

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –August 17, 2018 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: David Gruber, Pat Trunzo III, Steve Tuma, Charles Ehren, Munir Saltoun, Kent Feuerring and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex-officio members: Sylvia Overby and Jeff Bragman, Councilpersons and Co-Board liaisons for the AMAC, and James Brundige, Interim Airport Director.

Absent was Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer, a non-voting member.

Among others attending for all or part of the meeting were Jeff Smith and Mike Hendrit of the Eastern Regional Helicopter Council (“ERHC”), Jonathan Sabin of the EH Aviation Association, Patricia Currie of Say No to KHTO, Rick Prinz and Gene Polito of the SH Airport Advisory Committee, Michael Hansen and Lorraine Hayes residents of Wainscott and residents of EH and neighboring towns who have been working toward helicopter noise reduction over their homes and other members of the public, certain of whom had environmental concerns about airport operations.

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:

Thursday, September 20

Friday, October 19

Friday, December 7

The draft minutes of the July 20, 2018 meeting, as previously distributed and revised, were approved.

Sylvia Overby reported that the initial public survey work being conducted by town consultants for the Part 161 had been completed but that final results were not yet available.

Jeff Bragman reported on the Wainscott water ongoing testing, in home filters and new water mains, noting that acceptable levels of the contaminants were being lowered by several jurisdictions but that the analysis to date had not led to a determination of the source of the pollutants in Wainscott.

Jim Brundige reported that the review by Robinson Aviation resulted in reinstating the Southern Route for helicopter approaches. Arthur Malman suggested that, since Bruce Miller, the experienced HTO chief controller, had raised serious concerns about the southern route during busy times (although now willing to continue to use it) but Robinson’s chief controller had found the route safe without the need the raise the tower, the Town should engage a third party expert to help evaluate the level of

safety concern. Sylvia Overby and Jeff Bragman felt that the Town should rely on Robinson, its contract party, and that further expense for a third-party consulting controller should be avoided

Arthur Malman suggested that, since safety is the highest concern of airport operations, a civic group, such as the EH GGG could cover the cost of the third-party controller's engagement. Sylvia Overby felt that if a particular group engaged the third-party controller, he or she may be seen as bias. Arthur Malman suggested that the cost could be split. The matter was left for further consideration.

Concern was expressed that the Southern Route, although reinstated, was not being used on a 50/50 basis with the northern routes. Jeff Smith explained that the ERHC had clarified the issue with the helicopter companies and felt that the 50/50 split was once again being approached. Jim Brundige would develop data on the split for the next meeting.

Concern was also expressed about a particular allegedly low helicopter flight and Jim Brundige explained that he had reviewed the data and the helicopter had not been as low as perceived but that he would review the data further with the concerned resident.

Jim Brundige stated that at the end of the summer season, he would lead a detailed review of operational results with the controllers, ERHC and others to see whether there should be changes in the voluntary helicopter routes and would give a detailed report at an AMAC meeting.

Arthur Malman asked if the Town were interested in returning to a policy of actively leasing airport areas for non-aeronautical uses and bringing to a conclusion its lease negotiations with the FBO's and was told that the Town, had been awaiting a replacement in the town attorney's office, but with that person in place negotiations would resume. It was pointed out that, although one lease, that had expired in 1987 (although the tenant had continued to pay rent) had recently been renegotiated and finalized, several other leases had expired with some holdover tenants paying some rent and others nothing and the town was losing money each month. Arthur Malman reminded everyone that the AMAC and its predecessor, the BFAC airport subcommittee, had for years been recommending strongly that the town hire a professional lease administrator so that leasing matters, subject to town board policies and review, could be handled in a timely matter—for example immediate follow up within a few days of a late payment rather than waiting months to contact the tenant, standardizing lease forms, etc.

David Gruber stated that the AMAC had reviewed the airport leases, which had been a jumble of different forms and different definitions (e.g. using different CPI indexes for similar leases) and given the town a detailed memo of suggested changes without any meaningful improvement. Arthur Malman indicated that some of the changes had been incorporated in a recent lease but that the attorney's office maintains that there is no standard form. Jeff Bragman asked for a copy of the lease memo.

A short discussion ensued about adding new private hangars and possible locations. Kent Feuerring expressed the view that the rental rate for land being sought by the town was excessive and would make building new hangars uneconomic. Arthur Malman noted that in a recent lease the town had fixed aeronautical lease rates at 75% of the fair market rental for non-aeronautical leases, but Kent

Feuerring felt this was not workable and had shared his calculations with the town. The matter was left for further review.

The meeting then began a review of alternative landing fee allocation formulas. Arthur Malman explained that a couple of years ago the town, over the objections of the AMAC, had changed the landing fee formula used for years that had different schedules for helicopters and fixed wing aircraft. The current landing fee formula is based on weight only and had the presumably unintended consequence of dramatically reducing landing fees for helicopters which are quite light (making their operations at HTO more profitable) at the same time that the town was trying to limit them. He pointed out that the Town's traditional landing fee exemption for based aircraft was not being reconsidered at this time and that the object of the review was not to increase overall landing fees but rather to allocate them equitably among classes of transient aircraft using HTO.

David Gruber pointed out that the FAA guidelines recognize wear and tear on airport infrastructure as the basis to allocate landing fees. While heavy aircraft create the most wear and tear on pavements, aircraft weight is irrelevant to the cost of maintaining the tower, the 2 terminals, the fuel farm and fuel inventory, rest rooms, auto parking areas, snow removal, security, airport administrative services, etc.—for all of which helicopters are being undercharged by the current weight only HTO landing fee formula.

Arthur Malman suggested that the final landing fee formula might allocate all pavement related costs by weight but other costs on a different basis to come up with a single composite fee for each aircraft type expected at HTO. He suggested that one method might be to allocate non-pavement costs among aircraft types based on the maximum number of passengers (including pilots and service staff) that they were designed to carry—irrespective of the number of people on any particular flight.

David Gruber suggested that another way to allocate costs would be to classify aircraft by their standard, fully loaded, hourly operating costs. Jim Brundige stated that this data was not available from the FAA or easily comparable among manufactures. Jeff Smith pointed out that while there was private service that reported hourly operating costs on a standard basis, their data was very expensive at \$500 per aircraft and there are about 50-100 different aircraft types using HTO. David Gruber suggested that we first do a first stage study of the aircraft types using HTO and test the operating cost of a few of the aircraft types and then, if we wanted a large number of data points from the private company, we might be able to negotiate a lower price per aircraft type.

Jim Brundige then reviewed pending capital projects (see attached Exhibit A).

With respect to the perimeter fence, Arthur David Gruber suggested that since cattle crossings or gratings along the entire length of the approaches of 16-34 and the main runway along Daniels Hole road could be prohibitively expensive, Baker should be asked to give us only the linear footage of the sections of the perimeter fence that must be less than the 8 feet--without adjustments to the runways or other operational items. Arthur Malman also asked Jim Brundige to check with Steve Lynch about the feasibility of putting a cattle crossing or grating at 4 places of Daniels Hole road where the ends of the approaches to 16-34 and the main runway meet the road—if this is feasible Jim Brundige can then check

with Baker for an estimate of the cost per foot of putting in such cattle crossings or gratings that would need to be much more heavy duty to bear the weight of cement or other 18 wheelers using the road. Concern was express about having any cattle crossing or grating in the roadway which could be a hazard to bikers or pedestrians, especially on days when it is icy or wet. If these options are not viable then a low double fence with the outer sections slanted or curved toward the road would be the only remaining installation alternative. If either the cattle crossings or gratings and or the curved or slanted double fences prove not to be effective after installation, then the town would need to consider to runway displacement (with or without compensating extensions of the western ends) or other operational solutions.

It is expected that sufficient data would be available by the September AMAC meeting to make a recommendation on the 2018 approach end alternative since building will soon be starting on standard portions of the fence and gates.

The meeting adjourned at 11AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

AMAC Meeting
Airport Director's Update
August 20, 2018

Taxiway A Extension and Taxiway D Overlay Project

- Waiting for Town Board approval to proceed.
- Funding and engineering in place.

Resolution to close Runway 4-22 as a Runway—Install Signage per FAA

- Mandated by the FAA.
- Engineering and Bid Specs have been prepared by Baker.
- Ready to go to bid but cannot be done without a public hearing and environmental assessment per Town Code.
- After all comments are heard and it has been determined that no SEQRA action is required, Town Board passes the resolution and a pen and ink change is made to the ALP.
- When that process is complete, pavement that used to be Runway 4-22 cannot become a runway again without a public hearing and environmental assessment and FAA approval.

Perimeter Fence

- Baker Team visited the airport last week.
- Engineering drawings finalized
- Bid package being prepared by Baker and Town Purchasing Agent Jeanne Carroza.

Crack Sealing

- Baker has been authorized to proceed with engineering and bidding-Resolution 2018-806
- Baker surveyed all runways and taxiways and is preparing a proposal to be put out to bid. I am expecting that next week.
- The goal is to go to bid and complete the project before winter weather sets in.

NY State DEC Testing at Airport

- ?