

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –February 7, 2020 at Town Hall

Arthur Malman, Chairman of Town of East Hampton’s Airport Management Advisory Committee (“AMAC”), called the meeting to order at 10 AM.

The following members of the AMAC were present: voting members: Charles Ehren, Steve Tuma, Pat Trunzo III, Kent Feuerring, Gene Oshrin, David Gruber, Munir Saltoun 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 .

Absent was John Mak, a non-voting member.

Among others attending for all or part of the meeting were Jameson McWilliams, the assistant Town Attorney responsible for airport matters, Virginia Garrison of the East Hampton Press, John Kirrane of the Sag Harbor/Noyac civic association, Jim Stone of North Sea, , Patricia Currie of Say No to KHTO, John Cullen, a member of the Northville Civic Council and the Riverhead noise task force, Michael Hansen, a Wainscott resident, 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:**

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

The draft minutes of the January 10, 2020 meeting, as previously distributed but with the clarification that Munir Saltoun had been present by telephone, were approved.

Arthur Malman complimented Jeff Bragman and other town personnel for getting the “For Lease” sign up at the intersection of Daniels Hole and Industrial Roads and asked if there was any reason not to install a similar smaller sign in the terminal. Jameson McWilliams noted that the arrow on the present sign would need to be adjusted and Jeff Bragman and James Brundige said they would follow up.

Jameson McWilliams led a discussion on the operation of and policies behind FOIL requests and noted that, if public items were requested by the AMAC in connection with its work, only an informal request would suffice. She recommended that FOIL requests be as specific as possible and broad requests would often take more time. The Town charges a 25 cents per page for copies and can accept emailed requests directed initially to the Clerk’s office.

James Brundige noted that progress had been made to revive the HTO Planning website and cross reference it by links with the Town website's airport section. He and outside aviation counsel were working to bring the HTO Planning site up to date and then endeavor to keep it as the prime resource center for members of the public who wanted to access airport materials.

James Brundige distributed his January report (copy of the report, corrected as to the cost of the Runway/Taxiway Lighting and Signage section, is attached as Exhibit A). Proposals for the Runway/Taxiway Lighting and Signage project to comply with FAA requirements and Ramp Lighting project to improve safety in the ramp area are now ready for Town Board approval. Arthur Malman noted that both projects are FAA required and/or safety and that the board approval should be sought promptly so that these important projects could be completed before the busy season.

Pat Trunzo III explained some of the construction issues and choices arising from his review of prior construction plans and existing field conditions in light of the soundproofing recommendations from Savik and Murray to reduce the increased noise for employees in the management office and his further discussions with suppliers of key components. He will try to get a range of costs for early consideration by the town board so that again the work can be completed prior to the summer season.

James Brundige asked that the discussion of the two current airport soil and air environmental testing be postponed until the next meeting since a third potential bidder has surfaced and he wanted to avoid the possibility of an unfair advantage if the new bidder learned the particulars of the first two. Arthur Malman agreed that postponement would be appropriate and that, since the testing would be done during the busy summer months the town would still have time to approve testing and have it done during the busy summer season. He also noted that he had emailed questions on these first two to our non-voting member John Mak, an environmental expert, and asked his reaction to the ideas that the air tests be held on two busy summer Fridays and that, as a control, at the same time and date, an identical air quality test be made at a busy auto intersection (such as the turn on Route 27 from Woods Lane to Main Street in front of the Village pond).

Jeff Bragman reported that the Board was not disposed at this time to authorize a safety guard rail to be installed along the runway approach areas of the road where, some members thought, that the "L" shaped fencing could penetrate the window of a vehicle that might swerve off the road. After discussion, members suggested that the town engage a traffic safety engineer to report on the issue and Jeff Bragman asked Arthur Malman to send the entire a board this recommendation from the AMAC.

David Gruber said he had received the Vector reports previously requested from the town for actual individual landings and takeoffs and was reviewing the data. In the interim he wondered why some aircraft registered in NJ or other states were being exempted from the payment of landing fees as being HTO "based aircraft". James Brundige said he would review this but in the meantime the members clarified that the definition of "based aircraft" had been limited to those aircraft which had a hangar at HTO or a tie down for at least 6 months a year. Steve Tuma explained that Sound, which operates all the tie downs, only offers two contracts—6 months or a full year. Charles Ehren asked the price of a 6 month tie down and wondered if it was economically better for repeat transient aircraft to

buy a 6 month tie down contract to avoid landing fees-- Steve Tuma and James Brundige were asked to develop some data on this based on the actual landing data that the town has.

James Brundige requested that, since the chief tower controller was on vacation, the planned discussion on airport capacity should be postponed to the next meeting so that he can participate.

Arthur Malman noted that Airport users minimum standards in the town code needed to be revised and updated—for example (i) the current regulations require an FBO to be available 24/7 to service aircraft whereas Sound Aircraft, in response to the town's voluntary curfews, has no personnel at HTO during the curfew hours and (ii) there are no regulations at all for "Booking Service" which is a category that Blade claims to be in. James Brundige said he had forwarded suggested revisions to the town attorney and was asked to send copies to the AMAC members as well.

The major focus of the meeting was a discussion of the second draft (produced by a working group headed by David Gruber and Kent Feuerring to assure it would be acceptable to both the aviation interests and the noise affected) of the AMAC recommendation to the Town Board of parameters for an economic study of HTO—(this second draft differs slightly from the first draft and a copy is attached as Exhibit B). John Kirrane, who had used economic studies in his work at Citibank and Chase, noted the limits of their usefulness. David Gruber agreed that a study would not be dispositive, but would help the Board and the public understand at least the range of economic effects that were likely following Board decisions on continuation, reduction or closure of HTO.

Some members of the public noted that, although the draft study questions included one about the sales of homes if the airport were closed, homes were already being sold because of airport noise and, as airport operations continued, were likely to be even more numerous.

Arthur Malman once again reminded everyone 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 (which could include additional uses for excess airport land that would not affect operations), 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.

Several members of the public not residing in the town, stressed that any decision on the airport would affect them as well as town residents and David Gruber pointed to the section of the draft economic study parameters which specifically address affects in Southampton and other communities. Munir Saltoun asked why, if this and other studies were to consider effects on neighboring communities, these communities should not be asked to contribute to their cost.

Arthur Malman explained that the AMAC wanted to get these recommendations for the economic study to the Board as soon as possible but would give members and attendees a little more

time to comment—and will email copies to members and those folks to whom he had given a reminder of the new 10 AM meeting time.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

AMAC Meeting
Airport Director's Update
February 7, 2020

The following projects are to be submitted to the Town Board for consideration at next Tuesday's Work Session:

1. 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. Project can be done in phases—Phase I: runway lights and signs, \$18,000/\$30,000, Phase II: Taxiway lights: \$190,000

2. 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

3. 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—Pat Trunzo

Airport Soil and Air Environmental Testing

- P.W. Grosser and Madison Environmental have submitted proposals for soil and air testing
- The proposals are submitted for AMAC review.

EXHIBIT B

**REVISED SECOND DRAFT TO START DISCUSSION—NOT FINAL—
minor 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 Gabreski 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 }

No other materials were presented at this meeting