HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Select Committee to Investigate
Bureau of Aviation Pursuant to
House Resolution 259

Pages 92 through 151

Main Capitol Building Room 104 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Thursday, November 1, 1984

Met, pursuant to notice at 9:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR JOHN LESCOVITZ, Chairman REPRESENTATIVE BARRY L. ALDERETTE REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN H. WILSON REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD GEIST REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH PITTS

Commonwealth Reporting Company, Inc.

700 Lisburn Road
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

Camp Hill (717) 761-7150 Philadelphia (215) 732-1687 ALSO PRESENT: KAREN S. FLEISHER Legislative Assistant to Representative Wilson WILLIAM F. LYONS, III Legislative Assistant to Representative Wilson SCOTT CASPER Executive Director of House Transportation Committee PAUL LANDIS Executive Director of Republican Transportation Committee PAUL PARSELLS Legislative Assistant to Representative Petrarca

 $\underline{\mathbf{C}} \ \underline{\mathbf{O}} \ \underline{\mathbf{N}} \ \underline{\mathbf{T}} \ \underline{\mathbf{E}} \ \underline{\mathbf{N}} \ \underline{\mathbf{T}} \ \underline{\mathbf{S}}$ <u>WITNESSES</u> PAGE Don Bryan

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: The time being 9:00, I would like to call this public hearing to order, House Transportation Committee to Investigate the Bureau of Aviation according to House Resolution 259.

First on the agenda today is Mr. David Sims.

MR. BRYAN: I can offer as information, Mr. Sims is in District 12 today on a scheduled visit with his staff there.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I wrote to Sims, got no answer. I assumed from Larson's comments yesterday that none of the staff of PennDOT, except yourself and himself would be here.

MR. BRYAN: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: The Honorable Shirley Dennis, Secretary of Community Affairs?

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I got a letter from Dennis. She said she had another commitment.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Mr. Francis Strouse, Airport Engineering Section, State-owned Airports?

(No audible response.)

REPRESENTATIVE GEIST: Do we have subpoena power? REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: No, not yet.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Mr. Lawrence Hamacher, Jr., General Manager, Harrisburg International Airport?

MR. BRYAN: He is not here. Let me say,

Do you

Mr. Chairman, he's in Canada engaged in some negotiations 1 hopefully that will bring some air service into Harrisburg. 2 CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Mr. Charles Hostetter, Director, 3 Bureau of Aviation? (No audible response.) 5 CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Mr. Don Bryan, Deputy Secretary, 6 Local and Area Transportation? Okay, Don. 8 I am here. I MR. BRYAN: Good morning, gentlemen. have no statement. I am prepared to answer questions if I can for you, or otherwise supply information. CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: We will start with Rick. 12 have any questions. REPESENTATIVE GEIST: No questions here. CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Barry? 15 REPRESENTATIVE ALDERETTE: I think I asked everything I had to ask at this time yesterday. I have no questions. 17 CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Representative Wilson. REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Mr. Bryan, in light of the fact that Raup and Hamacher and others are not here. I had developed some questions to ask them. You are designated by Secretary Larson to be the omnipotent one this morning. 22 For Raup, I was concerned and you and I were just chatting 23

4

7

9

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

24

25

about it, I was concerned about the aircraft and aircraft use

and judgment of what aircraft was utilized at different times.

can only pick out different examples.

Back in September 9, 1981, the Secretary went to Meadville and used the King Air. He stayed in Meadville. The King Air was deployed back to Capital City to pick up the Governor to go to Kansas City and back to Pittsburgh.

The Baron you had under lease was sent back up that same day and picked up Secretary Larson in Meadville. The stupid question arises, why didn't he go in the Baron in the first place, instead of sending one plane to take him and send another plane to bring him back. This was all within a few hours. It didn't seem to be good planning of the utilization of the aircarft.

Is there a written policy setting forth what aircraft will be used, when it will be used, when it will chosen and this kind of overlay?

MR. BRYAN: There is not a written policy, but the manager does exercise in his judgment trying to match the aircraft with the mission. In that case I cannot tell you here why the Secretary wasn't taken to Meadville originally in the Baron. It could have been something having to do with the availability of the Baron.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Baron was available, absolutely, we checked that. It went up to pick him up at the point in time shortly afternoon. He went up early in the morning, typically, opened a highway or something, and went up

to pick him up and bring him back, which is on official duty.

I have no problem with that. It's just using the two aircraft seem to be a duplicated effort. We found that happening quite a bit.

As I said to you earlier, in that same context, the King Air came back and took the Governor to Kansas City. TWA flies out of here nonstop for \$538. The Governor spent \$5,000 going out and back. I realize you can't tell the Governor he can't use the state plane.

We talked to the folks in Ohio and they have a firm written policy that says in that type of case, the airline guide will be consulted and that offer will be made to, if it is, in fact, the Governor -- they don't stop the Governor from using the state plane, but they might suggest that that is -- I wondered, if in fact, you have ever in your six years looked at some sort of a written policy that might speak to that sort of thing?

I also found, as I told you earlier today, 1980 through 1984, you averaged \$100,000 a year in outside charters, a lot of which were spent when other aircraft were available, state aircraft were available. We did touch on that yesterday.

Again, the question is: Why not a written policy of some sort, a rule or regulation? If you have a rule or regulation, then it is less bendable, less amendable when

He

somebody comes in. I realize you are dealing with officials here and you have a touchy subject, particularly when you get 2 to telling the Secretary of Transportation, look, pal, you can't use that King Air today; you have to use the Baron. says, who are you working for? -- the Governor, also. are others that wouldn't it seem to me to be prudent to

promulgate some rules?

MR. BRYAN: I believe that a written policy would be desirable. When the Legislative Budget and Finance Committe talked to us on this subject, we asked their consultants at that time if they had any policies or had knowledge of any policies. They did not and were not able to provide us with any. We, frankly, weren't surprised at that because our manager, Mr. Raup. has been in touch with other states and with other corporate lead operators in an attempt to find some written guidelines for aircraft utilization.

To date, we have not found any unified or written policies, although we have collected information that he is using to compile a policy that we would use.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It would seem, you know, I couldn't help but think while you were stating that, you have taken great pride and credit for the recently passed Senate Bill 785. It would seem to be terrific innovative and leadership on your part to, instead of following the other states, perhaps we could lead them and develop a policy.

25

1

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

 I find other states are following us in some of the other things, the act that just got passed, they are, and rightly so. You should take pride in that sort of thing. I would think a written policy seems to be, and everybody that we have talked to, Mr. Dario's operation and others, seem to indicate that not having any written policy or rule or regulation on the use of the aircraft seems to lead to -- I don't want to use the word abuse -- but perhaps, a little misuse and perhaps not intentional. But if there's guidelines there, then at least Mr. Raup can say, these are the guidelines. You have to talk to somebody else. He then does not get massaged because of his position.

MR. BRYAN: We agree with the desirability of having such guidelines. As I said, we are developing them. If there are others in existence, and we have no knowledge of them, I'd be pleased to have them. We do intend to lead the other states as we indicated here, by developing such a policy and getting it out before any others because, as I have said, we have no knowledge of these in existence at the present time.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I believe Ohio does. We are waiting for copies of Ohio's. We will be glad to share that with you.

MR. BRYAN: Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That was Mr. Raup's questions. We will move to Mr. Hamacher now.

The staff calls my attention to a statement made by Secretary Larson yesterday on the second page, when he said, tallying the greatness of the Bureau of Aviation, he said "There is an airport directory, an aeronautical chart", a big smile when he said that, "published on a regular basis, a written manual that governs state flight operations." We don't have one, do we?

MR. BRYAN: You have one now. I did bring one for you.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Flight Operation Statutes?

MR. BRYAN: Yes, that's a written flight operations
manual, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It doesn't speak to the use of aircraft?

MR. BRYAN: No, it is the manual for the operation of the flights. It's for the pilots and mechanics in operating the aircraft. The point the Secretary was making, in '79, we didn't have that. Flight was just conducted.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I understand that. I didn't think your predecessor ran a good show, either, believe me. If you heard some of my comments to them in the past, you could appreciate it.

Let's go on to the airports at this time. Capital City, somewhere last October you closed the main instrument approach runway, 8/26 for an overlay toping and also for, I

You would have to

t

think they renewed the lighting system at that time.

MR. BRYAN: Yes, and the drainage.

_

•

participate.

. .

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Summer of '83, 8/26, it was closed for a \$2 million capital improvement program. By November, the engineering studies determined serious sinkhole problems. The runway is still closed. That's better than that year. Is there a master plan for the Capital City Airport? As I know it, the federal government requires for others -- I don't know if they do it for the state -- receive federal monies that you probably would receive for that

Is there, in fact, a master plan?

submit a master plan on a regular basis in order to

overlay from the Federal ADAPT Program.

MR. BRYAN: Yes, there is, and there was at that time. It was revised during the course of the last year, as a matter of fact, to provide for clearance of property for a T-hangar and corporate hangar development. It is only recently, as a matter of fact, revised to reflect our latest thinking.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's an ongoing situation, the revisions thereof. I have been on the authority of Doylestown and we constantly have to update that almost every couple of years. We have to tell the federal government what we project in the future as the projects we see coming and needs in the future.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. BRYAN: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Does that master plan -- I tried to get a copy, but nobody seemed to have one.

We'll get a copy of it for you. MR. BRYAN: Actually, the plan is really embodied in one document which is called the Airport Layout Plan. There is some documentation.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You have two engineers, one from Virginia and one from Pennsylvania that serve as -- I think Wilbur Smith volunteered from Virginia and Geo-Technical Services in Harrisburg, if that information is correct. It's not very, very important, but you had two engineers.

I find and I just got to be a little facetious, the phone book for the Capitol has a page full of highway engineers that are allegedly great at taking care of 45,000 miles of blacktop. It behooves me as to why we didn't understand and know that there were those sinkholes and those problems at Capital City Airport. I have got to go through the chronology for the benefit of the rest of the members of the committee.

They closed this runway last August and discovered two months later that they had these sinkholes and then decided it was going to cost seven and a half million, or something thereabouts, to improve and fix the sinkholes. Somewhere in the middle of the summer -- it's a two-page chronology on this runway. In June, I think, they announced the terms of the t

they really don't have to spend that 7.7 million but go back to the original plan and that is what they have done, is do the overlays as proposed August a year ago.

I find that very confusing to have all these engineers say that we are going to repair some overlays;

November it's going to cost 7.7 million and suddenly after you sit on it for six months, it isn't going to do anything but go back to the original at 1.2 million.

MR. BRYAN: Let me try to clear away the confusion. First, let me say we have not returned to the original plan. We are doing something that is essentially the original plan, but it is modified in some important ways.

We did know that there were sinkholes at this airport. The airport has been in operation for many years, and sinkholes have been an annual and continuing problem at the airport. They have been dealt with on a maintenance basis; and by that I mean, when one occurs, we simply fill it with whatever material it takes to fill it, and then make repairs on the surface. It was regarded as a nuisance maintenance activity.

Low and behold, when we began our reconstruction program that involved replacing the old drainage system, the runway lighting and repaving the runways, the contractors began their work on the sewer replacement system first. As they were digging up the old sewage system, and it was found

to be collapsed and generally, no longer functioning, they uncovered not just sinkholes of a maintenance, nuisance nature, but they uncovered large voids under the runway that we did not have knowledge of until that work began.

As they went further with their work of replacing the drainage system, we ran into more and more of these very large voids -- some of them approaching close to the surface and suggesting that we could be threatened with eminant collapse of parts of the runway system.

Then we hired the engineers that Represntative Wilson made reference to, to look at this pointed problem of the extent of the sinkhole problem underneath of the airport, which had never been investigated totally before. They did that and they told us that we didn't have just a surface nuisance problem, but we, in fact, had a piece of real estate that was seriously undermined by an extensive system of sinkholes in some cases with large voids involved.

There were actually two testings conducted. One was a radar system as I recall, and another was an electrostatic sort of testing system. These produced maps, if you will, of what it looked like underneath.

Based on that information, we asked our engineers to tell us whether we should continue to proceed with the resurfacing of the runway as originally planned, or whether some additional action was needed.

It was at that point that they recommended that we change our plan and proceed to a structural runway repair, not just a resurfacing with asphalt over the old asphalt runway. But actually, that we go in with structural concrete sections over the voids --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: When was that? In a point of time, when was that decision made?

MR. BRYAN: That was part of the investigations of late summer and fall a year ago, and that was when the \$7 million estimate was produced.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Wait a minute. I missed the chronology in time. The summer of '83 you closed the runway for the \$2 million capital improvement project. We have been down to Mr. Raup's office and that chronology you filed with him to get federal funds. For lighting and drainage, now you tell us that at that time you also knew about the sinkholes and had a plan to do something? What summer are you talking about?

MR. BRYAN: That summer. The work began, as you indicated, the work began during the late summer and fall of last year.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Right.

MR. BRYAN: And when that work began, we uncoverd sinkholes that were more extensive than were contemplated.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Everything is fine up to

there, Don, but at that point you just said something about knowing in the summer of '83, you hired engineers in essence. I don't think that rhythms with the chronology. That's this summer.

MR. BRYAN: No. The engineers had been retrained to design the work that was underway. We were proceeding based on that work. But when the contractor got on the site and started the work, what he discovered were sinkholes more extensive than what the engineers had thought were there. We then went back to our engineers and asked them, "Well, what do we do now?" They responded, suggesting that we modify the project, doing one of a couple of things. Actually, they outlined several options.

One of them was a total structural runway, as I recall, of \$13 million or so, which was just rejected out of hand.

The other was replacing major sections of the runway that were threatened by these large sinkholes at the cost of seven and a half million dollars as you mentioned.

We went to the FAA and asked whether or not they would be willing to participate in a project modified to that extent. Frankly, they said no, they would not.

We continued to work with engineers and others on finding solutions to the sinkholes that would be long-term solutions. We explored using flyash and other various

modified techniques.

In the end, what we came down to was modifying the original project basically, in the following way: reducing the amount of asphalt overlay that is to be placed and, indeed, is now being placed on the runway and using some of the cost savings of the reduced paving material and putting that into repair of the sinkholes.

So, what's happened over this last summer is that we have plugged the large sinkholes as we found them, using a combination of techniques of gabions, and concrete and flyash and a whole host of things, and are now finally repaving the runway with an overlay that is at the original thickness in the center through the main part of the runway that is normally used, and then feathers out to a thinner paving on the edge. The material that was saved through that modification and the cost of that material is what we used to deal with the sinkholes.

We had a great deal of difficulty, let me say, in obtaining successful test results from the paving contractor for the density and compaction on the runway repaving itself. That finally was achieved only a week ago, and they are now, actually as we talk, completing the paving of the runway. We expect that to be done, weather permitting -- that is, having no serious rain -- over the next several days, the runway would then be lined; and next week grooved thereafter, and we

expect to have it opened in the next two weeks, finally.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I suppose one thing has to strike at this point. You have an enginner, Francis Strouse, is your Resident Engineer on airports?

MR. BRYAN: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: He's qualified and capable to determine sinkhole depths, sizes, problems, capacities, underlays of runways, highways, or whatever?

MR. BRYAN: No, he's not. He does not have either the technical equipment available to do that, or I would say the specialized knowledge which is why we retained the engineers we mentioned.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You knew the sinkholes were there, but not to their size?

MR. BRYAN: Not to the extent.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: But they didn't indicate any problem to you because they were there before?

MR. BRYAN: They had always been a problem but it was a problem that was dealt with as a maintenance matter; one opened, you plugged it.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Doesn't it strike you-maybe it doesn't--that running some 14 months to solve a
problem is not quite in line? I mean, if one of my
constituents called me in August of '83 and I didn't solve
their problem till November of '84, I think they would be at

the polls next week voting for the other guy.

MR. BRYAN: I'm not happy with the amount of time that has been involved here, but I must say the time to some extent was needed because there has been a wrestling match of opinion.

I would still prefer, I would still prefer to have secured federal funding for structural replacement of some sections of the runway. What we have now with the project as we have, I would say, been forced to complete it, is a repaved runway but there has been no structural dressing of the sinkhole problem beneath it. I expect in the years ahead we will continue to be plagued by this recurring problem. I don't like that. I would rather have, while we have the runway closed, fix this structurally and then not have to deal with it again; but the FAA, and I respect their decision, after a lot of discussion, did not wish to participate in a larger project.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Part of the problem there, as I see it is, that you have, and perhaps with the committee's interest, you have some very large businesses that base their aircraft there. Businesses that I listened to the Governor tell us that we need more of. We have AMP and HARSCO and other people like that. Rite-Aid who will not open a facility 30 miles or more farther from an airport with a paved runway at its approach.

The indecision by the department, I think has led to an awful lot of unrest. I understand HARSCO may move to Lancaster Airport, which would be a problem. AMP who has justs put several million dollars in their facility, two jets, six King Air Turbo Jets, and so forth at that facility has caused extreme problems.

I have got to say that I must ciritoize, I guess, the management or the lack thereof. I can remember during the time this year when 8 and 26 was closed, calling flight service at 8:00 one morning to get the weather for the day to see if I had problems going home flying, and they said, "Didn't you know that at 9:00 the other runway is going to be closed?" I said "When were you told that?" "5:00 the day before."

I would think anybody that's going to use their equipment, AMP and HARSCO and all those people over there, would certainly be out of sorts to walk out to the airport and not to have found out at least a day ahead of time that they are going to close the airport.

Mr. Williams, do you know a John Williams, a local attorney developer?

MR. BRYAN: I have met him, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I would like to quote what he said: "Seeming lack of interest in developing Capital City Airport, result of bureaucratic incompetence at the

operational level," charged that the sinkhole issue is, "smoke screen and merely reflects the lack of attention of PennDOT to the airport over the years," and suggested by others they want all of the heavy equipment moved to HIA and do away with Capital City.

I can't sustain that I think you want to get rid of the airport. No, I don't really believe that, but the ongoing problems and lack of good management I suspect is all I can say; to say that 14 months to solve a problem and it still isn't really resolved. You have not done anything with the understructure to solve that difficulty.

MR. BRYAN: That's right. It is a matter of geology, and the proper solution is to address it with a structural replacement of the runway. We sought that, it's very costly. It required federal participation; that was denied. Those discussions took a long time with an exchange of a lot of engineering information.

Let me comment on some of the other things said because I, frankly, don't agree with some of them, certainly as they are stated.

There was no indecision. We have moved directly in all cases to get federal assistance or retain professional help whenever we have been confronted with the problems. So far as the corporations affected are concerned, they have been hurt and we are very sensitive to that because our airport

Q

revenues to some extent rely on their successful operations. We have wanted to restore that runway operation as soon as possible. We have in all cases proceeded to get whatever assistance, technical or financial, that was necessary to do that.

As to some of the moving, yes, AMP is moving to Harrisburg International because they have become engaged in jet aircraft operations as I'm sure you know, Representative Wilson, density altitude considerations, hot air and high temperature operations during the summer preclude the operation of jet aircraft out of Capital City Airport-precluded absolutely because of the limited runway lift.

Rite-Aid has had a similar problem because they have engaged in jet operations. So, those airlines because of their use of jet aircraft, have made decisions to relocate to Harrisburg International Airport where the runway is simply twice as long as it is at Capital City.

I foresee that kind of a phenomenon continuing with any of the corporations that become engaged in jet aircraft operations. Capital City Airport's runway is too short regardless of its physical condition to accommodate jet aircraft operations around the year. These corporations must be assured of operating around the year regardless of the heat of summer.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Don, I respectfully debate

with you the density altitude of a jet aircraft not being able to handle that in the summer. It just depends on the type of jet aircraft. I don't know what they have bought out here, some of them yes, some of them, no.

I think the problem, though, is that we talked yesterday about managing your real estate, about enhancing your revenue source. Certainly, it's like an apartment house that has a bad reputation; that has problems with their heat not being turned on; has problems with the electric; has problems with the snow not being removed; tenants don't come. Those that leave don't come back. They don't talk well of your operation which doesn't lend itself to you getting more tenants to offset your indebtedness. That is the problem.

MR. BRYAN: If you want to continue with comparison of an apartment building, I believe if you have an apartment building and it remains in disrepair, and you let it remain in disrepair you are not going to do very well in attracting tenants. The position we have taken, frankly, the apartment building in this case, the airport was in disrepair. We made conscious decisions to modernize it, to in this case, engage in a \$2 million modification program of the main runway and we set about that expeditiously. We encountered serious problems of geology.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: There is where we disagree, the expeditiously expression you just used. I don't think

that anybody feels it was expeditious. Now, I don't want to go through the chronology here and delay this that much longer, but there were statements made by you to the press that maybe we should close the airport during this 14 months. That doesn't lend itself well to good decision and good management as I see it.

AMP, you talked about AMP, announcing they moved to Capital City because of jet operations. Let me quote you to Harrisburg International, June '84, "AMP announced to move from Capital City to Harrisburg City International" due to "dissatisfaction with maintenance"; not a word about jet operation. "It does not feel PennDOT has given adequate assurances that future maintenance would be at the level that is adequate to the type of flight operations that we have."

That's in the <u>Patriot</u> by Merrill Yohe of AMP. That's what they stated. They didn't say anything about jet operations. They blamed it on your maintenance.

Anyhow, that's where I think we differ a little bit.

MR. BRYAN: If you could or anyone could point out how the decisionmaking process here with the FAA could have been expedited, I would be pleased to know of it, and use that better process the next time we are confronted with this type of problem. But, I do not believe that there was any laxness here. We moved as quickly as we could. It just required that much time to arrive at a decision in cooperation with the FAA

as to what kind of a project they would cooperate in.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Did you ever contact the FAA as far as the instrument approach to the runway? I have to explain this, I guess, to the committee. The runway that is closed is the instrument runway, the only instrument approach to Capital City Airport. In order to come in and find the weather like today, and make an approach to this particular closed runway, and then at the last minute when you finally see that runway, you circle over Beacon Hill and slide into the runway that's opened. It's a very nice experience. You ought to ride with me some day when we make that approach.

But, I wondered, have you and Mr. Hamacher ever contacted the FAA to reinstigate the instrument approach that did exist to runway 12, the runway that is still opened? There was an instrument approach that was cancelled some years ago. That could have been reinstigated to assist and alleviate that.

MR. BRYAN: I can't say what exists in terms of documentation, but I can say that has been a subject of conversation. I have discussed it with Mr. Walsh.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Oh, no. Mr. Walsh does not -You have to go to Long Island, in case you didn't know it, as
far as instrument approach. Walsh is real estate and
construction. It takes no equipment to reinstigate that
instrument approach. It's what's known as PR approach. That

y

equipment is in existence. I just wondered, has anybody -Mr. Hamacher would be the person to do that, would he not?

MR. BRYAN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: He's not here so you are the one Mr. Larson said would answer the questions.

MR. BRYAN: That's right. I'm indicating, to my knowledge, that subject has been discussed with the FAA, and I at least on one occasion, discussed it with Mr. Walsh. I don't know what documentation exists on it. I'm sorry, Representative, I can't tell you precisely what Mr. Hamacher has done.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I'm just curious, to alleviate the problem it would seem, if you have, as you say, a time table that that runway is closed, you could go to some other means to make safety one of the issues that I would think would be of interest to the management of the airports—safety.

MR. BRYAN: Let me say that I was left with the impression with my discussion with Mr. Walsh that his understanding of the situation was that reestablishing that other instrument approach was someting that was not desirable from an operating point of view because of conflicts with Harrisburg International. But, beyond that, I cannot --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I have got to repeat, Mr. Walsh does not make that decision. He has nothing to do with

it at all. That is done in Long Island. I can give you the person's name; it is my file, but it is not Mr. Walsh.

MR. BRYAN: Let me say on instrument approaches, and this also bears on corporate operations, and I think Representative Wilson you would agree, the instrument approach to the main instrument runway at Capital City Airport is nonstandard; that is, there's a hill involved in one of the directions. So, in using that main runway with instruments on it, you have to make, let's call it a steeper approach into the airport which is troublesome.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: How many degrees is that slope, do you know?

MR. BRYAN: I don't recall, offhand.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It's not that much steeper.

MR. BRYAN: It is nonstandard.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: The nonstandard part of it, Don, is what they call the minimum descent altitude which is higher. It's 658 feet above the ground versus 258 feet above the ground at HIA. That is simply because of that hill that is out there.

If you drove out the turnpike exit and the west exist to the turnpike, it's right over that point that he's talking about. That's the hill you have to come over and sort of slide down to get down to the airport runway.

MR. BRYAN: My point was, what that results is, you

have to make a decision to continue in to land or to not at a higher altitude. When conditions are poor, the result is, it's harder to get into Capital City than it is into Harrisburg International. That's another factor, I believe, bearing on some of the corporations moving because you can get into Harrisburg International in poor weather when you can't get into Capital City.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I would agree with you on that. There's not much you can do about that except take the hill down.

Moving on, I noted in your makeup of your staff and everything, you have a section that is called "Property Management Division". I would assume that is under Mr. Hamacher. How long have you had that? What are their responsibilities and what are their talents, and so forth?

MR. BRYAN: The state-owned airports has a subgroup within the Bureau of Aviation, are subdivided into Harrisburg International. Capital City, which has a small group of seven people involved, and one other person our man in the White House as I refer to him up at Mid-State Airport taking care of that mothball facility, which is being transferred out of our jurisdiction, unfortunately.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Can we transfer the guy too?

MR. BRYAN: Yes; as a matter of fact, we will.

Harrisburg International itself, which does have some 62

people or so on the staff down there, has within it an administrative unit. Within that administrative unit it takes care of payroll and paying the bills and the like. There are some people concerned with property management.

Actually, there is one person concerned on a fulltime basis with property management; that is, working with the tenants, the prospective tenants, handling rents, utilities and maintaining relationships there.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: The job would be similar, and were they there when you had the Project Management Company?

MR. BRYAN: They were there, and we had an arrangement with the private management company, whereby they maintained a specified list of properties in our industrial park. We continued to maintain property relations with the airlines and the airport users directly because of some of the additional complications involved, federal rules and securities and restrictions on the airport.

During that period of time, we continued to have our property manager on staff.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: What is their talent? What's their background? Pilot, aviation specialist, real estate specialist?

MR. BRYAN: The background is one of business, clerical and knowledge of real estate.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: They had that before they

came with you?

MR. BRYAN: I can't say in the case of the previous person.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You are answering for Mr. Hamacher. I remind you, you wouldn't let him come and I would like those answers.

MR. BRYAN: I understand. I can't say for the previous occupant of that job.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Let me apologize. You did not say he couldn't come. The Secretary said that. I apologize to you, sir.

MR. BRYAN: Frankly, in this case, I cannot tell you.

I'd have to look at the resume of the person in the present

job. I can do that and I can provide that information.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I think it has bearing on our case, so to speak, and I think it makes sense, if I may comment, to have somebody with expertise that would handle real estate. You have enough of it, and certainly, I would look to somebody that came from the real estate field that had experience in managing properties, knows the market in the Harrisburg area, completely. I think it would be an asset.

MR. BRYAN: Let me say I think it the important thing really here in the whole airport is the bottom-line total performance we're approaching it as a business, and our real estate operation is one that I would characterize as

successful. We have filled up our vacant properties down there. Our level of collection of monies is better than it used to be. Our revenues in total terms are up. Whatever the credentials of those people are, I would say they have done and are doing a very good job.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: On-the-job training.

Did you order, or did Mr. Hamacher order that \$75,000 automated management system that prevailed that we no longer have?

MR. BRYAN: That was ordered by the Director of the Bureau at that time.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: He made that decision without your input at all?

MR. BRYAN: He made that decision with my concurrence, but he concerned himself personally with the design of that system. It was one of the things --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You approved it?

MR. BRYAN: Yes, I did. Probably, I can't say specifically, but generally I sign the orders for such procurements. Probably, if we go back on the records, I probably signed the order for that procurement.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I had a question for Mr. Hamacher that I know you can answer. You acquired a military surplus helicopter in '79. The papers that were put forth as to utilization of that airport were mission in support of

1 2 3 n t t 5

Commonwealth's emergency operations, civil defense; mission in support of Department Environmental Resources, to include nuclear radiation, monitoring, landfill and compliance, and the Commonwealth's support administrative logistical and manmade and God-made disasters. The paperwork shows that Mr. Hamacher was the person responsible for that helicopter. I believe you can briefly tell me why he was made responsible for that helicopter. Maybe, you can tell me why that helicopter was never used for any of those purposes so stated on there.

As a matter of fact, it was used in helicopter training and recertification of the helicopter pilot you had. Maybe you can tell me why a helicopter that is incapable of IFR or instrument-condition flight was so equipped at the cost of \$11,000 to make it capable for outdoor flight that it could not do, if in fact, you had instrumentation for it. It was only used 13.9 hours in '81, and 10 hours in '82 for any state-related purposes.

Did you, in fact, sign off on that too?

MR. BRYAN: I probably did. Let me answer your question. Mr. Hamacher at that time was an aviation specialist in the statewide program section of the Bureau. He was not at that time involved in responsibility for state-owned airports. It was for that reason that he was involved in the procurement. We did procure that aircraft surplus, I

guess is probably the right term, from the federal government at no cost to us. It was secured for the purposes --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That is not a entirely true statement.

MR. BRYAN: -- at no cost from the federal government. We then invested 11,000. Actually, I think we invested finally some \$14,000, or so, of avionics to equip the aircraft to make it suitable for civilian use.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's almost \$2,000 for a little cart so you could haul it in and out of the hangar.

MR. BRYAN: Yes, there was a cart. That's true.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Three or four thousand dollars you paid for that.

MR. BRYAN: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Two thousand.

MR. BRYAN: Two thousand?

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Yes, you did pay for it. You didn't get it free.

MR. BRYAN: I stand corrected. All right, \$2,000, and another eleven or so and the money for the cart. So we did have some expenses involved, no doubt about it.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Don, the instrumentation that was put in was an ILS and things of that nature. ILS is instrument landing system device that that aircraft is prohibited from doing. Is that prudent?

MR. BRYAN: It's prudent to the extent that you or I flying in VFR visual conditions, as we might from time to time, might also have instruments on as a guide and as an aid to our flight, although we are not strictly flying under blind instrument conditions. I may be able to see perfectly clearly --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: If I'm going to spend my money to buy something that I cannot use, that's my money. But if you spend the state's money to buy something you cannot use, it's like the wrenches I hear about in Washington. This is the thread of this whole thing is what has been going on is the lack of management as I see it.

MR. BRYAN: The question is about the prudence. I would say that it is prudent, and probably you and I or any other pilot flying under visual conditions uses electronic nav-aids just as a check on where we are. I would say it's prudent from that point of view.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: ILS is not an instrument that is used to check on your position. It's an instrument used to make that descent into Capital City Airport down over that little hill which you cannot legally do. It doesn't check position.

MR. BRYAN: Yes. I understand. It could be of assistance in making approaches in marginal weather.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Do you recommend that your

pilots in that helicopter so make an instrument approach in an illegal helicopter with public personnel on board? I would be careful.

MR. BRYAN: No, but if they were caught out in deteriorating weather conditions, which we have all had happen to us from time to time, any of the aids that we might have on board would be welcomed.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: And a helicopter can do what I can't do? He can park along side of the roadway.

MR. BRYAN: Well, Representative Wilson, we, I guess, we'll agree to disagree on whether the aids would be prudent.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Small item, true.

MR. BRYAN: But, to the basic issue of why the helicopter at all, we buy it for the reasons stated, and we did have expectation that it would be used by the state agencies.

As it developed, it was used very little, very little; and after we determined that it was, in fact, used very little and we had few prospects for it being used, we made plans to get rid of it; but not just to get rid of it. We traded it and we got federal permission to trade it in on a new aircraft that we bought for general use. As I recall, on the trade-in, I belive we got 30,000 or some more than \$30,000 in credit. So, I would say from a purely business point of view --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Something better than that, 50,000.

MR. BRYAN: -- from a purely business point of view, something we bought and invested--what do you want to say--15 or maybe 20 thousand dollars in. In the end we got more than that for it on a trade-in. I would say it was an outstanding piece of business management.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Maybe, you ought do more.

MR. BRYAN: If I could predict that outcome in other cases. I would.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Let me go, and this may be a little boring, but I spent last evening reading the internal audit, I guess it was -- No, this was an Operations Review Group Report from James Scheiner, Deputy Secretary for Adminstration, to you as Deputy Secretary for Local and Area Transportation.

This was conducted November 26, 1979. You took office, when, in '78?

MR. BRYAN: No, in May of '79.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I thought the review was good. I thought the effort was excellent. I just highlighted a few lines I think I must read. On page 1, it says, "In general, the audit reveals that the Bureau of Aviation is operating without defined objectives, priorities, or policy. This condition is attributed to the needs of the Division of

the Aeronautical Code, the need to develop adequate rules and regulations, the need to define the Bureau's objectives, and implement the same with policy and procedures to control the Bureau's activities."

Page 2, I underlined the statement here, where this is, I think from the Bureau Director in answer to Mr.

Scheiner's allegations: "The Bureau Director has been with the Bureau since early October and has formed independent opinions of functional areas. The Director's opinions of the Bureau coincide with those of the report and are generally more critical."

Page 2 calls for the bottom line there, "The Bureau is emphasizing management-by-objectives as a technique and actively engaged in writing a Poilcy and Procedures Manual." Is that in existence?

MR. BRYAN: Yes, it is.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: What does it cover?

MR. BRYAN: It covers all of the statewide programs. As a matter of fact, I have a copy of it with me.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You mean the engineering programs?

MR. BRYAN: No, the licensing, inspection of airports.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Everything you do, including the operation of aircraft?

MR. BRYAN: There is a Flight Operations Manual for that, too. As a matter of fact, I have a copy of that with me. I'll be glad to give that to you.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's what you handed me?

MR. BRYAN: I gave you a copy of the Flight

Operations Manual. I also have with me a copy of these policy and procedures.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: How about airport management? Is that in there, too?

MR. BRYAN: No, that is not in that group.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You never had a written policy on that?

MR. BRYAN: Not entirely, no. That is still being developed in sections.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: You only have two more years?

Are you going to have it done by then?

MR. BRYAN: But continue. This was an important document and made many recommendations and were the basis of actions we took.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Page 4, Mr. Scheiner suggested under "Property Management: The Department formulate written leasing policy and that the Bureau of Aviation establish written pocedures to implement such." Do you have those?

MR. BRYAN: What was it?

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: R-8, under "Property Management and Leasing." It's the subject we talked about with the problems that everybody has been critical of.

MR. BRYAN: The key issue here really was the standard leases.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Wait a minute. That's not what he said. I repeat, "The Department formulate written leasing policy and that the Bureau of Aviation establish written procedures to implement such."

Do we have it?

MR. BRYAN: No, we do not have written procedures, but in a deeper sense --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It's an internal criticism; not Ben Wilson now.

MR. BRYAN: I regard this as internal cooperation.

Mr. Scheiner and I cooperated, as a matter of fact, on this effort. One of the problems that existed back in those days with regard to property management was leases were compiled willy-nilly as they were needed. We developed standardized leases.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Because your report of '84 does not indicate that.

MR. BRYAN: No, that's what I'm leading to.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Page 7, if you would,

"Airport Leasing." It says here, "An airport leasing Policy

1 2 3

and Procedures chapter is being developed based on information gained from a detailed rental analysis being conducted by the Bureau. This detailed analysis is being hampered by the Bureau's lack of access to information at HIA, but when the reorganization is approved, access will improve."

Do we have that?

MR. BRYAN: Yes. I can call on individual leases and I can get information that I need, and indeed, anyone else can. I believe you have your own staff, as a matter of fact, on the airport --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Oh, yes.

MR. BRYAN: -- gathering information on these.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Page 8, A14: "A budget year 80-81 request has been made for another light aircraft for airport inspections. Also, the Bureau has requested a surplus helicopter" -- we just discussed that -- "for use in inspecting the 200 plus helipads..." You didn't say that in your request form, by the way. "...in the State, and for other advantageous programs. Additionally, the present light aircraft is being utilized, not only for airport inspections, but also by airport engineers for contract administration."

We found yesterday in the use of utilization of aircraft that that's not true. The 3.4 hours per month on any one aircraft doesn't seem to be utilization.

MR. BRYAN: We did acquire not only one, but as a

matter of fact, two additional light aircraft.

You are correct. Utilization has been disappointing to us. It has been improving, but it has been disappointing.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Do you have any plans to get rid of any of those aircraft? You have got three of them.

MR. BRYAN: Well, we are considering disposing of the two that we bought because, among the many problems with them, one of them and one of the serious problems was, AD's Air Directives, with regard to that particular type of aircraft.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Who made the decision to buy that particular type of aircraft?

MR. BRYAN: I made the decision. It was a bid proposition and the low bid as it came in happened to be those two aircraft. That happened to also be Piper, and we were interested in supporting the Pennsylvania corporation. So, being the best price and the home team, as you say, we procured them. Unhappily, I must state, that they have been troublesome aircraft. We are considering --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: What troubles are you having, just AD's?

MR. BRYAN: Well, the AD's have been a very serious problem and I believe, again, the pilot of that particular aircraft has an unhappy record.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Underutilization might be part of the problem. It's like anything; if your cylinders

 aren't being turned over regularly, they tend to pit and rust and things of that nature.

MR. BRYAN: Yes, although the problems have had more to do with the tails and wings.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: The next page after that, page 8. It might be page 9. There's numbers 1, 2 and 3 at the bottom of the page. It speaks to, "The Department has never defined the Bureau's objectives or implemented policy and procedure to control the Bureau's activities, and has not treated the Bureau as an integral part of the transportation system or organization."

MR. BRYAN: That's true, and I think we probably would agree that the Code needed revised as stated there, and these things have been done.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It is now an integral part of the transportation system?

MR. BRYAN: Yes, it is, physically and structurally and in every way that I can describe.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I think it's page 6 of that group, or whatever is at the bottom. This section, as I read it last night, and as I read your Comptroller's report here of February, something like that, 1984, seems to say the same thing.

It says here: "Review of leasing activity at Harrisburg International Airport and Capital City Airport

Leased on a basis

revealed serious deficiencies..." -- this is 1975, or 9 -- "...in the administration of the leasing function; deficiencies noted at HIA, leases that expired and were now running month to month; property being occupied before a lease was executed; lack of control over property leased, no plot 5 plans, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. making it impossible to collect rental." There's a whole page 7

terminated."

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of all these faders at that plant. In your preliminary report in 1984, five years later, regards to defining needs for property management policies and procedures. "Mr. Hamsher and Mr. Cross agreed there's a need for written policy and procedures to effectively manage the property. He also discussed the Property Management Agreement with Pennsylvania Commercial Properties stating it did not alleviate HIA from much work. We recommended a contract be

That seems to be a regeneration of the same dissertation that we heard five years ago. I don't want to bore everybody here with the duplicates that I found in both of these reports that indicate that you're looking at the same You're looking at leases month to month. You are looking at people that haven't paid. You are looking at leases that don't describe the property. You are looking at U S Air being in a hangar, they didn't even know they were there for two years. They have no contract. You call that,

in fact, good management?

MR. BRYAN: Yes. Let me deal with the U S Air matter and back up into the other things that you have dealt with her.

U S Air had need immediately back in '81, I guess it was, for some space to repair some of their tugs. We had space down in our Building 30. They asked to move in and use that space and we gave them permission to do that back at that time. Let me, if I can find my page here.

It's customary when someone comes to us and says I have immediate need, if we have property available, we will say do it. You will agree you pay the rate whatever it is; they say yes, more or less, but get in there, we need it.

Now, remember, we are talking about U S Air about a major airline, the major airline serving our airport. They needed space in June of '81. We said it's available, move in. We prepared a lease, yes, after the fact.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Two years?

MR. BRYAN: No. A week or so later, sent that to them. In July, according to our correspondence, U S Air responded and said we welcome a short-term lease, because we understood the issue to be short-term. They responded to us in July of '81 asking for a five-year lease, and beginning then one month after they occupied it, which I think was prudent and good and helpful and constructive, one month after

they occupied it, we began a discussion of the terms of the lease. That discussion went on until, not just '83, let me tell you, it went on until this summer.

Finally, when they renewed all of their leases with us this summer, they signed that lease. They did start paying rent in May of '83. We finally reached --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: And they were there -MR. BRYAN: They were there almost two years.
REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's what I am saying.
MR. BRYAN: That's right.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: They were not billed for rent for two years, any rent?

MR. BRYAN: That's not my understanding.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's what Mr. Grover McLaughlin says.

MR. BRYAN: My understanding is they made no payments during that period, but they did begin to make --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: They were not billed for rent until May of '83.

MR. BRYAN: They weren't billed, but they weren't billed because we didn't have a lease agreed upon as a basis for the billing. But, as I understand in May of '83, they did begin paying the agreed-upon rents.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Don, I just can't sit here and let you tell me and this committee that that is prudent

and good management to say, here you are, U S Air, go ahead; take this building and then two years later, get around to sending them a bill for anything. You call that good prudent management?

MR. BRYAN: Let me ask --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: This is your original critique where Mr. Scheiner said the same thing. I think therein lies the problem. You seem to think that is good business.

MR. BRYAN: I am saying that in the operation of an airport or any large business or shopping center, for that matter, there are going to be instances where you have tenants on the property, certainly your major tenants, where they have additional property requirements. If property is available, you can arrive at an agreement there for them to use that property; certainly, if it's an immediate need, and then you follow that up with actions.

What you have here is a record of a follow-up action that resulted in a dispute. I don't deny that. It has taken a long time to resolve it. We have had a number of instances with tenants down there where we have had disputes of long-standing.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: If that tenant of longstanding is going to dispute with you for your gratitious attitude, you are letting him use that building free for two years, the next time they come to you and ask you for a favor, are you going to turn the other cheek?

MR. BRYAN: No.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Then I would suggest you need a written policy. You need a written philosophy that says no. If you want to occupy our property, you have a contract before you get in. I can't believe, and I've been in the real estate business for 28 years, that I could see anybody say to anybody that you could stay there for two years without coming up with a firm contract, without paying something. That is an agreement.

I understand your generosity of saying to U S Air, yeah, you want to run your tugs down there for a couple of days to fix them out of the rain, I have no problem with that. I understand that; you do that. But, you certainly don't let somebody there for two years without a contract, without any payment, and then end up in disagreement. I can't believe that you believe that is good and prudent management.

MR. BRYAN: That is not the issue, sir. The issue is, when a tenant comes to you and has an immediate need, you can do one of two things. You can say, you can use the property now and we will work it out as soon as we can; or you can say to them, and this would be a policy that would be possible, and I take it from your remarks, it is one that is being suggested. I say to them, no, until we have fully

processed the lease through state government and have it signed, you cannot use that property.

Now, sir, if we take that position, I can tell you that the mechanics of processing the lease from scratch through state government, hand-carried, is at least two weeks. If we adopt such a policy, we cannot respond immediately, or even reasonably to the needs of our tenants. I don't think we can run an airport like that.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Two weeks, two years, big difference.

MR. BRYAN: No. What happened here is, once you let them in the property, if a dispute arises, you have a situation that can drag on. Indeed, in this case, it did drag on.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I'm not going to go back into Mr. McLaughlin's comments, but in there, in 1975 and 1984, they also stated that as good prudent management, you should have an inventory of the facilities and their value. I can tell you, I rent properties. If somebody came into me very quickly and said, listen, I want to use that room in the back; I can give you a number, I could sign a paper right there on the spot and say it's going to be \$285 a week, a month, or whatever. If you want to get in there for a couple of days, we'll prorate it. I can do it immediately. I don't have to sit down and figure it out. I know every property under my

management and I know the square foot cost to rent it. I know what I'm going to get on this market today, and I think that's good prudent management that I don't see in any of your airports. You don't know what you have. You don't know, and both of your internal groups have said, you need a written policy. You don't have it. You don't have an inventory.

MR. BRYAN: As far as the rates are concerned, we do have them. I have copies of them here and I'll be glad to supply you with them.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Then in that case, if U S Air came to you and said, I need that warehouse, warehouse space at HIA, Gettysburg, \$1.85 cold a square foot, how many square foot do you want?

MR. BRYAN: That's right, and that's what happened here, but then they returned --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Two years later?

MR. BRYAN: No, they returned a month later and said we don't want a month-to-month arrangement; we want a five-year lease. This was in a building that under our plans is scheduled ultimately for demolition. I did not at that time nor do I now want to enter into a five-year lease with anybody in that building. Now, we got into an argument that lasted many years over that. That's obvious.

Again, the issue here is, whether we are going to have a very hard policy regarding occupany prior to lease or

not.

I do not think, in any reasonable sense of the word, for a major tenant on a state-owned airport that for us to deny them immediate use of some small available piece of property because we don't have a fully executed written lease in place is good management.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I have no problem with that, but I would have a rate that I could state to them immediately.

MR. BRYAN: I have that, and we have had that, and we had that at that time. It was not a matter of a rate. In this case the dispute had to do with the term of the lease. They wanted long-term and we didn't want to give them a long-term lease.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's not Building 30. This speaks to Building 30, not the terminal. Is Building 30 the terminal?

MR. BRYAN: No, Building 30 is a warehouse; the warehouse space down --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That has nothing to do with the argument over the terminal. You said the terminal.

MR. BRYAN: No, no, the term of the lease. The argument is over the term. They wanted a five-year lease and we did not want to give them a five-year lease.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Just tell them to get out.

MR. BRYAN: I guess I have to react and say I am not

4 5

.

 going to tell U S Air, our major airline at HIA, that because we were having an argument to get out of that building or pack up. No, we can't run an airport like that; we can't do that. I don't think that's right.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: If Braniff folded, you would have been stuck with the bill if U S Air went under, wouldn't you?

MR. BRYAN: We're not talking about all of -REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That would have been another
one of those \$536,000 writeoffs?

MR. BRYAN: Representative Wilson, we are talking about a small piece of space in a warehouse where they are repairing tugs. We are not talking with a major contract with the terminal.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: It just seems that it's not each one of these items as being small. If I take and pile all of the small items together, you have one huge mismanaged property.

MR. BRYAN: I don't agree at all. That property is now making a half a million dollars a year when it used to be losing a million. I do not regard that basic bottom line as mismanagement. That airport's management is a tremendous financial success, and that is the bottom line, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's terrific. If I got a property to manage and it took me six years to make it

profitable, I would have been fired four years ago.

MR. BRYAN: Sir, if you have any properties losing a million dollars and you think you can get them out of that hole, in a month or two months, my hat is off to you.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: No, I don't take a month or two months.

Anyhow, in the report in '79, page 7, it says here that there's, "Only one regulation affecting the leasing of property of state airports; this is Title 67, Chapter 103 of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation Regulation which establishes the requirements for a written agreement between the Department of Transportation, and any entity wanting to lease land and/or building space or to sell goods or provide service at Harrisburg International Airport."

Obviously, you were in violation of the law when you occupied Building 30.

MR. BRYAN: Admitted. Again, I suggest that literal pursuit of that makes it impossible to effectively run an airport or practically any business.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: And you should have suggested an amendment to that title. Wouldn't that have been the way to go?

That's your own internal regulation. That's not something we in the legislature did. This is your regulation.

MR. BRYAN: Let me say further that I'll consult my

counsel first to see whether, literally, we are in violation of that, because certainly an agreement, verbal exchange of letters, I believe, constitutes some form of an agreement; although, I'll not attempt to characterize the form of it now.

Although, I will admit that we are not in compliance to the extent there was not -- what's the language -- it says for a written agreement. Well, I don't know; maybe I'll back off a bit. There usually is an exchange of correspondence, and I'll grant it it's an exchange of correspondence that discusses terms.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Try that in court.

MR. BRYAN: It is unclear as to whether we are in full compliance, but I don't apologize for that.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Is Mr. Hamacher living free on the airport?

MR. BRYAN: No, he's not. As a matter of fact, he's no longer in the airport at all. He was there for a time living in one of the homes there and paying rent. That rent was the established rent for that home. There are several homes there on the airport.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Let me continue on that same:
"The only policy affecting leases at the state airports is
Master Policy Manual Statement Number 20101.010, which states;
no employee of any department may lease, buy or sell materials
or houses, services, equipment, et cetera, to or from the

department..."

MR. BRYAN: There is a written policy, not only permitting, but requiring occupancy on the airport of either the manager as I recall, or the fire chief, or the chief of maintenance because they must be present to meet federal --

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I have no argument with that, except this is what your own policy, Master Policy Manual Statements says. I have no problem with the fireman staying there, living there, or whatever you want to do.

MR. BRYAN: I'm not sure this statement is correct and that is the only policy, because the occupancy on the airport is pursuant to other written policy.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Tell Mr. Scheiner about it.

MR. BRYAN: With all due respect to Mr. Scheiner, it
is conceivable he was in error here.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: That's possible.

MR. BRYAN: But, there is and I will provide for you if you wish to have that written policy governing occupants on the airport by one of the chief people.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I could go through this document here, which I think is a good one, by the way.

Really what I'm trying to demonstrate to this committee, and I think to you, sir, is that I don't think you need to defend all your actions. I think you need to improve your actions.

I think everybody is saying to you that you need some written

2 3 4

policy, something in writing. You need some kind of direction. You need to have this whole operation, get itself into what everybody has been recommending to you from your inside out, from '79 to '84, is to have written policy, have direction and objectives.

I know you can tell me you have those, but I haven't seen those written policies on much of this operation, particularly in your biggest item, that the management or mismanagement of HIA and Capital City--the two big items.

I don't have any more questions. I have some questions for Mr. Larson, if he's going to appear.

MR. BRYAN: If he is needed, the Secretary -REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: He said he was going to be
here yesterday. I have that on the record.

MR. BRYAN: Yes. He understood that he was scheduled here, I believe, at 12:15.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: It is my understanding since he was here yesterday there would be no further questions for him.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: No, I specifically asked the Secretary. I could probably ignore it. I tried to boil him down to certain items I wanted to ask him and I wanted to ask him yesterday. I asked him specifically if he would be here today. He said he would be here.

MR. BRYAN: He will be here, but he understood that

_

he should plan to be here at the scheduled time, at 12:15. I can contact his secretary and it could be he could get over here on short notice.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Let me recommend to the Chairman that we take a ten-minute break and let me think about this a minute. I don't want to drag him over here for nothing.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Okay, recess for ten minutes. (Recess.)

AFTER RECESS

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: I think what we will do instead of having the Secretary come over, because I know what busy schedule he has, is that Representative Wilson still has some questions he'd like to have answered. From the two days of hearings here, I guess there are still some unanswered questions that Ben would like to have clarified and the committee would like to have clarified.

If possible, some written policies on the use of the aircraft, some policies on the rental use of the properties inside the Capital City and Harrisburg International, and the management of those properties.

I'm going to let Ben make a few more comments. I think after Ben discusses these last few questions, give -- the suggestion is, we will come back on Wednesday, the 14th of November after election, and possibly come back with some of

these answers and new policy decisions. We request that the Secretary possibly be there.

MR. BRYAN: Certainly I will arrange to be there and get information that you need and relay this message to the Secretary.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I prepared last night a document which pertains to the Secretary's flights. I have enumerated all of the Fridays and Mondays to State College. The gentleman back there says he has an answer for all these. I would like that, if you would please, to explain to me the business purpose that took the state aircraft to State College on Monday and Fridays, particularly. You don't need to do all these flights. It happened to be there in the log of flights.

MR. BRYAN: We'll provide that, certainly.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I'd appreciate that. I also think that in light of the Chairman's comments, which I think is good, perhaps you can take this and have this taped. How long would it take to get the tape -- the transcript of this to go over this and give us some commentary and what you might do about what we are talking about. I think we might make this productive if we do that.

MR. BRYAN: Ten-working days places it the 15th of November.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Anyhow, let me see if we can't do that. We are prepared to come back at that time with

some sort of precise statement on some of these comments we have gone over. Maybe we can save ourselves a lot of work.

MR. BRYAN: I certainly will go over my notes and prepare materials, answer some of the questions that were raised.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: Don, there was some difference between the 1979 audit by, I guess, Scheiner and the current audit in 1984. There still seems to be some problems that haven't been taken care of in that five-year span. Maybe we would like to see if we can get some answers from the department, if they plan to take care of those particular problems which Representative Wilson suggested, or maybe you have some written policies on those.

MR. BRYAN: Let me take those two audits, the internal '79 and the '84 one, which I asked for, by the way--it's the opening page--and make a comparison, and where progress is not clear, or not documented, let me explain it.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I seriously must compliment the department on those audits. I think they are good. I think they speak to the problem we are trying to get to. It's the implementation thereof, or sometimes the answer, yeah, we're working on it; and I have to keep saying, yeah, six years you don't get that on the -- But anyhow, I would appreciate, the Chairman has stated it very well, that if one of the Board thinks they can come in with this and maybe wrap

it up.

MR. BRYAN: I will do that. I will compare those two documents and be here on the 14th.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: With the Secretary.

MR. BRYAN: I will indicate to the Secretary you want him here, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I think some of these pertain to him and his decisions, which their overview of you, you have no choice in the matter. I think he has to answer to several of them.

MR. BRYAN: I am leaving open for the Secretary to make is own schedule. I can't speak for his schedule as I sit here now. That's my only reservation.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I understand that. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: We will have another meeting concerning the House Resolution 259 at 1:00, Wednesday, the 14th of November. We will try to get the same room here, 140.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: Would you please let us know if Dr. Larson will be able to attend that as soon as possible?

MR. BRYAN: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I think if we have to, we'll have to change to be sure he is here.

MR. BRYAN: I will get back to you immediately on this, this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN LESCOVITZ: At this time I would like to adjourn the meeting.

(Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the hearing was adjourned to reconvene at 1:00 p.m., Wednesday, November 14, 1984.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify, as the stenographic reporter, that the foregoing proceedings were taken stenographically by me, and thereafter reduced to type writing by me or under my direction; and that this transcript is a true and accurate record to the best of my ability.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

BY: Karen J. Rünk, OCR