

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –January 10, 2020 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, Steve Tuma, Pat Trunzo III, Kent Feuerring, Gene Oshrin, and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex-officio members: Jeff Bragman, Councilperson and Board liaison for the AMAC, Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer and James Brundige, Airport Director .

Participating by telephone was Munir Saltoun, a voting member.

Absent was David Gruber, a voting member, and John Mak, a non-voting member.

Among others attending for all or part of the meeting were Teresa McCaskie of the Southold Town Helicopter Advisory Committee, Michael Norbeck, a member of the East Hampton Aviation Association (“EHAA”), Patricia Currie of Say No to KHTO, John Cullen, a member of the Northville Civic Council, Michael Hansen, a Wainscott resident, Michael Haverland, an EH Village resident, Jeff Smith of the Eastern Regional Helicopter Council and Bernedette Ruffiero of Sound Aircraft and, by open telephone line, Alex Gertsen, Director of Airports and Ground Infrastructure the National Business Aviation Association (“NBAA”) and, as well as, in person or by open telephone line, residents of EH and neighboring towns who have aviation interests and/or who have been working toward helicopter and/or jet noise reduction over their homes and other members of the public.

The agenda had been previously distributed to members and made available to the public prior to the meeting and additional copies were distributed to attendees.

The next meetings are SCHEDULED for the following Fridays at Town Hall, at **TEN (10) AM:**

FEBRUARY 7, MARCH 13, APRIL 10, MAY 8, JUNE 12, JULY 10, AUGUST 14

Jeff Bragman explained that he would be the sole board liaison going forward since Sylvia Overby had taken on an additional liaison assignment

The draft minutes of the December 2019 meeting, as previously distributed but with the clarification that Sylvia Overby had requested by email regarding her position on FOIL issues and a correction to note that Pat Trunzo III had not been present, were approved.

Arthur Malman asked when the “For Lease” sign would go up at the intersection of Daniels Hole and Industrial Roads and Jeff Bragman and James Brundige said they would follow up.

Len Bernard reported that he had sent out the letter to Baker confirming the items to be covered by the Phase II Pavement report and spoken with them, but wanted to further confirm their understanding of the items to be covered

James Brundige distributed his December report (attached as Exhibit A) and a plan of the ramp lighting which, he explained showed a reduced number of lights as suggested by the town's lighting experts and which plan was supported by the town's safety officer. The new lights would be on only until the Sound ground service people left for the night and thereafter there would only be the current lights in front of the terminal which are dark sky compliant. It was noted that the board approval should be sought promptly so that these additional safety measures could be available before the busy season.

Arthur Malman suggested that the new lights should be coordinated with the town's voluntary curfew hours and Steve Tuma confirmed that his staff would not normally be on site during the curfew period. Arthur Malman noted that the current town minimum standards for airport users required an FBO to be available to service aircraft 24/7 and this should be revised to cut out the voluntary curfew times. He also noted that the current standards had no provisions for a "booking agent" such as Blade and sections for these businesses needed to be added. James Brundige explained that he wanted to revise several sections of the standards and would send around revisions on the items noted and his further proposed revisions as well.

James Brundige explained that he was awaiting a proposal from a second environmental firm. Teresa McCaskie asked about the new environmental AMAC member she had suggested. Arthur Malman explained that new non-voting member, John Mak, was in Stony Brook and so did not expect to attend every meeting but would try to be present in person or by phone when environmental issues were to be discussed.

Jeff Bragman had a few questions on the safety guard rail to be installed along the runway approach areas of the road where the "L" shaped fencing could penetrate the window of a vehicle that might swerve off the road. The proposed safety guard rail had been recommended by Ed Michels, Town Safety coordinator, and Jim Brundige. Pat Trunzo III asked if the low fencing could be less of a hazard if the horizontal sections could be tilted up. Other members were concerned about changes to the completed fence since which could affect the structural integrity of the fence, increase the overall cost and could cause an FAA problem since the fence was already at the maximum permitted height for these approach areas. James Brundige explained that the proposed guard rail was approved by the Town's Highway Superintendent and said he would get back to the AMAC with the lengths required and a ballpark estimate of cost.

Pat Trunzo III summarized his review of the SoundSense noise suppression report and felt it would be important to review the plans of the current conditions before going forward. James Brundige said he could make available these plans for his review. Pat Trunzo III confirmed that if just the windows and doors were done as a first phase as suggested, there should not be excessive extra expense of a "second phase" if further work on insulation etc. were subsequently undertaken only if the window and door work turned out not to be sufficient.

Arthur Malman reported that Jameson L. McWilliams, Assistant Town Attorney had said she had delivered, in response to David Gruber's FOIL request, the complete Vector reports showing airport usage by individual aircraft. He suggested that town resident, Michael Haverland, and others who wanted these reports also do FOIL requests that he thought would be processed expeditiously. Michael Haverland asked if these could be made available without the need for FOIL requests which could just delay things. Arthur Malman said that he had invited Jameson McWilliams to attend the next AMAC meeting when she would explain more fully the FOIL process for this and other information.

Michael Haverland and others said that they were unable to find items, especially current items, on the Town's "HTO Planning" website. Len Bernard pointed out that the airport section of the Town's website was where current information could be found. Arthur Malman asked if the town webmaster could migrate the HTO Planning materials into the main website's airport section so that people could look in one place---or if not, add clear links between them. It was also pointed out that materials were being added to the website in chronological order with no real way for anyone to find materials on a topic of interest. Arthur Malman asked Len Bernard to discuss these issues with the town's web experts and report back at the next meeting how these problems could be addressed

Arthur Malman explained that in order to better understand the economic impact of the town's possible closure of the airport, he had asked David Gruber, Kent Feuerring and others to work up a preliminary list of possible items to be considered in such a study—that would be acceptable to both the aviation interests and the noise affected. Arthur Malman stressed that memo distributed at the last meeting (and attached again without changes as Exhibit B for convenience of reference) was only a first cut and has not been reviewed in detail. He had hoped to start the detailed discussion of the economic study at this meeting but would postpone it until the February AMAC meeting since absent today were both David Gruber, one of its authors as well as John Kirrane who at the last meeting had explained his lessons from his experience with economic studies as an executive using them at Citibank and Chase.

It was also explained that an economic study would be only one of several studies that the AMAC would suggest that the town have before it when making major decisions on the airport in 2021. Other studies would include noise studies, diversion studies, environmental studies, land use planning for alternative uses etc. Arthur Malman and Jeff Bragman, both stressed that studies such as this would need to be carefully planned, would take significant time and require substantial expenditure—hence the need to address them promptly if they were to be available to the Board when it would making major airport decisions in 2021 when the grant assurances expire.

With respect to helicopter diversions if HTO were closed to them, Arthur Malman said he had heard of a few possible work arounds by helicopter users when the Town's proposed limits on them had been expected to go into effect (before the court enjoined the Town from proceeding with them).

1. Helicoptering into the large WH airport and then picking up a waiting small fixed wing plane to HTO.
2. Helicoptering into the large WH airport and then driving to their destination in the EH area.
3. Helicoptering into the small seasonal SH helipad and then driving to their destination in the EH area.
4. Helicoptering into the small MTK airport and then driving to their destination in the EH area.
5. More usage of noisy seaplanes for commuting.
6. Selling or renting a house outside the EH area and avoiding HTO.

No one else offered any other alternatives at this time

Arthur Malman said that Michael Haverland had sent an email to him on the possible study and related points and asked him to share his thoughts with the meeting.

Michael Haverland thought that it would be important to have flight tracks by aircraft and a discussion ensued on the data available. HTO has flight path data close to the airport but not at farther distances. Jeff Smith explained that the FAA had some data further out. Arthur Malman asked Teresa McCaskie, who had been interacting with the FAA for many years to work with James Brundige to help him to identify the particular reports that could be supplied by the FAA and the particular person at the FAA who could supply them. It appeared that relevant flight paths out to about 25 miles from HTO might be able to be obtained.

Michael Haverland also asked about noise data. James Brundige explained that HMMH is the town's noise complaint consultants who have been processing data and putting together detailed reports on a daily, monthly and yearly basis. Patricia Currie complained that the consultants used only Plane Noise reports and not Air Noise Reports that many people were using to register noise complaints. James Brundige explained that all reports were made available to HMMH but that only complaints using the Plane Noise system were useful for analyzing where the hot spots are, and they were the ones that HMMH felt they could work with. A discussion ensued on better and easier ways for residents to register noise complaints with simpler apps.

A discussion ensued on the capacity of HTO. Jeff Bragman did not think that capacity was relevant at this juncture with so many other issues to consider, but Pat Trunzo III pointed out that there should be some consideration of how much additional traffic could be expected at HTO over time. James Brundige would ask the tower chief to attend the next meeting to review capacity issues since there was agreement that the airport was already at capacity for aircraft parking (which deficiency led to needless additional noisy flights as aircraft needed to park at other airports while waiting for their passengers) but some disagreement on landing and take-off operations capacity.

Jeff Bragman asked that future meetings start at 10 AM and there was general agreement.

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

AMAC Meeting
Airport Director's Update
January 10, 2020

Runway/Taxiway Lighting and Signage

- Savik and Murray has presented an engineering proposal to upgrade and repair all Runway and Taxiway lights and signs.
- Their proposal includes:
 - Survey all lights, signs and reflective markers and prepare a report.
 - Prepare design drawings and construction plans.
 - Prepare construction cost estimate.
 - Submit FAA Form 7460 to the ADO for construction approval.
 - Prepare public bid package in collaboration with Town's Purchasing Department
 - Oversee the bidding process and recommend bid award.
 - Professional Engineering fee: \$28,510.00
- The airport lighting is old and is being replaced and repaired in increments. In 2014, Taxiway A lights were replaced with LEDs. In 2017, new PAPIs and REILs were installed. In 2019, new, lighted Taxiway H signs were installed. This project is necessary for the safe operations of aircraft in the air and on the ground and will bring much of the remainder of the lights and signs on Taxiway D and Runway 10-28 up to 2020 standards. Preliminary estimated cost of construction: \$150,000.

Ramp Lighting

- Savik and Murray has presented an engineering proposal for installation of Ramp Lighting. The Proposal includes:
 - Determine type of lighting best suited for the project.
 - Prepare design drawings and construction plans.
 - Prepare construction cost estimate
 - Submit FAA Form 7460 to the ADO for construction approval.
 - Prepare public bid package in collaboration with Town's Purchasing Department.
 - Oversee bidding process and recommend bid award.
 - Professional Engineering fee: \$21,280.00.
- If approved, lighting will not be on all night—only when needed for an hour or two in the evenings as ramp workers prepare the ramp for the next day. For passengers who come in after dark, the lights in front of the terminal are on all night and are Dark Sky compliant. New Ramp Lights will be LED and Dark Sky compliant. Preliminary estimated cost of installation: \$120,000

Airport Soil and Air Environmental Testing

- P.W. Grosser has submitted their proposal.
- I have been in contact with Madison Environmental this week with what I believe the community is looking for. Madison indicated that they will be submitting a proposal by week's end.

- I will forward both proposals to the committee by email as soon as I receive them so that they can be discussed at the February meeting.

Deer Fence Guardrail

- Recommended by Airport Manager and Town Safety Officer.
- In addition to being a safety measure, it would likely further discourage deer from attempting to leap the fence.

Soundproofing Management Office

- Savik and Murray has submitted a proposal for engineering the project.
- Proposal includes:
 - Prepare engineering plans based on SoundSense recommendations.
 - Prepare public bid package in collaboration with Town's Purchasing Dept.
 - Manage bidding process to include awarding bid.
 - Professional Engineering Fee: \$16,650.00
- Estimated construction cost to be determined.

EXHIBIT B

FIRST DRAFT TO START DISCUSSION—NOT FINAL—not yet any changes from original submission at prior meeting

It is the unanimous recommendation of the Airport Management Advisory Committee that the Town Board undertake a study of the economic impact of the airport. This would facilitate both decision-making about the future of the airport and the likely requirement that the town will be required ultimately to undertake a full part 161 study as the legal predicate for any action by the FAA to allow restrictions on airport access for the purpose of reducing environmental noise.

The purpose of this study should be to evaluate the full spectrum of market-based economic costs and benefits to the residents, property owners, and businesses in the Town of East Hampton and separately, the Town of Southampton due to the presence and operation of the airport.

We specifically recommend that any economic study incorporate at least the following elements:

1. Estimates of the total size of the East Hampton and, separately, the Southampton economies, distinguishing the export economy (goods and services sold to tourists, second home-owners, agricultural products, other exported goods and services) and domestic economy (value-added and local imports consumed locally);
2. The revenues of both the airport and aviation-related businesses in respect of operations at the airport, not including commercial air service unless based at the airport;
3. The wages and salaries paid to East Hampton residents and, separately, to Southampton residents by both the airport and aviation-related businesses;
4. The wages and salaries paid to those non-residents in either East Hampton or Southampton by both the airport and aviation-related businesses;
5. Expenditures for goods and services in both East Hampton and, separately, Southampton by both airport and aviation-related businesses;
6. Expenditures for goods and services outside of both East Hampton and, separately, Southampton by both airport and aviation-related businesses;
7. The numbers of visits to East Hampton and, separately, to Southampton that occur via the airport;
8. The numbers of visits to East Hampton and, separately, to Southampton that would not occur “but for” the airport (the “additivity principle”);
9. The numbers of East Hampton and, separately, Southampton residents (temporary, seasonal, and permanent) that regularly utilize the airport,

10. Expenditures, including seasonal and short-term rents, in both East Hampton and, separately, in Southampton by visitors, including employees, who would not visit but for the airport;
11. Portion of expenditures by such “but for” visitors that is value added locally;
12. Impact, both positive and negative, on real estate values in East Hampton and, separately, Southampton if airport is closed looking at 2, 5, 10 and 15 year horizons;
13. Impact on real estate values on the North Fork, Westhampton and areas near KFOK and KHVW if airport is closed;
14. Estimate of the number of real estate sales and homes put on the market that would result if the airport is closed.

This study is specifically recommended not to include qualitative costs and benefits that are not market-based, including the value of reduced travel time for airport users, impacts on road traffic, diversion of air traffic to the Southampton Village heliport, Montauk Airport, Gabreski, or to adjacent waters if the airport is closed, the burden of noise to airport neighbors, and other qualitative costs and benefits to health, welfare, and safety. Nor is it intended to evaluate positive and negative environmental impacts. Those matters should be addressed separately.

Exhibit C

{ ALSO TO BE ATTACHED BY THE TOWN TO ITS FILE COPY OF THE FINAL MINUTES ARE THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS PRESENTED TO THE MEETING }

- Picture of proposed airport guard rail presented by James Brundige
- Proposed locations of new ramp lights presented by James Brundige





Light 8

Light 7

Light 6

Light 5

Light 1

Light 2

Light 3

Light 4