Town of Nantucket
NANTUCKET MEMORIAL AIRPORT
14 Airport Road
Nantucket Island, Massachusetts 02554

Warren Smith, Airport Manager
Phone: (508) 325-5300
Fax: (508) 325-5306

Commissioners
Arthur D. Gasbarro, Chairman
Andrea N. Planzer, Vice Chair
Anthony G. Bouscaren
Philip Marks III
Michael Leavitt

AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING
December 9, 2025

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 PM by Chairman Arthur Gasbarro with the following Commissioners present: Andrea Planzer, Anthony Bouscaren, and Philip Marks III.

Michael Leavitt arrived at 5:06 PM.

This meeting took place at 131 Pleasant Street, Nantucket, MA, and was conducted via Zoom Webinar and broadcast live on the Town of Nantucket YouTube channel.

Airport employees present were: Warren Smith, Airport Manager; Preston Harimon, Airport Assistant Manager; Mariya Basheva, Finance Manager; Vilina R. Ilieva, Office Manager; Elizabeth Reuss, Administrative Assistant; and Madison Collins, Environmental Coordinator.

Mr. Gasbarro read the Town's virtual meeting statement.

Mr. Gasbarro announced the meeting was being audio and video recorded.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for comments on the Agenda; hearing none, the Agenda was adopted.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for comments and concerns on the 11/18/25 Draft minutes; hearing none, the Draft Minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the 11/19/25 and 12/03/25 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
Mr. Marks – Aye
Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

Public Comment:
None.

Pending Leases/Contracts Mr. Smith presented Exhibit 1 for approval of the following contracts, leases, and contract amendments.

- **Hagedorn Aviation Hangar No. 8 – Lease Agreement**
  A Ten (10) Year Hangar Lease Agreement at $37,375 Per Year, with a Monthly Rent Abatement of $1,211.12, Expiring December 31, 2035.
- **Tradewind Aviation – Lease Amendment**
  Amend the Lease to Month-to-Month Basis Following the Term Expiration on December 17, 2025. Monthly Rent Shall Remain at $9,502.50 in Accordance with the Original Lease.
- **Stowe Enterprises, LLC d.b.a. FreshAir Services – License Agreement**
  A License Agreement for Aircraft Cleaning and Security Screening Services, Expiring December 31, 2026, with an Annual Business Fee Plus Airport Cleaning Fee and Security Screening Fee.
- **Johnson Controls Fire Protection, Inc. – Contract**
  A Two (2) Year Statewide Contract for Fire Alarm, Sprinkler System, and Elevator Inspections, Expiring December 31, 2027.
- **Anderson and Kreiger – Letter of Agreement**
  A Letter of Agreement for Legal Services of General Matters for Calendar Year 2026.
- **1200.Aero, Inc. – Contract**
  A Contract for a One-Time Program Development for $49,000 to Track Noise-Sensitive Areas and Report APU Usage Run Time on the Ramp.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract**
  Task Order MJ-EN-16 for Concrete Hardstand Construction Gate 2A for $174,200.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to approve the leases, contracts, and contract amendments as set forth in Exhibit one (1), excluding the Hagedorn Aviation Lease Agreement. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – Aye
Mr. Marks – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

090925-01 Jet Fuel Discussion
Mr. Smith reported on jet fuel updates. World Fuel is preparing to replace the current 5,000-gallon fuel truck with a 7,000-gallon truck within the next two (2) weeks, with delivery expected by March. Three (3) additional 7,000-gallon trucks have also been requested, and the supplier has been informed of required delivery dates. Preparations are underway to ensure all trucks are available for the upcoming season. Mr. Smith also noted correspondence from Robert B. Our regarding future barge operations. A vote is pending to allow use of the Steamship Authority slip, with the goal of enabling tug and barge freight operations by the end of the first quarter next year without additional licensing. Mr. Smith plans to meet with Robert B. Our to discuss further details.

Mr. Marks suggested forming a subcommittee to consolidate ideas and define a clear plan for fuel-related issues, noting significant work has been done by Commissioners recently and emphasized the need to streamline options before investing additional time.

Mr. Gasbarro agreed, stating that prior meetings have covered the topic extensively but that a subcommittee could focus on details and provide refined recommendations to the full Commission. Mr. Gasbarro proposed creating a subcommittee dedicated to fuel supply and resale, including jet fuel and Avgas, and clarified that the group would operate under Open Meeting Law requirements, with posted agendas and recorded minutes. Commissioners not on the subcommittee could still attend meetings.

Ms. Ilieva asked about voting requirements. Mr. Gasbarro explained that the subcommittee would consist of two (2) Commissioners, act in an advisory capacity, and make recommendations without formal votes. Mr. Gasbarro outlined potential discussion topics, including storage versus transport, supply considerations, pricing structures, management guidelines, infrastructure improvements, and service contracts.

Mr. Leavitt supported a broad scope for the subcommittee, covering all aspects of fuel supply and sales, and noted that additional options might emerge during the review process.

Mr. Gasbarro confirmed this approach and reiterated that the subcommittee would report back when ready. The topic will be removed from the main agenda until the subcommittee requests its return.

<u>**Pending Matters**</u>**:**

071420-03 Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Investigation
Mr. Smith provided a brief update on PFAS mitigation efforts. One (1) home has been connected to public water, while 83 Skyline remains unconnected. Two (2) additional homes have received quotes and are awaiting contract execution to begin work. Five (5) remaining homes are still pending quotes. Weston Solutions is scheduled to install four monitoring wells between January 12 and January 15 in the Runway 15 approach area and the Sun Island area.

050923-01 Crew Quarters Project

101425-01 Discussion – S.W. Cole Pending Contract
Mr. Smith provided an update that ongoing work with legal counsel regarding resolution of the S.W. Cole invoice. Legal advised contacting S.W. Cole, and outreach is planned to finalize an accommodating resolution.

Mr. Smith reported that legal counsel requested original RFP documents, bid pricing, design drafts, meeting minutes, and related emails to establish a clear understanding of prior communications regarding the amp service. A SharePoint site has been created to provide these materials. Due to limited time since the last meeting and the holiday period, legal cousel requested additional time to review the documents.

Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that this matter will remain on the agenda for the January meeting.

Mr. Marks emphasized the importance of addressing all issues, including whether the service size was included in the original bid and why discrepancies occurred. Mr. Gasbarro noted a breakdown in communication regarding the expected level of basement preparation. Mr. Marks agreed, stating that while the Commission decided not to build out the space immediately, the necessary infrastructure was expected to be installed to allow for future expansion.

Mr. Leavitt noted prior discussions requiring follow-up, including whether irrigation was included in the contract. Mr. Smith confirmed irrigation was not included.

Mr. Leavitt asked if the completion date and liquidated damages were agreed upon, and whether the project should be considered incomplete if additional work remains. Mr. Smith stated that legal counsel is reviewing the matter and has not provided a definitive answer. The completion date was July 24th following an approved change order.

Mr. Gasbarro added that the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO) complicates defining completion, as partial use of the building raises questions about delivery standards.

Mr. Leavitt commented that contract law should clarify whether a temporary certificate meets completion requirements. Mr. Gasbarro agreed but emphasized that design changes and installation issues for the basement remain unclear.

Mr. Gasbarro explained that documentation is incomplete due to management and project turnover, making it difficult to trace changes. The goal is to determine what was intended for the basement and what is needed to make it usable, acknowledging that additional work may be costly. Current findings suggest basement design work stopped before the RFP was issued, leaving unclear responsibilities.

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project

Mr. Smith reported that the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for Terminal Optimization was released late the previous night, with a January 15, 2026 deadline for grant application submission. The grant is part of a $1 billion program for terminal expansion and improvements and represents the final installment of a five-year ATP program. As a non-hub, non-primary Airport, the project qualifies for 90% federal funding with an additional 5% state match. Work on the task order and scope is nearly complete, with Airport consultant, Rich Lasdin confirming final review before submission to the FAA, the Massachusetts Aeronautics Division, and then to an Independent Fee Estimate (IFE). Geothermal scope development will begin within the next few days.

Mr. Gasbarro asked if both terminal and geothermal components would be submitted together but as separate phases. Mr. Smith confirmed this approach, noting the geothermal may not qualify under the NOFO and will likely be treated as a separate asset-related project, which is why the work was split into two (2) phases. Both will be combined for cost mitigation.

Mr. Gasbarro confirmed the timeline, noting the next Commission Meeting on January 13 and the January 15 submission deadline, and suggested a special meeting if necessary. Mr. Smith clarified that the grant application does not require the task order to be finalized but having it ready strengthens the application.

Mr. Gasbarro requested that the completed task order be distributed to the Commission for review and inclusion in the next public packet.

120925-01 Non-Union Personnel Agreement – Review and Approval

Mr. Smith stated that the non-union personnel agreement was distributed to all Commissioners prior to the meeting for review. The majority of updates involve basic language revisions and updates to health insurance plans, which were significantly outdated. Mr. Smith noted that the manual was last approved in 2006. Two (2) specific changes include aligning vacation time with the Town of Nantucket's policy and increasing the rollover limit for compensatory time from fifty (50) hours to seventy-five (75) hours.

Mr. Bouscaren asked for clarification on the source of the document and whether it was from the old version. Mr. Smith confirmed that updates were made to the existing agreement, which had last been revised approximately twenty (20) years ago.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to adopt the revised Non-Union Personnel Agreement. **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – Aye
Mr. Marks – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

111825-01 Rates and Charges Public Hearing Proposed to be Scheduled for January 13, 2026, Overview

Mr. Gasbarro stated that this is the initial review of the drafted Airport Rates and Charges document that will be presented at the January public hearing. The purpose is for the Commission to review, raise concerns, and provide input before finalizing changes after public feedback. The draft will be advertised and made available for public review. Mr. Smith noted that the proposed adjustment includes a 3.5% increase across the board.

Mr. Leavitt noted that the proposed 3.5% increase based on CPI does not reflect actual Airport operating costs, which rose approximately 15.4% last year excluding certain items. Mr. Leavitt suggested decoupling fee adjustments from CPI and aligning them more closely with expense trends. Commissioners discussed factors contributing to higher costs, including salary increases, headcount growth, and one-time payouts. Ms. Basheva confirmed standard annual salary adjustments of 3–5% and recent staffing additions. Mr. Gasbarro proposed considering a 5% increase as a reasonable and defensible figure, emphasizing that fees should cover operational costs and not to just specifically generating profit. Fuel pricing was noted as separate from aeronautical fees and subject to market considerations.

Mr. Smith noted that new charges have been added to cover services such as disabled aircraft recovery, use of support equipment, repair of damaged airport property, and hazardous material cleanup. These updates align with industry practices and ensure cost recovery for unplanned events.

Mr. Smith reviewed a new line item that was added for aircraft weighing 15,001 to 25,000 pounds to align with common industry categories. The threshold for another line was adjusted from 10,500 pounds to 10,001 pounds. The waiver for purchasing Ten (10) gallons of fuel was clarified to apply only to Avgas. Hangar classifications were updated to specify Hangar Four (4) as non-heated and Hangars Two (2) and Three (3) as heated. Additional changes include increasing the boarding ramp stair use fee from $25 to $50 per turn, setting lavatory service at $100 per service, and adding a mobile preheater fee of $100 for a maximum of one (1) hour. The fingerprinting fee for security was raised from $50 to $75 per individual. A new photography and filming fee was introduced at $300 for the first hour and $200 for each additional hour. Non-aeronautical fees were streamlined, with livery and charter services consolidated under one (1) section, and a new bus display case advertising option was added at $600 per year.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the newly listed "Use, Service, and Administrative Fees" items—added without fixed dollar amounts—are intended to enable cost recovery by referencing the Airport's internal rates and charges. Mr. Smith confirmed this approach, explaining that events such as disabled aircraft recovery would be billed based on staff time and associated personnel costs. Mr. Gasbarro inquired if additional legal or supporting language is needed. Mr. Marks suggested explicitly referencing the internal personnel/equipment rate sheet to ensure clarity during any future disputes. Mr. Harimon noted that the Airport maintains a list of equipment and personnel with established charges, and Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the need for consistency so that similar incidents generate comparable invoices. Mr. Leavitt recommended a general clause stating that any special service requiring Airport personnel will be billed at standard rates, including both labor and equipment. Mr. Harimon added that many cases involve spill response, citing past ramp incidents requiring a $1,500 spill kit for clean-up. Mr. Leavitt agreed the clause should expressly cover hourly personnel rates and the cost of materials.

Mr. Leavitt questioned whether the term "Signatory Terminal User" applies only to Cape Air and noted that the definition specifies year-round service with a minimum of two (2) days per week, suggesting that regular service should require more than two (2) days per week. Mr. Gasbarro explained that the current definition is intended to encourage carriers to provide year-round service and opposed making the requirement more restrictive, as the Airport seeks to attract new entrants.

Mr. Leavitt questioned how common use square footage charges, which are based on a three-year average of enplanements, would apply to new entrants without historical data. Ms. Basheva confirmed that current airlines have three (3) years of data but acknowledged the need for a solution for new carriers. Mr. Harimon explained that common use space includes terminal areas and is calculated using enplanement formulas. Mr. Leavitt suggested using available seat capacity or a comparable carrier's rate to avoid providing new entrants with an unfair benefit. Mr. Marks suggested charging retroactively once actual data is available. Ms. Basheva noted that the current $15 per square foot rate likely came from an appraisal and inherited formulas but agreed language could be added to address new entrants. Mr. Leavitt recommended allowing the Airport Manager discretion to assign a fee based on similar operations. Mr. Smith clarified that this approach would apply to both signatory and non-signatory users.

Mr. Leavitt inquired about the distinction between the two (2) items for Common/Joint Use and Preferential Use under section 2h. Mr. Harimon explained that preferential use refers to assigned positions, such as United's designated spot last year, which prevents occupying common-use or overflow gates. Ms. Basheva asked about the number of common-use spots, and Mr. Harimon clarified there are two (2). Mr. Gasbarro suggested adding definitions or explanatory notes under the columns for clarity, proposing that "assigned gate" may be clearer terminology than "preferential," as the current wording could raise concerns about favoritism. Mr. Harimon noted the terms may originate from FAA language but agreed to review. Mr. Gasbarro recommended including either definitions or brief explanatory sentences in the document to ensure transparency.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on how the Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) charges are calculated and billed, noting the reference to April through October and questioning whether charges are annual or monthly. Ms. Basheva explained that charges are based on the previous season's enplanements and billed annually. The calculation involves determining the additional cost for LEO services beyond the usual budget, then allocating that cost among airlines proportionally to their enplanements. Mr. Leavitt raised concerns that this method does not account for new entrants or significant changes in service levels, suggesting alternatives such as basing charges on available seats or departures. Ms. Basheva noted challenges in predicting schedules early in the year and uncertainty about industry standards. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the system's imperfections but emphasized that it is designed for cost recovery. Mr. Marks asked about the source of the LEO rate, and Ms. Basheva confirmed it comes from weekly invoices from the police department, which can vary annually based on flight schedules and service periods. Mr. Leavitt suggested revisiting the metric for future contracts to better align charges with actual operations.

Mr. Leavitt recommended clarifying language to define a non-signatory terminal user as someone operating less than year-round and less than twice weekly. Mr. Leavitt confirmed that the section on FBO scheduled service applies to Tradewind, Slate, and JSX, and asked how Tradewind's scheduled flights are distinguished from its on-demand Part 135 flights. Ms. Basheva explained that billing is based on monthly activity reports. Mr. Leavitt also asked about fees for Part 380 charters and security requirements under the TSA 125 program. Mr. Smith noted that security costs would not be separately billed, as advised by security coordinator Rob Holdgate, since carriers handle their own screening. Mr. Harimon confirmed that the 125 program does not require on-site law enforcement, but Ms. Basheva added that costs could be recovered if an incident occurred. Mr. Smith acknowledged that language regarding Part 380 charters needs clarification and committed to updating it, so these operators pay the appropriate fees.

Mr. Leavitt noted an inconsistency in the landing fee schedule. The fee for aircraft under 6,000 pounds increased from $7 to $8, but the base rate for aircraft over 6,000 pounds remained at $42. Leavitt suggested that the base rate should be adjusted to $48 to reflect the updated calculation.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns about the pricing structure for grass tie-downs, noting that an annual parking pass valued higher than the tie-down itself. Mr. Marks explained that tie-downs cannot be used without an aircraft and that parking is in a secure area. Mr. Harimon shared comparisons with other Airports, stating most include free parking and that current rates align with industry standards. Mr. Gasbarro suggested considering separate pricing for tie-downs and parking but acknowledged practical challenges. The discussion concluded with agreement to apply a 5% increase across the board rather than change the structure.

Mr. Leavitt raised a concern that landing and ramp fees are not being charged to hangared aircraft and suggested clarifying this with the fee. Mr. Marks explained that the practice has been to waive these fees for home-based aircraft. Mr. Gasbarro suggested adding language to the document to formalize this exemption and define home-based. Mr. Marks added that when an insurance certificate is submitted, home-base information is clearly indicated on the certificate itself.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether freight carriers such as UPS and FedEx pay ramp fees. Ms. Basheva explained that these carriers pay landing fees based on inbound gross weight at seven (7) cents per pound, billed from monthly activity reports. Mr. Harimon added that ramp fees are addressed in their lease agreements as an annual parking fee, not as overnight ramp charges. Ms. Basheva confirmed this applies to carriers including UPS, USPS, Mountain Air Cargo, and Ameriflight.

Mr. Leavitt inquired whether frequent operators and hangared aircraft pay landing or ramp fees. Ms. Basheva confirmed that some operators pay landing fees and have land leases. Mr. Harimon noted that T-hangars and common hangars are exempt. Discussion followed on defining "home-based" aircraft, commercial versus non-commercial operations, and whether exemptions should apply broadly. Mr. Gasbarro agreed to maintain current practice but improve clarity in the fee schedule and copy the exemption language from section 5a tie-down fees to the section 5b common hangars and T-hangars to avoid confusion

<u>Manager's Report</u> – Mr. Smith reported on:

Project Updates – AIP

- **Concreate Hardstands** – Mr. Smith reported that the Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) for the concrete hard stands at Gates 1 and 2A has been completed. The task order for this project was approved earlier in the meeting, allowing work to proceed.
- **Continued Environmental Monitoring** – No update.
- **Airport Master Plan Update** – No update.
- **PFAS Mitigation Grant** – No update.
- **MEPA NEPA Updates** – No update.
- **Ramp Lighting** – A virtual demonstration of the high-mast lighting control system is scheduled for December 12 to address technical questions. This is considered a long-lead item, and preparations are underway to advance the process.
- **Additional General Aviation GPUs** – The second ground GPU is scheduled for construction on January 9th and is expected to be delivered shortly thereafter.
- **Commuter Apron Services** – The Airport is currently working on the Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) for the Commuter Apron Services project. The estimated scope and task order are being finalized and are scheduled to be presented at the next Commission meeting

Project Updates – Non-AIP

- **Electric Aircraft Charging Station** – No update.
- **Sound Barrier Noise Wall** – Premier Fence has provided a preliminary schedule for the sound barrier project. Mobilization and stockpiling are planned for January 5th. Installation of drilled shafts will occur from January 12th through March 6th, followed by installation of the superstructure from March 7th through April 24th. Substantial completion is anticipated by April 24th. A pre-conference meeting with McFarland-Johnson and Premier Fence is expected next week to review the schedule.
- **ARFF Transition** – No update.
- **Tenant Alteration Applications –** No update.

Mr. Smith addressed a prior question about whether the Environmental and Dormitory budget line items should be moved into the contingency line. The recommendation was to keep the items in their original form, emphasizing that Massachusetts municipal finance relies on transparency, predictability, and clear statutory budget controls. Large contingency amounts can signal uncertainty, making it preferable to maintain the appropriations as previously presented. Ms. Basheva added that, based on experience working with the Finance Committee, the committee generally prefers budgets with clearly defined purposes rather than large contingency allocations. Moving the proposed amounts would increase the contingency line to approximately $350,000, which could prompt questions during the annual budget review. To avoid potential concerns or reductions, the suggestion was to keep the current budget structure and revisit adjustments next year when more data is available.

Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that leaving funds in the Environmental and Dormitory line items, despite knowing they will not be used, does not present an accurate or transparent picture of income or operational needs. The point was made that the Airport requires a substantial contingency because it is a large, complex enterprise with many unpredictable maintenance demands. Last year's unexpected fuel farm repair was cited as an example of costs that cannot be forecasted in advance, with similar unforeseen issues likely to arise in the future. The view was expressed that the contingency line may need to be even larger, and that consolidating funds into contingency, rather than distributing small amounts across multiple line items, would provide a more transparent and realistic budget structure.

Ms. Basheva noted that while budget transfers between line items are permitted, relying on frequent transfers can make it harder to explain year-end variances and next year's budget needs. Clear line-item spending helps provide context for why certain areas appear overspent, even when overall funds are sufficient. Mr. Leavitt responded that consolidating funds in the contingency line would simplify both spending and year-end reporting. In this view, starting with a single contingency source and documenting transfers from that line provides a clearer and more straightforward explanation of unexpected expenses.

Mr. Gasbarro highlighted the need to balance responsible planning with avoiding perceptions of a "slush fund". Mr. Gasbarro noted that the Commission previously voted to keep funds in contingency unless revised and asked staff to clarify proposed amounts. Ms. Basheva recommended maintaining contingency at $100,000, environmental at $125,000, and dormitory repairs at $180,000, explaining the rationale for these figures and potential uses.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested a compromise to increase contingency to $200,000, reduce dormitory repairs to $80,000, and keep environmental funding at $125,000. Madison Collins supported maintaining environmental funds for upcoming projects such as noise abatement and PFAS monitoring. Ms. Basheva agreed that the proposed adjustment is reasonable and easier to justify to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Marks made a **Motion** to approve the update to the Final Operating Budget. **Second** by Mr. Bouscaren and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – Nay
Mr. Marks – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

RFP/Bid Status:

- ✈ **RFP Boarding Ramp** – Bids for the boarding ramp RFP were due December 8th. Two (2) bids were received and are currently under review.
- ✈ **RFP Flat Roof** – scheduled to be issued on December 15th.

Operations Updates:

- ✈ **Ramp Management Plan** – No update.

- ✈ **Airline Service** – No update.
- ✈ **Grass Landing Operations** – No update.
- ✈ **Runway 6-24 Rehabilitation** – No update.
- ✈ **TSA** – TSA installed two new Credential Authentication Technology (CAT) machines at the front of the checkpoint, improving security screening efficiency.
- ✈ **Union Collective Bargaining** – The kickoff meeting for collective bargaining is scheduled for December 17th.
- ✈ **Airport Employee Housing Needs** – Work is underway with Airport HR to compile a housing needs questionnaire for staff. Responses are due December 10th, with approximately 80–90% already received. Once all responses are collected, the data will be analyzed and shared with the Commissioners.

Personnel Report:

Commissioners' Comments
Mr. Marks asked if there is a timeline for the Runway 24 reconstruction project. Mr. Smith stated that the project will be included in next year's Capital Committee request. Mr. Harimon noted that the project is anticipated for FY28, more likely FY29 or FY30.

Mr. Marks addressed the high demand for additional general aviation hangar space and suggested coordinating hangar development with the runway project. Mr. Gasbarro referenced the old pit area as a potential location for hangar expansion. Mr. Harimon added that it would likely be an additional row of T-hangars next to the existing ones and then expanding toward the post office. Ms. Basheva confirmed that future hangar development is already listed on the Capital Improvement Plan and referenced a proposed 14-unit hangar complex.

Mr. Leavitt revisited concerns regarding municipal budget restrictions requiring the hard stand project to be split into spring and fall phases. Mr. Leavitt noted that completing the work in one (1) phase would be more efficient and questioned the cost difference, estimating $1.4 million for two (2) phases versus approximately $1 million if done at once. Mr. Smith confirmed that completing both gates together would likely cost around $1 million, while splitting the project could increase costs by roughly $300,000. Ms. Basheva explained that the split was necessary due to timing and supplemental request deadlines, though efforts are being made to minimize additional costs. Mr. Smith agreed to seek a more precise estimate from McFarland-Johnson. Mr. Leavitt also asked if delaying completion would cause ramp damage or impact airline up gauging. Mr. Smith said that damage is unlikely and proposed operational adjustments, including swapping gates to reduce wear. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the inefficiency but noted that municipal contracting rules limit flexibility, and the current approach is necessary to keep the project moving forward.

Public Comments
None.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to adjourn the meeting. **Second** by Ms. Planzer and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye

Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – Aye
Mr. Marks – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

12/09/25 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
11/18/25 Draft Minutes
11/19/25, and 12/03/25 Warrant Approvals
Exhibit 1
Hagedorn Aviation Lease Agreement
Tradewind Aviation Amendment No. 1
FreshAir Services License Agreement
Johnson Controls Fire Protection, Inc. Contract
Anderson Krieger Letter of Agreement
1200.Aero, Inc. Contract
McFarland-Johnson Task Order No. MJ-EN-16
PFAS Table
Administrative Personnel Manual
ACK Rates and Charges Draft
ACK Airport Revenue Memo
October 2025 Statistics
October 2025 APU Log Summary