Airport Management Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting –June 14, 2019 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, David Gruber, Steve Tuma, Pat Trunzo III, Kent Feuerring, Gene Oshrin, and Arthur Malman and non-voting ex-officio members: Sylvia Overby and Jeff Bragman two Councilpersons and Co-Board liaisons for the AMAC, Len Bernard, the Town's Chief Budget Officer and James Brundige, Airport Director.

Absent was voting member Munir Saltoun.

Among others attending for all or part of the meeting were Elliot Meisel and Kathryn Slye of the East Hampton Aviation Association, David Pedersen of Long Island Aviation, Patricia Currie and Sheryl Gold of Say No to KHTO, Peter Bordy of the Sag Harbor Express, Frank Sorrentino, Gianparlo De Felice and, by open telephone line, Jeff Smith of the Eastern Regional Helicopter Council ("ERHC"), Alex Gertsen of the National Business Aviation Association and Teresa McCaskie of the Southold Town Helicopter Advisory Committee, as well residents of EH and neighboring towns who have been working toward helicopter 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 9 AM:

JULY 12 [Cancelled]

AUGUST 16

SEPTERMBER 13

OCTOBER 11

NOVEMBER 15

DECEMBER 6

The draft minutes of the May 17, 2019 meeting, as previously distributed, were approved and, Arthur Malman noted since there had been no further clarifications of the draft April 5 minutes after the clarification at the May 17 meeting to the effect that it would be the Town's airport fund and not the town's general fund that was losing money from unleased airport property that was available for non-aeronautical use, the April 5 minutes as so corrected have become final.

Arthur Malman explained that minutes of a meeting could be written in some detail as we had been doing for the AMAC or in skeleton form, with essentially only a list of who was present and who

was absent, and the formal resolutions adopted. He said that since Sylvia Overby had reported that the town attorney's office had expressed concerns about the detailed nature of the draft minutes which were being sought in litigations, he was willing to move to merely skeletal minutes.

However, he did point out that, in the FAA's recent decision in favor of the town in a Part 16 brought alleging the town's failure to fully explain its rationale for increasing landing fees and fuel flowage fees a few years ago, the FAA directly pointed to detailed AMAC minutes which showed that the town, through the AMAC, had a detailed record of careful consideration of alternatives before the increase.

David Gruber and Charles Ehren opposed a change to skeletal minutes and felt that the detailed minutes provided an important record of items considered, data compiled, and alternatives reviewed. Pat Trunzo III noted that the AMAC meetings were not televised and, as a result, many people, who were working or otherwise unavailable, had no other way to learn what was being considered.

Sylvia Overby was particularly concerned that someone had forwarded draft minutes to people outside the AMAC and these drafts were being FOILed. Arthur Malman said he did not send around draft minutes beyond the committee members, but did explain that where he would be paraphrasing members or people outside the committee who had spoken at some length at AMAC meetings he would sometimes send them a preliminary draft of the sections referring to their comments to confirm that he was being reasonably accurate in describing their comments—and then usually included most of the clarifications they requested in the draft circulated to the whole committee for final approval.

David Gruber questioned whether the Town was required to even turn over draft minutes in response to FOIL requests. Arthur Malman pointed out that, over the last few years, there had seldom been any material changes from the draft minutes to the final minutes which were then routinely posted on the town's website.

Sylvia Overby also was concerned that the town was being put to substantial expense by wide ranging FOIL requests that required substantial work by the town attorney's office.

David Gruber pointed out that if FOIL requests or interrogatories were too broad and potentially time consuming, the Town could often defer responding until the requests were made more focused. David Gruber also felt that the Town should file with the AMAC minutes copies of all materials presented to and discussed at the meeting. [TOWN SHOULD ATTACH THESE MATERIALS AS EXHIBIT B BEFORE POSTING FINAL MINUTES ON ITS WEBSITE]

Jeff Bragman explained that he could see the advantages of both approaches to minute drafting, but he would be inclined to support more transparency and continue with the detailed minutes.

It was the sense of the meeting that the AMAC should not move toward skeletal minutes.

Arthur Malman explained that many AMAC members felt misled by the Liaisons, who during discussion of alternatives for the LI Airways property at the May 17 AMAC meeting, had forgotten to mention that just the night before, at a public town board meeting, the board had adopted a resolution

to set aside $275,000 in case the town would want to buy out the remaining term of the LI Airways lease. Gene Oshrin did not think this was an oversight but a more purposeful effort to keep relevant information from the AMAC and the aviation community generally.

The Liaisons explained that they did not mention this resolution adopted at the public meeting because they did not want to get into a discussion of the deliberations that were still ongoing in executive session about this lease. Several members pointed out that this rationale was not persuasive. the Liaisons had often said before on particular issues that they could not discuss them in public at AMAC meetings since they were still being discussed in executive sessions of the Board (and the AMAC members accepted this position).

The Liaisons also explained that they were still far from any definite course of conduct with respect to the lease but just wanted to move some funds to a particular account if they were to act in the future. Pat Trunzo III said that this excuse made no sense since the town board regularly voted for a particular action and, at the same meeting, adopted a resolution to segregate funds for it. Len Bernard pointed out, he would generally prepare a funds resolution if requested by the Board. He had been out of town when the board asked for the preparation of this particular resolution to segregate funds but agreed that the board often adopted a resolution for an action at a meeting, and, at the same meeting, adopted a resolution to segregate or move funds from one budget line to another to cover it.

Jeff Bragman felt that, in retrospect, it would probably have been better to have waited until the board was set on an action with respect to the LI Airways lease and only then adopt a funding resolution, rather than to cause unwarranted concerns by doing so before it was needed.

Arthur Malman also pointed out that prior liaisons to the AMAC and its predecessor, the BFAC, routinely gave the committee members a head's up when there was a chance that the town board would be considering an airport related issue so that interested parties could attend. Sylvia Overby did not feel that there was any need for this since the agendas for the town board meetings were routinely posted on the town's website, so anyone interested in an issue could check it. Several aviation and other members pointed out that, while she was technically correct, most AMAC members had jobs or other responsibilities and did not continually monitor town's website for board meeting agenda postings, so that a simple email or telephone call in advance of a meeting would go a long way to restore trust among all members that the Liaisons and the board were not trying to sneak through anti-aviation measures.

Arthur Malman then asked the AMAC to consider in detail capacity at HTO since David Gruber had pointed out the May 17 AMAC meeting that HTO had significant unused capacity and that actions taken (or not taken) to improve operations at HTO would not reduce the level of HTO operations which were demand determined as versus capacity restrained. He had continually pointed out that not attending to repairs or improvements in a timely manner, when the airport fund had the resources to do so, would not decrease the demand for operations---and resultant noise—but only end up costing the town more to rectify deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure

The capacity discussion would be divided into two parts: first the capacity of HTO to have aircraft land and take off ("operations") and second, the capacity of HTO to park aircraft once they have discharged their passengers.

With regard to operations, James Brundige reported that, on the busiest day in HTO history, Friday May 25. 2018 (the Friday before Memorial Day), HTO had 375 operations (operations are generally divided evenly between landings and take offs, although sometimes there may be slightly more landings on a Friday and slightly more take offs on Sunday or Monday).

In the busiest hour of May 25, 2018 there were 26 landings, and no one was asked to circle during that hour.

On May 25, 2018 there were 187 landings –Helicopters 74, Seaplanes 26, Jets 29 and 58 others.

Based on discussions with the tower chief and the other HTO controllers, James Brundige reported that the HTO tower could safely bring down for landings 4 times the number of landings that were brought in to HTO during the busiest hour of May 25, 2018. This would translate to a capacity to land about 100 aircraft an hour, although some might need to circle to even out the flow.

Even if a helicopter were requested to circle for 10-15 minutes, since the helicopter flight to or from NYC is only 45 minutes as versus anywhere from 3-5 hours or more by car or bus on busy times, a person who could afford the $600 ticket would not change to a car or bus to avoid the possibility of circling. Teresa McCaskie asked what research the town had done to confirm that the auto trip at busy times could be that long. Arthur Malman explained that no further research was needed on this since almost all members of the AMAC around the table and people in the audience had experienced a 4-5-hour trip on the LIE (most everyone in the room raised their hands to indicate their personal experience with a 4-5-hour drive at busy hours).

The unused available capacity for safe landings at HTO at less busy hours would be even be substantially higher than the actual usage on that busy May 25, 2018. Assuming aircraft landed only, but steadily, between 7 AM and 7PM, this would translate to a theoretical capacity of 1200 safe landings per day as versus the 187 on May 25, 2018, the airport's busiest day.

Sheryl Gold questioned why, since the former chief controller, Bruce Miller, had raised concerns about the safety of landing helicopters in much smaller numbers from the Southern route, everyone seemingly is now forgetting safety. Arthur Malman pointed out that the procedure that Bruce Miller had been concerned about was bringing helicopters coming in on the southern Sierra route into and mixing them with the downwind leg of fixed wing aircraft, especially when the airport was busy. As Bruce Miller had himself noted at the time of his presentation, a safer alternative would be to land helicopters south of the main runway when they were coming in from the south on the Sierra route and the airport was busy. Following this suggestion, the procedures for 2019 had been changed so that helicopters coming into HTO from the south at busy time will normally be brought down south of the main runway rather than entering into the fixed wing pattern.

Jeff Smith and James Brundige reviewed these new procedures in detail and explained the improvements to safety, although since the helicopter landing areas south of the main runway are limited there could be some situation where a helicopter coming from the south may be asked to circle over the ocean while waiting for one of the helicopters already landed south of the main runway to taxi or hover over to the main terminal freeing up a landing spot. If the now unused LI Airways ramp and parking area, also south of the main runway, were available for helicopter landings it would decrease the possibility for helicopters circling at busy times.

Sheryl Gold also asked to see a copy of the report Robinson Aviation was to have delivered to the town detailing the safety concerns of Bruce Miller and why there were not material. Arthur Malman explained that Jeff Bragman, having asked several times for such a report and, each time, after believing it was to be forthcoming but not receiving it, learned that Robinson was not willing to deliver a detailed report. Jim Brundige did note that Robinson had sent him an email saying that they felt operations at HTO were safe. It was pointed out that this was not a detailed report about the Miller safety concerns and the Town was apparently not going to seek one from an independent third-party expert, especially since Bruce Miller's major concerns had been addressed.

Jim Brundige also reported that, as suggested at the last AMAC meeting, there would be new voluntary helicopter procedures for 2019 that would encourage pilots who landed from the north to take off to the south and vice versa to try to equalize the annoyance of over-flights to neighbors on the north and south.

The meeting then turned to aircraft parking capacity. Steve Tuma explained that as jet technology has advanced, jet engines have become more efficient and quieter, allowing larger jets to land on HTO runways that were once considered too short. As a result, since HTO's aircraft parking areas were originally designed, jets have become more numerous at HTO and the jets that do land here are much larger, needing more area to park.

On many busy weekends, even when aircraft are parked on make-shift areas, there is still not enough parking or hangar space for all aircraft coming into HTO. As a result, increasing numbers of aircraft on busy days drop off their passengers and take off again to park at Westhampton or other nearby airports. When the passengers are ready to leave—later that day or another day-- the same aircraft that could have been parked overnight returns to HTO from Westhampton or some other nearby airport to pick up the passengers.

The unintended consequence of inadequate aircraft parking at HTO is to increase the operations at HTO with a commensurate increase in the noise burden to residents.

This extra movement of the aircraft—and extra noise for residents—is of little or no consequence for the passengers whose sole concern is that they are dropped off and picked up at HTO on their own schedule. The small extra cost to move the aircraft is inconsequential as compared to the overall cost of the flight, although it needlessly doubles the noise burden for local residents.

Landing fees at HTO are among the highest for local airports in the United States, but an analysis done by the AMAC's predecessor (the HTO subcommittee of the Town's Budget and Finance Committee) found that, unless the already high HTO landing fees were increase 7-800% they would have no material effect on reducing operations since landing fees as a percentage of overall cost of flying are relatively small.

James Brundige confirmed the AMAC's finding that in recent years helicopter and seaplane operations at HTO have generally increased and operations by smaller piston planes and by jets have stayed about the same, although the jets coming in are generally larger needing more parking area.

Jeff Smith was asked whether the helicopter companies would add more equipment to the NYC/HTO route or materially raise prices if helicopter demand continually increases. He confirmed that if demand increased, the companies had available equipment to re-allocate to this HTO route.

Arthur Malman summarized this discussion and those of recent meetings on these issues

1. There is sufficient capacity at HTO, even at its busiest hours, to land safely many times the number of aircraft that have been landing or taking off ---even if no improvements or major repairs are made to the airport.

2. There is insufficient parking and hangar capacity at HTO to handle aircraft on the ground at HTO's busiest days with the result that aircraft drop off passengers, take off and fly to Westhampton and other close by airports to park and then land again at HTO to pick up passengers----with the unintended consequence of a needless increase in operations noise for local residents.

3. Usage of HTO is **demand driven** by people who can afford a helicopter or fixed wing flight rather than spending hours on the crowded roads.

4. The operations of seaplanes and helicopters, both noisy, is likely to increase at HTO.

5. Not making repairs or improvements at HTO will have no meaningful effect on usage.

6. The excuse of not making repairs or improvements at HT0 (without increasing the length of the main runway which is not being advocated) because "it would be seen as an expansion of the airport" is only misleading to the public since the airport has unused capacity and operations are demand driven.

7. Delaying timely repairs, especially to pavements such as runways, taxiways, ramps and aircraft parking areas, will not reduce operations at HTO but only, based on all studies reviewed by the AMAC, only increase the cost of the eventual repairs at a later date when detioration is worse. Even those AMAC members who are considered anti-noise advocates, support keeping the airport infrastructure in good operational condition as a cost-effective measure and have been disappointed by the Town Board's reluctance to approve needed

repairs and improvements unanimously recommended by the AMAC, even though the airport fund has adequate reserves for this purpose.

The airport directors monthly report is attached as Exhibit A.

Jim Brundige explained that an "FDIO box" discussed briefly at the prior meeting is a communications device placed at airport towers at the schedule set by and at the expense of the FAA and could make tower operations more efficient, and possibly increase safety margins, by relieving controllers from manually inputting flight data on slips of paper and telephoning the FAA Tracon personnel to coordinate that data with regional operations at Tracon. It would not increase operations or capacity at HTO. All members recommended that the Town Board should encourage local and federal governmental officials to advocate that the FAA to move up HTO on its schedule for FDIO box installation.

Jim Brundige also explained "fusion radar", also discussed at the last AMAC meeting, which is a system that could replace most of the functions of one of HTO's existing tracking systems (Multi-Lateration tracking) when the present contract expires at the end of 2020. He is researching the system more fully and there may be some reasons to consider it an addition to current tracking systems rather than a replacement depending on its ability to let us access historical data efficiently. The cost should be somewhere in the $20-30,000 per year range and would not have any meaningful incremental cost if it is a viable total replacement for the present Multi-Lateration tracking system

Arthur Malman noted that the cost estimate for soundproofing the current management office (which is noisier with jet engines and APU's running outside it as jet parking has been relocated) may not be too different from the cost of relocating it to the rotunda as originally planned when the airport was originally designed. Jim Brundige noted that the "big room" of the management office could be relocated with some improvements to visibility of the field but the airport director's office would remain where it is. Arthur Malman explained that the cost of the rotunda conversion could be more than offset by rental for the highly desirable vacated big management space (which has a good view of the ramp and most of the field) from a restaurant, FBO or another user.

Pat Trunzo III pointed out that when the airport terminal was being designed a wide majority of local residents were desirous of seeing a restaurant included and such a use could be a source of revenue for the vacated space to offset the rotunda cost.

Kent Feuerring asked about the status of the Part 161 process. The Liaisons indicated that the town board was rethinking the cost/benefits and strategy of the Part 161 but were not in a position to publicly share their analysis to date.

Arthur Malman asked about the "for lease" signs but there was no new update except that they were still in progress with the town department charged with producing them.

Sylvia Overby had no news on any major leasing of vacant non-aeronautical land, but did report the possibility of some new desk space leases in the terminal.

David Gruber and Len Bernard will tele-conference with Baker to confirm that Phase II of the pavement report will supply the data needed to develop an accurate annual contribution to a pavement improvement and replacement reserve.

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Malman

Exhibit A

AMAC Meeting
Airport Director's Update
June 14, 2019

Taxiway D and 422-3 Repaving

- Awaiting Baker Proposal for Engineering and Bid Package.

Perimeter Fence

- The contractor has determined that the Marder pipes are not suitable for this project and have offered to construct a "Marder Style" fence post made of four feet high 4x4" posts and four feet long 4x4" horizontal post. See attached sketch.
- Consideration should be given to installing a guardrail along Daniels Hole Road on the approach ends of Runways 28 and 16.

Crack Sealing—Runway and Taxiway Striping

- Phase 1—painting and striping Runway 16-34 and all taxiways complete.
- Phase 2—crack sealing postponed until after busy season in September. Runway 10-28 will be painted then also after crack sealing is complete.

Helicopter Traffic Patterns

- Helicopter pilots are maintaining a high degree of compliance with ERHC's request that pilots who come in from the north should depart out the south and vice-versa. See attached flight tracks.
- Pilots are also complying to a high degree with maintaining high altitudes—3500 feet inbound and 3000 feet outbound while utilizing BROC on departures.

FAA Radar Coverage at HTO

- In reading the May minutes, I found there is some confusion regarding radar coverage at HTO. Historically, there has been no FAA radar coverage at low altitudes beyond an area abeam Westhampton. Recently, the FAA has installed technology that "fuses" several radar stations on Long Island, Connecticut and Rhode Island that allows them to see and track aircraft traffic into and out of HTO all the way to the ground. This technology can be available to the Town within the next year, allowing us to eliminate the cost of Multi-Lateration tracking. Whether we go that route or not will depend on

how accurately we can archive tracks and altitudes. Currently with M-Lat, that capability is excellent and I wouldn't want to lose it.

Capacity of HTO

- A study of last year's busiest day, Friday May 25th, the Friday before Memorial Day, revealed the following:
  - There were 374 total operations.
  - During the busiest hour, between 5pm and 6pm, there were 26 arrivals and 26 departures—about 1 per minute. Discussions with the Tower chief has revealed they could handle up to 4 times that amount of traffic, or 4 per minute—2 arrivals and 2 departures.

EXHIBIT B

[ALSO TO BE ATTACHED BY THE TOWN TO ITS FILE COPY OF THE MINUTES ARE MATERIALS PRESENTED TO THE MEETING]:

AT THIS MEETING: A DRAWING OF THE CANTERLEVERED FENCE AND THE CHART OF HELICOPTERS USING THE PROCEDURE OF COMING IN FROM THE NORTH AND GOING OUT TO THE SOUTH OR COMING IN FROM THE SOUTH AND GOING OUT TO THE NORTH