

Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –March 13, 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 via telephone conference call.

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 James Brundige, Airport Director and Len Bernard, the Town’s Chief Budget Officer .

Absent was John Mak, a non-voting member and non-voting ex-officio member Jeff Bragman, Councilperson and Board liaison for the AMAC.

Among others attending for all or part of the telephone meeting were Virginia Garrison of the East Hampton Press, Mike Wright of the Express News Group, John Kirrane, of the Sag Harbor/Noyac civic association, Patricia Currie and Sherly Gold 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, Teresa McCaskie of the Southold Town Helicopter Committee, Alex Gertsen, Director of Airports and Ground Infrastructure the National Business Aviation Association (“NBAA”), Jeff Smith of the Eastern Regional Helicopter Council (“ERHC”), Zachary Cohen, an East Hampton resident, Ron Klausner, a member of the Southampton Airport Advisory Council, Michael Haverland, an EH Village resident and other 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:**

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

Arthur Malman noted that it was likely that the April 10 meeting would be on Zoom.

The draft minutes of the February 7, 2020 meeting, as previously distributed were approved.

Jim Brundige presented his Airport Directors Update (attached as Exhibit A) and walked the group through each of the items.

He noted that no decision had been made yet by the Board on the recommendation that a traffic safety engineer be hired to assess the potential danger to the driving public of the horizontal protrusions from the deer fence at runway ends smashing through the windshield of a vehicle that for any reason swerved off the road. He was asked to get back to the committee with an estimate of costs of a low protective fence along the road in these areas.

On the soundproofing of the management offices, Jim Brundige thanked Pat Trunzo for all his work on studying the initial proposals and bringing his construction expertise to them in order to better define the work that needed to be done, which will help guide the engineers in setting our construction specifications.

Arthur Malman noted that, with respect to the environmental study proposals and the discussion of the Solar Roadways product for pavements, since neither John Mak, our member with a deep environmental studies background, nor Kim Shaw, the Town's head of Natural Resources could attend today's meeting, full discussions of the three environmental study proposals and Solar Roadway would be deferred. Arthur Malman noted that, even though it was likely that air traffic at HTO would be markedly down this summer because of the virus, he felt that a small study should be conducted rather than waiting for next summer. Sheryl Gold thought that with less flying, the results would be skewed and waiting until the airport was fully operational would be better. David Gruber disagreed and noted that he favored small studies to get a handle on the issues before spending substantial sums on extensive studies.

David Gruber and Kent Feuerring presented the final drafts of the economic study and a companion process study, reflecting comments to date from AMAC members and members of the public (copies are attached as Exhibits B and C). They stressed that the memo on the economic study is not intended to be even a comprehensive summary of the proposed study. There are many questions to be asked and answered in the course of study design. We should not attempt here to identify all of them or we will never get going. This is preliminary and indicative only.

David Gruber and Kent Feuerring explained that two issues have been raised that will have to be addressed once a design process is underway but did not seem to them to be appropriate for attempted resolution here. The first is how many alternatives should be considered in the economic study, only keep HTO open or close it or should the study include other possibilities in between. David Gruber thought that this is a critical issue but far too complex to address in a preliminary context, but it should be one of the prime issues for design of the study.

A discussion followed and, it was noted again that the economic study would be only one of several studies recommended to the Board. The drafts were approved and would be forwarded to the town board.

Michael Haverland asked about the availability of airport data. James Brundige reiterated 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. Michael Haverland also asked about detail landing and takeoff data and Jim Brundige said he would work on getting it to him.

Teresa McCaskie asked about the new 2020 Voluntary Helicopter Routes. Jim Brundige indicated that they were still being fine-tuned. Teresa McCaskie thought things were getting confused since she referred to recent meetings where they were presented as finished products. Moreover, she

indicated that these routes did not solve many of the problems for her area. Arthur Malman said he was surprised because he thought that she and others had been pushing for years on having helicopters on the Northern Route fly further east over the water to Plum Gut before turning back to HTO as now reflected in the draft 2020 routes, but that, in any event while the AMAC could listen to concerns over routes, the voluntary routes were worked out between the Town and the Airport Director and Tower chief, on the one hand, and the ERHC and other aviation parties on the other.

Arthur Malman thanked everyone for working hard to make the telephone call in meeting successful and orderly and said he hoped that future meetings could be held on Zoom while the corona virus restrictions prevented physical meetings for the AMAC.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

AMAC Meeting
Airport Director's Update
March 13, 2020

Runway/Taxiway Lighting and Signage

- Resolution 2020-347: Retain Savik and Murray-Airport Lighting and Signage Engineering—Adopted March 5, 2020.

Ramp Lighting

- Resolution 2020-346: Retain Savik and Murray-Site Lighting Along Airport Apron Areas Engineering—Adopted March 5, 2020

Soundproofing Management Office

- Renegotiated Savik and Murray's proposal to only perform engineering for 13 industrial windows and 2 doors per SoundSense specifications.
- Engineering costs reduced from \$16,650 to \$12,650 plus incidental expenses.

Airport Soil and Air Environmental Testing

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

Coronavirus

- Passenger Areas and Offices at the Airport have been equipped with hand sanitizers and hand washing instructions.
- Employees have been briefed on measures to avoid possible infection.

EXHIBIT B

Draft of 3-12-20.3

March 13, 2020

Memorandum to East Hampton Town Board from the Airport Management Advisory Committee: Unanimous recommendations to the Board for a study of the economic impact of the East Hampton Airport (“HTO”).

It is the unanimous recommendation of the Airport Management Advisory Committee that the Town Board undertake a study of the economic impact of HTO. This study would be one of several studies (e.g., environmental, including noise, land-use alternatives, traffic and diversion, etc.) that would be the factual basis for the Board’s final decision-making about the future of HTO. This and the other studies would also provide essential data in the event that the town were 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 economic 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 and affected East End communities due to the presence and operation of HTO. The extent to which economic impacts outside of the East End should be included is a matter to be considered in the context of the design of the study, having due regard for the requirements of part 161. Even if the Board’s ultimate design of the economic study should intentionally omit some matters required to be addressed under part 161, we would consider it a very unfortunate waste of time and resources, both human and financial, if those matters which the Board decides to include in the economic study were addressed in a manner that failed to meet the requirements of part 161.

This economic study is specifically recommended not to include qualitative costs and benefits that are not immediately market-based, including the value of reduced travel time for HTO users, impacts on road traffic, diversion of air traffic to the Southampton Village heliport, Montauk Airport, Gabreski Airport, or to adjacent waters if HTO is closed, the burden of noise to HTO 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, as the procedures and methodology required for such other studies are quite different.

In addition to this economic study, we foresee the need for an environmental impact statement that meets all the requirements of SEQRA, regardless of whether an argument can be made that none is legally required, and a far more robust analysis of alternatives, both for operating HTO and in the event of closure, than is typically found in an EIS. Decisions about the future of HTO are momentous for many people, on all sides, both near and far. Any decision needs to be made on the basis of a full factual record, meticulously compiled, enjoying the confidence of the whole community.

Separately, we have described our suggestions for the process itself.

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 HTO and aviation-related businesses in respect of operations at HTO, not including commercial air service unless based at HTO and not including existing non-aviation businesses on or near HTO that are expected to remain in operation regardless of its future;
3. The wages and salaries paid to East Hampton residents and, separately, to Southampton residents by both HTO and aviation-related businesses at or using HTO;
4. The wages and salaries paid to those East End residents who are not residents of either East Hampton or Southampton by both HTO and aviation-related businesses at or using HTO;
5. Expenditures for goods and services in both East Hampton and, separately, Southampton by both HTO and aviation-related businesses at or using HTO;
6. Expenditures for goods and services on the East End but outside of both East Hampton and, Southampton by both HTO and aviation-related businesses at or using HTO;
7. Expenditures for goods and services outside of the East End by both HTO and aviation-related businesses at or using HTO
8. The numbers of visits to East Hampton and, separately, to Southampton that occur via HTO;
9. The numbers of visits to East Hampton and, separately, to Southampton that would not occur “but for” HTO but assuming other area airports remain open (the “additivity principle”);
10. The numbers of East Hampton and, separately, Southampton residents (temporary, seasonal, and permanent) that regularly utilize HTO,
11. 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” HTO but assuming other area airports remain open);
12. Portion of expenditures by such “but for” visitors that is value added locally in East Hampton and, separately, Southampton (that is, expenditures net of imported inputs for the purchased goods and services);
13. An estimate of additional visitors and rentals and net revenues (net of imported inputs), including to other modes of transportation, in East Hampton and, separately, Southampton that would result if HTO were closed but other area airports remain open;

14. Estimate of the number of real estate sales and homes put on the market that would result if HTO were closed but other area airports remain open, looking at 2 and 5 year horizons, and the numbers that would result if HTO noise continues or increases.
15. Impact, both positive and negative, on real estate values in East Hampton and, separately, Southampton if HTO were closed but other area airports remain open, looking at 2, 5, 10 and 15 year horizons;
16. Impact on real estate values on the North Fork, Westhampton, and areas near Gabreski and the Southampton heliport if the HTO were closed but other area airports remain open;
17. To be considered, the need for including study of economic impacts outside of the East End.

Exhibit C

Process draft 3-12-20.3

March 13, 2020

Memorandum to the East Hampton Town Board from the Airport Management Advisory Committee; Unanimous Recommendations for the Process for Studies Relating to the East Hampton Airport ("HTO").

We attach a recommendation, also adopted unanimously by AMAC, as to the need for and general description of a study of market-based economic impacts of HTO as a basis for decisions about its future. In that memorandum, we also recommend an environmental impact statement and a robust study of alternatives, both for operation and for land-use and diversion in the event of closure, to provide a comprehensive factual basis, broadly accepted by the community, as a basis for the policy decisions the Town Board must make.

That said, we consider the manner in which a study is conducted, the process, to be at least as important as the contents. There will never be a perfect study or complete agreement of stakeholders. However, we should strive to create a factual record for decision by the Town Board that is broadly accepted as honest, unbiased, and as comprehensive as necessary for the decisions to be made. The design of the studies, and the manner in which inevitable procedural questions are raised and answered in the course of the studies, are critical to a successful outcome that enjoys the confidence of the community on all sides.

Please note the following:

1. We specifically recommend that the process, from start to finish, be overseen by a committee on which all stakeholder interests are represented. Those should include local pilots and aircraft owners, airport users, commercial operators of helicopters, amphibians, and/or jets using HTO, FBOs at HTO, the noise-affected and separately those who advocate for airport closure rather than regulation, environmental advocates more generally, and the local real estate industry. It should be the specific task of this group to discuss with professionals and Town Board liaison(s) aspects of study designs and execution that are controversial, to make recommendations, that may include a range of different approaches to address disagreement, and, if no recommendation can be made, to frame questions properly for resolution by the Town Board.

2. As no committee can fully represent the interests of the community, there should be ongoing opportunity for direct community participation in the processes of study design and execution. Dialogue amongst the Town Board, the stakeholder committee, the general community, and professionals is essential to a successful outcome that finds broad acceptance within the community as a basis for decision.

3. Our list of substantive matters to be addressed is only preliminary and indicative. The first task should be design of each study in consultation with professionals. We are well aware that much of the data that we would like to have, and that is implied by our list of contents, may be unavailable or difficult to obtain cost-effectively. This is always the case with studies. How to gather the data and whether and when to employ estimates and "proxy data" are fundamental considerations of study design. Once the Town Board determines that a study is to be undertaken, recommendations of the stakeholders committee as to contents and methodology for that study may need to be further fine-tuned.

4. It should not be a foregone conclusion that professionals who participate in the design of a study will necessarily participate in all or part of its execution.

5. We are recommending separately an EIS and a robust study of alternatives, primarily because the methodologies for those studies are generally different. An EIS embraces many considerations that are not market-based. A robust alternatives study is of necessity more speculative than a market-based study. However, in many cases the lines between what could be included in a market-based economic study and what could be included in such other studies are blurred. An essential task in design of each study is affirmative consideration of what is to be included and what is to be recommended for inclusion in other studies.

6. We consider it essential given the time, effort, and money required for proposed studies that they be designed in a manner that responds to the requirements of part 161. In that manner, should a part 161 be necessary or desirable in the future, it will not necessary to re-do work already done or to start over. To that end, study designs will require the advice of aviation law professionals in addition to specialists in this type of economic analysis.

7. These studies will be time consuming. They should be designed and commenced as soon as practical to allow the Board and the community in general completely to understand them as a valid basis for Board action regarding HTO.

Exhibit D

{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