

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: Date Not Determined
 - 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: Unknown

I have a copy of the Safety Risk Management Document that was used for the siting of the Tower. It can be viewed in my office. Bruce was not the Tower chief when this process was completed. It was the responsibility of RVA, DY and the FAA to ensure the tower was placed properly. According to the SRMD, “The site selected is reserved for the MATCT (Mobile Air Traffic Control Tower) and meets these requirements:

- There must be maximum visibility of the airport’s traffic patterns.
- There must be a clear, unobstructed and direct line of sight to the approaches to all runways or landing areas and to all runway and taxiway surfaces”

The Tower was placed in the best location possible to fulfill all requirements as explained in the SRMD.

No one is saying the height and site were ok then and not now. What is being proposed is an improvement that will allow special VFR operations to take place during inclement weather so that helicopters are not loitering in holding patterns waiting for an instrument approach clearance and allowing helicopters to utilize the southern route for Special VFR thereby easing the burden on communities to the north when weather is below VFR. In other words, it’s an improvement—an

enhancement—in order to make the operation work better, more efficiently and in a way that improves noise mitigation and safety.

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 is in place
- Bid package will be ready by the end of 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 have discussed with Baker. They say Walbridge can perform that task.

Fuel Farm

- Fuel Tanks Installed
- PSEG has delayed connecting 3-phase power supply until the end of January. Very disappointing, given that they were given the design and \$30,000 to do the job last fall.
- Commissioning expected mid-February
- Old Fuel Farm will be removed soon after the new one is fully functional.

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 have been removed.
- Baker is in the process of providing engineering documents for bidding and 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.
- Gabreski, Islip MacArthur, Republic, Martha's Vineyard Nantucket do not sell 94UL.
- Munir hosted a conference call with Swift Fuels and will brief AMAC on the findings.