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
January 13, 2026

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Chairman Arthur Gasbarro with the following Commissioners present: Andrea Planzer, Anthony Bouscaren, and Michael Leavitt.

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.

Also present: Rich Lasdin, McFarland-Johnson

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 12/09/25 Draft minutes; hearing none, the Draft Minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the 12/17/25 and 01/07/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Public Comment:
None.

011326-01 Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Revisions to Airport's Rates and Charges
Mr. Smith reviewed the proposed updates to the Airport's Rates and Charges, which included a five percent (5%) increase across all categories and the addition of a line item for new airline entrants, establishing temporary rates until three (3) years of enplanement data are available. Clarified definitions were added for common joint-use and preferential-use ramp positions. The LEO services fee was increased to $0.34 per enplanement, and enrollment requirements for the landing fee incentive program were clarified. New language also defines seasonal (non-signatory) users providing less than year-round service, and clarifies scheduled service classifications under 14 CFR Parts 110.2, 135, and 380. Additional updates include a new MGTOW category for aircraft between fifteen thousand (15,000) pounds and twenty-five thousand (25,000) pounds and corrected hangar numbering to distinguish heated versus non-heated facilities. Revised language confirms that ramp fees for aircraft under six thousand (6,000) pounds are waived with the purchase of ten (10) gallons of Avgas, and that hangar tenants are not charged landing, ramp, GPU, or preheater fees for non-commercial operations. New administrative service fees were introduced for disabled aircraft assistance, support equipment, Airport property damage, and hazardous material cleanup, all billed at direct cost. GPU use increased to $75 per hour, boarding stairs to $50, and electrical outlet use to $50 for up to eight (8) hours. Lavatory service language was clarified, and a mobile preheater fee was added. Fingerprinting fees increased from $50 to $75. Special event and filming fees were updated to $300 for the first hour and $200 for each additional hour. Ground transportation language was reorganized, relocating Livery, Charter, and Courtesy Van items to Section F. A new advertising option was added for a bus display case at $600 per year and conference meeting room language was updated to specify a capacity of eight (8) to ten (10) occupants.

Mr. Leavitt suggested that since the weight categories were updated on the FBO side, the terminal side should be adjusted in the same way for consistency throughout the entire fee schedule. This would involve changing the 10,499-pound category and adding a 10,001–15,000 pound category so that all charts use the same weight bands. Harimon added that the focus of the update was on the FBO side and that the signatory categories were not intended to be changed, and it is unclear whether updating them would affect any current users. Mr. Leavitt responded that it likely would not affect existing users but could capture future ones, and that aligning categories across the document would prevent inconsistencies. Mr. Gasbarro agreed, noting that differing weight bands between sections might raise questions or cause confusion.

Mr. Leavitt raised concern that certain common-use terminal fees are based on a preceding three (3) year enplanement average, which may not reflect changes in airline service levels. Mr. Leavitt noted the Airport already receives monthly enplanement reports used for landing fees and suggested common-use charges should likewise be allocated using current monthly data rather than historical averages.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether staff still had concerns with changing the methodology. Ms. Basheva stated that airlines prefer a known annual figure when negotiating spring leases, and a monthly approach would cause terminal/hold room rent to fluctuate. Ms. Basheva added that any change would require review by legal counsel and discussion with the airlines.

Mr. Leavitt cited potential service growth as an example of why historical averages may undercharge current users. Mr. Leavitt acknowledged existing multi-year lease terms would need to be honored until renewal but recommended shifting toward an actual-usage model going forward.

Ms. Basheva responded that recent annual enplanement changes have been relatively modest and offered to share three (3) year trends. Ms. Basheva cautioned that changing the formula immediately could trigger extended negotiations because carriers are already operating under leases with renewal options.

Ms. Gasbarro suggested taking the issue under study for implementation in a future cycle rather than revising the methodology midstream. Mr. Leavitt agreed, noting any change could be applied prospectively and would not override existing contracts, though Mr. Gasbarro observed many leases are annual and could be impacted in the upcoming renewal cycle. Mr. Gasbarro requested draft rate language changes and an estimate of the financial magnitude (impact/benefit) before proceeding.

Ms. Basheva stated modeling could be performed using prior-year enplanements to compare outcomes. Ms. Basheva noted operationally the change would require adding a monthly terminal and hold room rent calculation to existing monthly invoicing for landing and ramp fees, while office, counter, and kiosk fees would remain flat and could continue to be billed annually.

Mr. Gasbarro and Mr. Leavitt discussed that the required monthly data is already reported by airlines and could be incorporated as a line item on the existing monthly invoice. Mr. Leavitt suggested language allocating common-use charges monthly by each carrier's share of total monthly enplanements and striking references to the "preceding three-year average."

Ms. Basheva raised a further concern about seasonality: if only one (1) or two (2) carriers operate in early months, allocating eighty percent (80%) of common-use rent by monthly enplanements could shift a disproportionate share of annual rent to those carriers during start-up months. Ms. Basheva offered to share the current spreadsheet and formula and noted staggered seasonal start dates may be a key reason the annual method was adopted.

Mr. Bouscaren stated a preference to retain the current formula for this year while providing advance notice of any change.

Mr. Leavitt supported the idea of implementing the new methodology next year, with advance notice to the airlines that the airport is moving toward real-time usage-based billing. Mr. Leavitt added that staff could model the change by running sample scenarios in a spreadsheet to understand how the revised approach would affect charges.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested taking a practical approach by running sample numbers, such as for May or June, to see how the monthly method would affect charges. This would allow the Commission to evaluate whether the impact is significant without creating a major new project. Mr. Gasbarro proposed moving forward on that basis as the next step.

Public Comment:
Ms. Amira Trebincevic from Delta Airlines expressed support for transitioning to a real-time allocation method, noting that the airline lease already authorizes the Airport to revise rates and charges annually. Activity at Nantucket has traditionally been stable, but with carriers considering future service adjustments, a more current, usage-based methodology is consistent with practices at many other airports. Ms. Trebincevic explained that real-time allocation could be implemented monthly or through a forecast-based annual model with an end-of-season reconciliation. Ms. Trebincevic also raised concerns about the proposal to charge new entrants at fifty percent (50%), stating that new airlines should be billed based on actual or forecasted use rather than a discounted

rate. Overall, Ms. Trebincevic supported shifting to a real-time allocation structure and anticipated general airline acceptance given evolving service patterns.

Additionally, Ms. Trebincevic asked the Commission to reconsider increasing the annual adjustment from three and a half percent (3.5%) to five percent (5%). Ms. Trebincevic emphasized that the current allocation model is not cost-based, and while a future cost-based discussion would be welcome, the present increase should remain more modest. Ms. Trebincevic noted that airline payments to Nantucket have doubled over the past five (5) years, from roughly $900,000 to approximately $1.8 million, improving Airport balances while airlines face rising costs and economic uncertainty. Many carriers are experiencing profitability pressures, and operating at Nantucket is already expensive due to housing and staffing challenges. For these reasons, Ms. Trebincevic urged the Commission to maintain the originally proposed three and a half percent (3.5%) increase in support of both airlines and the traveling public.

Mr. Gasbarro responded by acknowledging Ms. Trebincevic's comments and affirmed the Commission's intent to explore real-time allocation methods, including reviewing practices at other seasonal airports with staggered operating schedules. Regarding the proposed five percent (5%) increase, Mr. Gasbarro noted the need to be sensitive to rate impacts but highlighted that the Airport faces the same cost pressures as airlines, including staffing, equipment, logistics, and the overall expense of operating on Nantucket. Mr. Gasbarro explained that the Airport must also fund terminal improvements and service enhancements, some of which will require local contribution even with potential grant funding. Given these factors, Mr. Gasbarro expressed personal support for the five percent (5%) increase, while leaving the matter open for full Commission discussion.

Mr. Gasbarro added that the Airport applies rate methodologies consistently across all users to ensure fairness and shared responsibility.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to close the public hearing. **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Mr. Leavitt made a **Motion** to adopt the proposed Rates and Charges with adjustment to the weight grid to be consistent throughout the entire fee schedule. **Second** by Mr. Bouscaren and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

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.
- **Island Carpet, Inc. – Contract**
  A Two (2) Month Contract for $46,955.75 for the Removal and Disposal of Existing Carpet in the TSA Checkpoint and TSA Passenger Hold Room Areas.
- **Overhead Door Company of Cape Cod – Contract**
  A Four (4) Month Contract for $42,000.00 to Remove and Install Two (2) New Doors at the Snow Removal Equipment Building at 39 Bunker Road.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Task Order MJ-EN-17**
  A Three (3) Year Contract for $117,700.00 for Tank Compliance Services and Monthly Inspections.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Task Order MJ-EA-12**
  A One (1) Year Contract for $527,300.00 for the Design and Bidding for the Commuter Apron Rehabilitation Project.
- **Colonial Ford, Inc. – Contract**
  A Contract for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) New Ford E-350 Cutaway Van for $114,784.80, with a Lead Time of Four (4) Months.
- **Timberline GSE, Inc. – Contract**
  A Contract for the Supply and Delivery of One (1) New Straight Passenger Boarding Ramp for $34,299.00. Scheduled to be in use by May 2026 to Serve a Range of General Aviation Aircrafts.

Mr. Leavitt questioned the proposed Hagedorn Aviation lease, noting that the term is ten (10) years with only a CPI-W adjustment and a mid-year appraisal, and asked whether such a long term is typical for hangar agreements. Mr. Smith responded that ten (10) year hangar leases are very common.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the $145,000 abatement reflected capital improvements made by the tenant. Mr. Harimon explained that the amount covers the cost of converting the former freight building back into an aircraft hangar, including replacing the old overhead door with a bifold door. A portion of the hangar will also remain available for Airport equipment storage.

Mr. Leavitt asked about the McFarland-Johnson design contract, noting the $500,000 design cost and requesting the total project estimate. Mr. Smith explained that the full programmatic cost is about $4.7 million and confirmed that it is included in the capital budget.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the new GA boarding ramp being purchased from Timberline GSE, Inc. would fall under the existing fee schedule for boarding ramp usage. Ms. Basheva clarified that the current boarding ramp fee applies only to the commercial side, not the FBO/GA side.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether a similar charge should apply to general aviation now that the Airport is supplying one. Mr. Harimon explained that the new boarding ramp is intended to assist passengers with disabilities boarding or deplaning from general aviation aircraft, providing an essential accessibility service, adding a separate fee may not be necessary. Mr. Leavitt agreed that if the ramp's primary purpose is to assist passengers with disabilities, it would not be appropriate to charge a fee for its use.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on the FBO van purchase, noting conflicting layouts in the contract attachments and wanting to confirm whether the selected configuration was strictly for passengers or included luggage space. Ms. Ilieva confirmed that the van does include room for luggage.

Mr. Leavitt asked about the expected useful life of the FBO van, and Mr. Harimon estimated about ten (10) to twelve (12) years given its heavy use.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether leasing had been evaluated as an alternative to purchasing. Ms. Basheva explained that no analysis was done because the funding was already approved through a capital article at the most recent Town Meeting. That article covered multiple FBO equipment needs, including the boarding ramp, GPUs, and the van, all of which were items carried forward from the prior administration's equipment list.

Mr. Leavitt suggested that leasing the FBO van would be more financially advantageous than purchasing it outright. Citing the principle that depreciating assets are typically leased, Mr. Leavitt noted that municipalities cannot use tax benefits such as depreciation, while financial institutions can, often resulting in more favorable lease rates. Leasing would also allow the Airport to replace the van more frequently, keeping a newer vehicle in front of visitors. Mr. Leavitt recommended evaluating lease options for all rolling stock when local funds are being used. Mr. Leavitt suggested obtaining a lease quote for the FBO van to compare costs before proceeding, noting the need to place an order soon if there is a long lead time.

Mr. Gasbarro agreed that exploring a lease option is worthwhile, especially given the depreciation considerations for a government entity. However, Mr. Gasbarro noted that the van is a semi-custom vehicle rather than a standard off-the-lot model, and the lease market for that type of configuration may be limited or more expensive. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the need to determine whether such a vehicle is even available for lease and at what rate, but supported looking into it.

Ms. Basheva noted that one (1) concern with leasing equipment, based on experience with the fuel trucks, is the delay in repairs or replacements on Nantucket when leased equipment breaks. When the Airport owns the equipment, in-house staff can repair it immediately, avoiding long periods of downtime. Ms. Basheva added that leasing would also require planning and budgeting in advance for future years.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the Commission should approve the van purchase now and have staff report back, or hold the item until next month, and whether delaying would affect ordering.
Mr. Smith confirmed there is a four (4) month lead time and how a delay could push that into the busy season.

Mr. Harimon asked how capital funding would work if a lease option were identified, and Ms. Basheva explained that the existing FBO equipment article is flexible enough to accommodate either approach.

Mr. Leavitt suggested that the Commission does not need to delay the approval of the Colonial Ford, Inc. contract until the next meeting and could instead direct staff to obtain a lease quote for the FBO van and share it with the Commission by email so members can compare the options and determine whether purchasing or leasing is more appropriate.

Mr. Gasbarro agreed, recommending that the Commission approve the purchase now, and then have staff determine within the next week whether a viable lease option exists.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to approve the leases, contracts, and contract amendments as set forth in Exhibit One (1). **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

<u>Pending Matters</u>:

071420-03 Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Investigation
Mr. Smith deferred to Ms. Collins, the Airport's Environmental Coordinator, to provide an update on the PFAS investigation. Ms. Collins reported that staff will review the fuel farm remediation scope of work next week. Four (4) new long-term monitoring wells are being installed, two (2) near the Runway 15 approach and two (2) on Sun Island Road, to replace the current temporary well and improve monitoring precision. Ms. Collins is also working with Weston Solutions and McFarland-Johnson to update the PFAS website, improving terminology and aligning activity descriptions up to date with the current stage of the project.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the new monitoring wells would provide real-time data or be used for periodic sampling. Ms. Collins explained that the wells operate the same as the existing wells, with Weston Solutions visiting periodically to collect measurements and samples. Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that the wells are not automated and expressed interest in exploring real-time groundwater level monitoring in the future.

Mr. Gasbarro requested an update regarding the remaining water connections. Mr. Smith reported that installation work at 21 Monohansett and 44 Madequecham Valley Road has been approved and is ready to begin. Outreach to 90 Skyline Drive, 1 Nobadeer Farm Road, and 6 Evergreen Way remains unsuccessful, even after consultant attempts. Mr. Smith has contacted legal counsel to determine what options exist after repeated failed attempts, including whether any MassDEP provisions allow waiving certain services or moving forward after prolonged non-response.

Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of thoroughly documenting all outreach efforts, such as certified mail, to demonstrate the Airport is making every reasonable attempt to connect the remaining properties to municipal water. Mr. Gasbarro stated that there must eventually be a point where the Airport can move forward if homeowners remain unresponsive. The goal remains to complete the outstanding connections, and the Airport has already shown patience with an initial target of finishing the work by year-end. Mr. Gasbarro expressed strong interest in seeing the remaining connections completed rather than left unresolved.

050923-01 Crew Quarters Project
Mr. Smith reported that there has been no change or new guidance from legal counsel regarding the S.W. Cole services. Mr. Gasbarro suggested removing the topic from the agenda.

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project

Mr. Smith provided an update on the terminal grant funding opportunity, including past terminal project awards and the current need for terminal optimization. The proposed project elements include common-use ticket and gate counters, an expanded hold room, removal of the apron tent for safety, and potential improvements to the front curb for better traffic flow. The grant application is due January 15 at 5:00 p.m. Eastern, and the commissioners received the application in advance for review. Mr. Smith opened the discussion for any questions, noting the intent is to pursue this final round of terminal funding.

Mr. Bouscaren asked for the estimated project cost and the expected share of funding. Mr. Smith explained that the total programmatic cost is approximately $27.5 million, with historical eligibility rates suggesting the Airport may qualify for about fifty-one percent (51%) to fifty-three percent (53%) of that amount. This would result in an estimated FAA grant of nearly $15 million, with the possibility of additional funding from MassDOT, though that amount is not yet known.

Mr. Bouscaren then questioned the economic benefit of the project, noting that while a larger hold room may improve the passenger experience, it does not generate additional revenue for the Airport. Mr. Smith explained that expanding the terminal would eliminate the need for the existing tent on the ramp. Bringing passengers inside would improve safety, comfort, and operational standards. Mr. Smith added that the terminal is facing space and occupancy limitations under building code due to increasing passenger volumes, and expanding the hold room would help the Airport remain compliant.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that the estimated project cost is significantly higher than expected, even after narrowing the project to essential needs rather than optional enhancements. The earlier plans appeared to cover only the terminal building, without any work on parking or the arrival and departure areas. Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Lasdin to clarify whether the $27.5 million estimate applies strictly to the terminal's vertical construction or if it also includes parking lot and accessway improvements.

Mr. Lasdin explained that the $27.5 million estimate does include curb-front realignment, roadway adjustments, taxi and bus lane modifications, and reconfiguration of the pickup and drop-off area. The estimate also covers reusing the basement for office space, reconfiguring and expanding the upstairs hold room, and enlarging the SEBIS area. Mr. Lasdin noted that the scope reflects the smaller version previously discussed and that the square-foot cost estimate, about $1,820 per square foot, aligns with comparable projects, such as the current terminal project at Martha's Vineyard.

Mr. Gasbarro stated that although improvements to the curbside and drop-off area are needed, those changes would add significant cost beyond the terminal building itself. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized focusing on true needs, such as eliminating the tent and expanding the hold room, and questioned how the $27 million estimate breaks down between the building and exterior infrastructure.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the plans keep the terminal within its existing footprint or if any expansion is proposed, and whether the footprint is truly being enlarged or merely the existing wall reconstructed. Mr. Lasdin explained that the project includes about one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet of expansion by reconfiguring a portion of the exterior wall, noting that overall growth is minimal, and clarified that this involves shifting the airside exterior wall outward roughly five (5) feet to the edge of the roof overhang to create additional hold-room space.

Mr. Leavitt asked how long the expanded facility is expected to meet projected growth needs. Mr. Lasdin said the answer ties back to master plan projections based on a twenty (20) year planning horizon and will need to be confirmed.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that terminal needs must be balanced with the limited capacity of the ramp, which restricts overall growth regardless of interior improvements. The Commission has discussed staying close to the existing footprint because earlier full-scale concepts costing $40–50 million were not feasible. Even though the proposed project will still be costly, Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that removing the tent remains a key priority for improving passenger experience and maintaining the quality of the Airport.

Mr. Bouscaren expressed concern about the $13 million cost, emphasizing that retained earnings must also cover the noise wall and upcoming PFAS expenses. Mr. Lasdin clarified that the project is more substantial than a five (5) foot extension, noting that the baggage-screening area would be relocated and the hold room expanded into that area, effectively doubling the size of the current hold room. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the redesigned corner of the terminal would resemble operations at many other airports and significantly improve the facility, but at a considerable cost without increasing revenue.

Mr. Bouscaren asked about projected timing, assuming the grant is awarded in June, and questioned how long it would take to reach construction, estimating the Airport may be two (2) years away from actual building activity. Mr. Gasbarro stated that the Airport has already invested substantial resources in earlier work including base drawings and a full scan of the building. Mr. Gasbarro noted that this earlier work positions the Commission to better evaluate financial feasibility, which may involve a combination of retained earnings and long-term borrowing. Mr. Leavitt stated that without knowing the expected lifespan of the improvements, it is difficult to determine the appropriate type of long-term borrowing, noting that a ten (10) year bond would not be suitable for a facility improvement lasting only three (3) years. Mr. Lasdin stated that all federal grant applications must be based on actual bid prices, meaning the terminal project must be fully designed and put out to bid before the August grant deadline. Mr. Lasdin noted that an award decision may arrive earlier, but the design team has not begun work because the Commission is still deliberating on the financial commitment and related concerns.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about the earlier design work and whether that work contributes to the current project effort. Mr. Lasdin explained that the earlier work consisted of preliminary studies, including terminal analysis, building scanning, surveying, hazmat review, geotechnical work, and development of conceptual alternatives. Mr. Lasdin emphasized that none of this resulted in construction-level documents and that the design team has been preparing a scope of services for full design work but has delayed submitting it to avoid committing Airport funds before the Commission decides whether it wants to proceed with the project.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for more detail on the grant due on January 15th and how its timing affects whether the Airport should move forward with design work. Mr. Lasdin explained that the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) due January 15 only signals interest. Funding decisions may come in April or May. A full grant application, which must be based on actual bid prices, is due in August. To meet that requirement, the project would need to be designed and bid beforehand. Mr. Lasdin added that the design team will provide a scope and fee; if the Commission approves it, design work can begin. If the Airport does not receive the grant, the project can be stopped at that point.

Mr. Leavitt asked how much the Airport would be required to spend on design work between now and August in order to reach the bid-ready stage for the grant application. Mr. Lasdin explained that the Airport must commit to design costs to complete the documents, which will go through state and federal review and an independent fee review, but the project could still be cancelled at any time if the Commission decides not to proceed. Mr. Lasdin said the fee is not finalized yet because the scope is still being reviewed and will be sent to the Airport, MassDOT, and the FAA within the week. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that determining the scope is essential before design begins and that the Commission needs to decide whether the project should include only the terminal building or also the additional elements such as curbside and parking-lot improvements, which may not be affordable without grant funding. Mr. Lasdin confirmed the project could be segmented and noted several optional components that could be removed. Mr. Gasbarro requested a draft scope before any work proceeds, and Mr. Lasdin said it would be ready by the end of the week. Mr. Gasbarro reiterated that the terminal building may be finalized, but other elements could be separated into a future phase if funding is limited.

Mr. Bouscaren suggested moving forward with the terminal project, focusing on expanding the hold room while keeping the overall scope limited to avoid draining retained earnings, and possibly forming a subcommittee to assist. Mr. Gasbarro said the Commission should review the scope being prepared by Mr. Lasdin and emphasized that their primary focus is on the building itself.

Mr. Harimon asked whether geothermal upgrades were included in the $27 million estimate, and Mr. Lasdin confirmed they were not.

Ms. Basheva asked about Owners Project Manager (OPM) costs, and Mr. Lasdin stated those are also separate.

Mr. Gasbarro reiterated the need to focus on essential needs rather than optional elements when evaluating the project scope. Mr. Gasbarro expressed support for submitting the grant application and clarified that doing so does not commit the Airport to constructing all elements shown, nor does it prevent the Airport from revisiting or reducing the project at a later stage.

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

Project Updates – AIP

- **Concreate Hardstands** – The IFB for Gate 2 was completed, and the task order was approved at last month's meeting. The project is scheduled to begin on March 26 and run through May 15, finishing before the start of the summer season.
- **Continued Environmental Monitoring –** No update.
- **Airport Master Plan Update –** No update.
- **PFAS Mitigation Grant** – No update.
- **MEPA NEPA Updates –** No update.
- **Ramp Lighting –** The wireless control lighting panel has been selected and is ready for build-out though it involves a long lead time. Installation of the high-mast lights is expected to begin in mid-March and remain on schedule for completion by the May 15 deadline.

- **Additional General Aviation GPUs** – The final GPU is expected to be delivered within the next few weeks as its build-out is being completed. Once it arrives, both GPUs will be ready for use for the upcoming season.
- **Commuter Apron** – Previously discussed.
- **DBE/ACDBE** – The DBE/ACDBE goals were nearly finalized when the FAA requested unexpected last-minute changes. Work on the revisions is ongoing, and the required updates were submitted just before the meeting. A response from the FAA is expected within the next day or two (2).
- **Fuel Farm Remediation** – The scope of work for the Fuel Farm Remediation project was reviewed by Airport management, including Mr. Smith and Mr. Harimon, and comments were sent to McFarland-Johnson for further review. The goal is to begin the project this spring, with warmer temperatures required for the necessary paint application. An April start date is the most likely timeline.

Project Updates – Non-AIP

- **Electric Aircraft Charging Station** – Efforts to schedule installation with Beta are ongoing, but Beta Technologies has not been responding. Repeated attempts have been made with no success. The plan was to have the charging station installed this spring so outreach will continue to push for progress.
- **Sound Barrier Noise Wall** – Premier Fence has begun mobilizing equipment for the project, installing snow fencing and low-profile barricades. Staking of the drill holes started yesterday and continued into today. The drilling team is expected to arrive on the island on Thursday.
- **ARFF Transition** – No update.
- **Tenant Alteration Applications** – No update.

RFP/Bid Status:

- **RFP Flat Roof** – The RFP for the flat-roof building was issued on December 15 and will remain open through January 21 to solicit proposals for a new entrant to that building.

Operations Updates:

- **Ramp Management Plan** – No update.
- **Airline Service** – No update.
- **Grass Landing Operations** – No update.
- **Runway 6-24 Rehabilitation** – No update.
- **TSA** – TSA announced that starting February 1, any domestic traveler without a Real ID or another acceptable TSA-approved ID must pay a $45 Confirm ID fee. The fee covers ten (10) days of travel and requires additional screening, which could cause delays and potential missed flights. Travelers must register and pay through TSA's Confirm ID webpage. MassDOT plans to mail notices to Massachusetts residents, but there is concern that those with PO boxes may miss the information. The Airport is advising the public to prepare for this requirement and check TSA's website for any further updates.

- ✈ **Union Collective Bargaining** – The collective bargaining kickoff meeting was held before the holiday season, but the first negotiation session was postponed to January 28. Meetings with non-union staff will take place this week to prepare for how to proceed into that first negotiation meeting.
- ✈ **Airport Employee Housing Needs** – Mr. Smith reported that a housing questionnaire was sent to the Commission to assess staff housing needs and preferences. The results show that approximately seven (7) employees have immediate housing needs. Mr. Smith noted that housing affordability is a widespread challenge, as the cost of living on the island is roughly one hundred thirty percent (130%) above the national average. The intent was to bring this information to the Commissioners' attention and invite questions, with the goal of supporting future efforts to create additional housing options for Airport staff.
- ✈ **Town of Nantucket Roadway Project –** The Town of Nantucket Roadway project in front of the Airport has begun, with tree removal underway on Airport Road and Monohansett Road. The old split-rail fence removed and the DPW confirmed that the fence was beyond repair and will replace it. Over the next four (4) months, work will include installing drainage from Evergreen Way to Okorwaw Avenue, adding gravel roadway subbase, shifting the road for the new bike path, building the bike path subbase, and installing the paving binder before summer. Significant construction activity will continue through late April, and travelers are being advised to expect delays and use caution when approaching the Airport. Any remaining work will be completed in early fall.

Personnel Report:
A new full-time janitor has been hired to support the FBO building and ARFF, with additional coverage for the terminal during peak seasons. There is a strong operational need for this added position. The new hire has accepted the role and is expected to start next month.

Mr. Smith provided a reminder that the next three (3) Airport Commission meetings will be held virtually, as previously agreed. These meetings will be held via Zoom.

Commissioners' Comments
Mr. Leavitt noted that the statistics included in the January meeting packet were from November and questioned why more current data was not being provided, especially for items like Southwest Ramp operations and noise complaints that do not rely on airline reporting. Mr. Smith responded that this timing has historically been the practice, following the pattern used by the previous Airport Manager. Mr. Gasbarro added that the delay had been attributed to reporting timelines and packet preparation schedules. Mr. Leavitt pointed out that fuel numbers in the packet were already current for December, so not all data is delayed. Mr. Harimon said updated ramp data can be provided for any month the Commission prefers. Mr. Gasbarro supported the idea of moving toward more current reporting if it is feasible and not burdensome, noting that more timely data would be beneficial.

Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that passengers arriving in February may blame Airport and airline staff for TSA's new Real ID/Confirm ID requirements. Mr. Leavitt suggested doing local public outreach through outlets like the Inquirer and Mirror and The Current to alert island residents rather than relying solely on government mailings. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether signage might also help, acknowledging that passengers may see it too late, but it could still be useful. Mr. Smith shared that he recently attended a meeting with other Airport Managers and the Massachusetts RMV, which is preparing digital materials, including a QR code, for airports to display so travelers can easily access information. Mr. Smith agreed that local PR outreach would be beneficial.

Mr. Gasbarro said that, following the housing questionnaire, the Airport should begin focusing on creating a housing production plan. Mr. Gasbarro suggested slowing down to assess the data, discuss options, and determine next steps, recommending adding an agenda item in March to begin a broader planning discussion so the Airport and Commission are prepared for the next capital cycle in November. The plan could explore various approaches, including additional housing units, bedrooms, duplexes, purchases, or new construction, using a phased strategy.

Public Comments
None.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

01/13/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
12/09/25 Draft Minutes
12/17/25, and 01/07/26 Warrant Approvals
ACK Rates and Charges Draft
Exhibit 1
Hagedorn Aviation Lease Agreement
Island Carpet, Inc. Contract
Overhead Door of Cape Cod Contract
McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-EN-17
McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-EA-12
Colonial Ford, Inc. Contract
Timberline GSE, Inc. Contract
PFAS Table
November 2025 Statistics
November 2025 APU Log Summary