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
## February 3, 2026

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

Anthony Bouscaren arrived at 5:38 PM.

This meeting was conducted remotely by video conference via Zoom and will be aired at a later date 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; Johnathan McCredie, Fennick McCredie Architecture; and Priyanka Menon, Fennick McCredie Architecture.

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 01/13/26 Draft minutes; hearing none, the Draft Minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Ms. Planzer made a **Motion** to ratify the 01/07/26 and 01/21/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – 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.

- ✈ **Stowe Enterprises, LLC dba FreshAir Services – License Amendment**
  Amendment No. 1 to the License Agreement, Expiring December 31, 2026, to Allow One (1) Additional Parking Space on the General Aviation Ramp.
- ✈ **GMSTEK-X1 – Contract Amendment**
  Contract Amendment totaling $8,505.67 for Additional Credit Card Processing Services, Including the Purchase of Four (4) Link Payment Terminals and the X-1 Pay Device Subscription.
- ✈ **World Fuel Services – Contract**
  A 3-Year Aviation Fuel Supply Contract with Pricing Subject to the Market Rate as Outlined in the Agreement.

Mr. Smith recommended postponing action on the World Fuel Services Contract for further discussion during the Aviation Fuel Subcommittee on February 10.

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

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

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

**020326-01 Letter of Authorization to Proceed with Design Services for the Airport Terminal Optimization Project**
Mr. Smith explained that the letter of authorization allows McFarland-Johnson to begin preliminary design work for the Airport Terminal Optimization Project. The intent is to keep all improvements within the existing building footprint, with no exterior expansion, curb work, or landscaping. The plan includes relocating airline ticketing offices to the basement and shifting the baggage makeup area south to increase hold-room capacity. Mr. Smith noted that this early authorization is needed before the formal task order is complete, as the project still requires scope review, FAA approval, MassDOT approval, and an Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) before a task order can be finalized.

Mr. Lasdin explained that the Airport has applied for a federal terminal grant and that this year is likely the final opportunity to receive this type of funding. The initial submission placed the Airport in a pool of interested applicants. Based on past eligibility for the existing terminal, roughly fifty-three percent (53%) of the new project cost was considered eligible for federal participation, and the application requested that full eligible amount. Final awards will not be known until April or May. If selected, the Airport must then submit a full application in the fall using a completed one hundred percent (100%) design and actual bid prices from a contractor. The federal share would be capped at fifty-three percent (53%) of the final total project cost, which could be lower or higher than current estimates. Mr. Lasdin emphasized that awards are fully discretionary at the national level, highly competitive, and unpredictable. Mr. Smith confirmed that approximately $7 billion dollars in requests were submitted for only about $1 billion dollars in available funding.

Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the grant background information and noted that the Commission remains hopeful about receiving funding, but attention must return to the scope of the terminal project. The commission previously narrowed the design approach and now needs a clearer understanding of actual passenger needs compared to what the current concept would build. Mr. Gasbarro explained that earlier direction focused on staying mostly within the existing building footprint, but updated data is necessary before finalizing guidance for a task order. To support that discussion, Mr. Smith provided new information about potential passenger counts if every hard stand were occupied at the same time by the largest aircraft that can operate at the Airport. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that this is not a full design exercise, but rather a way to compare the existing holdroom with tent, the proposed project, and potential future demand. Mr. Gasbarro then invited Mr. Smith to review the numbers that were prepared for the Commission.

Mr. Smith confirmed that the current combined capacity of the holdroom, tent, and adjacent walkway is three hundred thirteen (313) passengers. The proposed design from Fennick McCredie Architecture would increase that number to three hundred sixty-one (361) passengers, a gain of forty-eight (48) seats. Mr. Smith explained that future aircraft upgauging, such as American Airlines potentially switching to the A319 and JetBlue operating the full A220 fleet, will eliminate the usability of certain ramp positions, including Spot 4. Mr. Smith stated that Spot 7 is used only for emergency overflow. Under these limitations, the ramp could accommodate two (2) A220s, one (1) A319, and two (2) E175s, resulting in a maximum of five hundred seventy-eight (578) passengers. Assuming a typical sixty percent (60%) load factor, total occupancy could reach three hundred ninety-three (393) passengers, which still exceeds the proposed three hundred sixty-one (361) seat capacity. Mr. Smith emphasized that simultaneous aircraft on the ground is realistic during summer fog delays and would create significant pressure on terminal space. Mr. Lasdin confirmed the aircraft capacities and noted that Gate 6 is limited by wingspan, while Gate 1 cannot accept larger aircraft because the wingspan would extend into taxi lane Foxtrot.

Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the need to confirm that the terminal design will meet future passenger needs, noting that replacing the tent and gaining approximately fifty (50) holdroom seats would be a meaningful improvement, but long-term overcrowding concerns may still remain. Questions were raised about when design decisions become final and whether changes can still be made after the task order is approved. Mr. Lasdin explained that adjustments can be made only until the thirty percent (30%) design stage, because structural, mechanical, and architectural elements are defined after that point.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested that the Commission may need another programmatic meeting before full design work begins to confirm the terminal program, reassess the balance between spaces such as the holdroom, baggage screening area, and ticketing lobby, and consider whether further expansion into the ramp area would better support future needs. Mr. Lasdin explained that the proposed holdroom layout includes indoor space for concessions, which are currently located in the tent. There is still a short window to refine the design, although not much time remains due to the anticipated federal grant schedule. The government has not yet released the official deadline for applications, but the working assumption is that submissions will be due in September. If the deadline is moved earlier, the design timeline will tighten even further, which is why programming decisions need to be finalized soon.

Mr. Gasbarro then asked Mr. Lasdin for a professional opinion on the appropriate size of a holdroom that would meet current operational needs. The request focused on determining a reasonable capacity based on the maximum number of passengers who could realistically be present at one time, including potential overlap or delays, without considering the structural limitations of the existing terminal. Mr. Lasdin explained that terminal planning standards assume that about eighty percent (80%) of passengers choose to sit and about eighty percent (80%) arrive early enough to use the holdroom. The earlier estimate of five hundred seventy-eight (578) seats assumed a one hundred percent (100%) load factor, which Nantucket does not experience, so the actual need is lower. Mr. Gasbarro noted that this places the Airport's current figure of three hundred sixty-one seats (361) seats close to the planning standard and asked whether the perimeter of the future holdroom could be expanded slightly without affecting ramp operations. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that the five-foot expansion currently proposed is the limit that has been evaluated, and moving farther onto the commercial service side could worsen existing FAA surface penetration issues created by aircraft tail heights.

Mr. Gasbarro added that the goal is to maximize holdroom capacity without triggering significant structural changes or creating additional ramp impacts, and asked whether any remaining options exist that would stay within those limits. Mr. Lasdin explained that the baggage screening area will be relocated into the current airline office space, allowing the entire existing screening area to be absorbed into an expanded holdroom. Mr. Gasbarro shared the program plan for the benefit of the public and the Commission, noting that the current concept provides three hundred sixty-one (361) seats and removes the tent through a planned building bump-out. Mr. Gasbarro questioned whether additional small expansions around the holdroom perimeter might be possible, whether the baggage screening area could be tightened, and how to ensure redundancy in screening equipment while still maximizing seating capacity. The goal is to confirm that the design provides the greatest possible improvement without creating operational or structural complications. Mr. Lasdin offered to meet with up to two (2) commissioners the following week, along with the architect, to review potential program adjustments.

Mr. Gasbarro then invited comments from other commissioners. Mr. Leavitt requested clarification on maximum passenger counts based on a fully utilized ramp and current aircraft types. Mr. Smith confirmed the earlier estimate of five hundred seventy-eight (578) passengers at full ramp capacity and noted that last summer's operations included mixed aircraft fleets, with the coming summer expected to see all JetBlue flights using A220s, American continuing with E175s, and future summers potentially involving A319s. Mr. Leavitt sought clarification on how last summer's actual ramp usage compared to the theoretical maximum capacity of five hundred seventy-eight (578) passengers. Mr. Smith explained that a typical busy-day configuration last summer consisted of one (1) A220, one (1) E190, and three (3) E175s, totaling about four hundred seventy-seven (477) passengers. Mr. Leavitt noted that the proposed ramp capacity represents roughly a 21 percent (21%) increase over that number, yet the current design increases holdroom seating by only about 15 percent (15%). Based on frequent overcrowding last summer, including reliance on the tent and further strain during delays, Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that the proposed expansion would barely accommodate existing levels of traffic, let alone the projected increase. Mr. Leavitt added that moving forward too quickly to capture available funding risks committing significant dollars without fully addressing capacity needs.

Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the concern, noting the need to balance funding opportunities with a design that meaningfully improves conditions, even if the final solution cannot be perfect.

Mr. Bouscaren joined the meeting.

Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Leavitt for thoughts on what an appropriate holdroom seating capacity should be based on the numbers discussed. Mr. Leavitt responded that the question should be directed to the consultants, noting that established industry models exist for determining appropriate hold room size. Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that the process has been reversed by starting with the largest hold room that can physically fit and then accepting whatever capacity that produces. Instead, Mr. Leavitt suggested beginning with passenger demand, including local factors such as fog-related delays, to determine the correct hold room size first. Once that need is defined, the next step would be to determine whether the required space can fit within existing constraints or whether physical limitations prevent achieving the ideal size. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged that earlier designs were intentionally scaled back due to high cost estimates in the $55-60 million dollar range, and emphasized the need to move forward without becoming stuck in endless studies.

Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Lasdin whether the original design data and sizing rationale could be revisited to help determine if the current design can be expanded. Mr. Lasdin agreed to meet with up to two (2) commissioners and the architect to explore possible adjustments and confirmed that industry models were used in previous planning, adding that while Nantucket rarely operates at full load factor, the proposed concept remains expandable toward a larger terminal project in the future if needed.

Mr. Leavitt emphasized that any adjustment to load-factor assumptions must be applied consistently to both existing and future passenger counts. Based on the current projections, future ramp activity reflects a twenty-one percent (21%) increase in passenger volume while the proposed terminal design expands holdroom seating by only about fifteen percent (15%). Mr. Leavitt stressed that the terminal is already undersized today, so the planned expansion would not fully support even existing traffic, let alone future growth. Mr. Leavitt also expressed concern about spending more than $20 million dollars on a project that may only serve short-term needs, potentially requiring additional major investments within a few years. Mr. Bouscaren noted that cost must be weighed alongside capacity and suggested a more modest expansion to the west that remains under $10 million dollars and could be supported by retained earnings. Ms. Planzer asked whether operational strategies, such as admitting passengers by flight, could reduce holdroom crowding. Mr. Lasdin explained that fire code limitations apply, but operational controls and TSA agreements can restrict which flights enter the holdroom at a given time. Mr. Gasbarro concluded by reaffirming the Commission's desire to improve the terminal and eliminate the tent, but noted concerns about investing in a solution that does not fully meet the objective, suggesting delaying the authorization or approving a smaller amount of design funding, proposing either action at a future meeting or through a special meeting to determine how to proceed.

Mr. Lasdin noted that the terminal project scope is not yet finalized, and once it is, the state and federal review process and the IFE procurement will take additional time, making it unlikely the task order will reach the March meeting, with April being more realistic. Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that design funding would be needed before the full task order is ready. Mr. Lasdin referenced a comparable project on Martha's Vineyard, where the design fee alone was approximately $4.6 million dollars, suggesting Nantucket's design cost will likely be around $3 million. Mr. Gasbarro asked what level of interim funding would allow progress on refining the scope without committing to the full amount. Mr. Lasdin agreed to consult with the architect to estimate what is needed over the next month. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of confirming the project scale the Commission is willing to advance and asked about reimbursement options if the grant is not awarded. Mr. Lasdin clarified that if the Airport accepts a design grant, the FAA requires the project to be built within two (2) years or the design grant must be repaid, but if the project proceeds, design and construction costs would be eligible at the anticipated fifty-three percent (53%) federal share.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns about the financial risk of investing roughly \$3 million dollars in design work before knowing whether the FAA will award any grant funding. With far more national requests than available funds, the Airport could receive little or nothing, which would mean either proceeding with the full terminal project using only local money or accepting that the design investment would be wasted if not used within two (2) years. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the risk but noted that even without full grant funding, the Airport would still aim to improve the terminal, at minimum replacing the tent, though a fully locally funded project would be significantly limited. Mr. Gasbarro explained the immediate decision before the Commission which is whether to approve the full \$1.5 million-dollar authorization now, approve a reduced amount to refine the scope, or delay to the March meeting. Mr. Leavitt asked whether a partial investment could carry the project forward until April or May, allowing the Airport to stop work if no grant is awarded and limit costs to \$1 million rather than \$3 million dollars. Mr. Lasdin confirmed this is possible, noting that spending would align with progress, and a stop-work order could be issued if the funding outcome is unfavorable. The Commission agreed that Mr. Gasbarro and Mr. Bouscaren would meet with Mr. Lasdin and the architect to explore options and review prior terminal plans, with the group reconvening as needed before the March meeting to chart a path forward.

Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that the authorization letter presented was too vague and felt like an open-ended approval. The request was for clearer language that specifies exactly how the funds may be used and what design objectives McFarland-Johnson is expected to follow. Mr. Gasbarro asked how that specificity could be added and whether a smaller interim authorization would work. Mr. Lasdin indicated that the amount could be reduced and agreed that language could be added to limit spending strictly to terminal optimization design. Mr. Leavitt clarified that the deeper issue was the absence of clear design direction, noting that the Commission had not yet determined whether McFarland-Johnson should design within the existing structure, design to a particular cost limit, or design for a specific passenger capacity. Ms. Basheva suggested that the Commission include clarifying language directly in the motion when approving the authorization. This would ensure that any additional work McFarland-Johnson might need to perform, or any spending above the approved amount, would require the consultant to return to the commission for further approval and noted that the funds are already legally restricted by the Town Meeting warrant article to terminal improvements only, which provides an additional safeguard. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that the upcoming meeting with McFarland-Johnson and the architect would help define the project scope before significant work begins. Mr. Bouscaren suggested approving the letter as written and adjusting it later as needed.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to approve the letter of authorization. **Second** by Mr. Leavitt and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

**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 work on the remaining water hookups is ongoing, with six (6) properties still needing completion. Two (2) of these homes, thirty (30) and forty-four (44) Madequecham Valley Road, have contracts in place and are expected to be finished by the end of the month. The connection at twenty-one (21) Monahansett Road has already been completed, and the reimbursement process is underway. Three (3) additional properties, one (1) Nobadeer Farm Road, six (6) Skyline Drive, and six (6) Evergreen Way, still need to secure contractors. Work is also progressing on the fuel farm remediation project, with the FAA currently reviewing the project specifications and preparing comments. Ms. Collins noted that updates to the PFAS website are also in progress, and although no new language has been finalized, ongoing meetings with consultants aim to ensure the site is current and easier to understand.

**021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project**
Previously discussed.

**Finance:**

**020326-02 2nd Quarter Report FY26**
Mr. Smith presented the second quarter financial report, noting that Airport revenue totaled $11.56 million, a four percent (4%) increase over the same quarter last year, driven primarily by higher fuel sales. The fuel revolver spending limit was raised from $6 million to $8.5 million to ensure adequate purchasing capacity through the end of the fiscal year, and total year-to-date fuel revenue rose twenty-five percent (25%), or about $3 million. FBO revenue increased nine percent (9%), and vehicle-related income such as parking fees, tickets, and taxi permits rose sixteen percent (16%), while fee income decreased five percent (5%) and investment interest dropped twenty-one percent (21%), roughly $94,000. Total revenue ended the quarter at one hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of the annual budget. Operating expenses, excluding debt service, were slightly over $3 million with only minor changes year over year. Salaries and Medicare rose seven percent (7%) due to annual adjustments and holiday overtime, and medical insurance also increased. FBO and operational expenses rose sharply, fifty-nine percent (59%) and forty-one percent (41%), due to replacing outdated furniture and painting the FBO and terminal. Administrative expenses, including utilities and credit card fees, decreased twenty-four percent (24%), and repairs and maintenance declined thirty-nine percent (39%). General insurance increased significantly due to a recent settlement with a former employee. Overall operating expenses including debt service were down eighty-seven percent (87%) compared to the same period last year, and total expenses including debt service ended the quarter at fifty-eight percent (58%) of the annual budget.

**Manager's Report** – Mr. Smith reported on:

**Project Updates – AIP**

- **Additional General Aviation GPUs** – The final GPU for the ground support equipment was delivered last week, giving the Airport two (2) units capable of supporting larger private aircraft for the upcoming summer season. This brings the total number of GPUs available on the southwest ramp to four (4).
- **Ramp Lighting** – The Airport is coordinating with McFarland-Johnson to develop a construction schedule for the high-mast lighting project, accounting for long lead times of approximately three (3) months for the light fixtures and one and a half (1½) months for the poles. The plan is to start work on the commercial ramp and then move toward the southwest ramp, wrapping around the terminal. This approach is intended to prevent any disruptions to commercial air service, especially from a security standpoint, if the project extends beyond the May 15 target due to material delays.
- **Master Plan –** The final Airport Layout Plan for the master plan is still undergoing FAA review, a process that takes several months due to the size and complexity of the document and the number of elements that must be evaluated. As expected, the Airport is waiting for the FAA's final review before the plan can be officially approved.
- **DBE/ACDBE** – The DBE goals have been approved, but the overall plan required revisions from the FAA. The FAA provided the necessary updates, those revisions have been completed, and the plan has been resubmitted for review with the hope of receiving approval by the end of the week.
- **Commuter Apron** – Airport management has reviewed the scope of work and is coordinating with McFarland-Johnson to develop a construction schedule for the fall, with the project planned to go out to bid in March. Geotechnical work and pavement markings began February 2, and surveying is scheduled to take place later this month.
- **Continued Environmental Monitoring** – No update.
- **Airport Master Plan Update** – No update.
- **PFAS Mitigation Grant** – No update.
- **MEPA NEPA Updates** – No update.
- **Fuel Farm Remediation** – No update.

**Project Updates – Non-AIP**

- **Sound Barrier Noise Wall** – Thirty-one (31) holes have been drilled for the Sound Barrier Noise Wall. Concrete pouring was scheduled to begin February 2 but was postponed due to the forecast of more than twenty (20) inches of snow on top of existing snow. Since the storm did not occur as expected, concrete work has likely already begun and is expected to start this week.
- **Concreate Hardstands** – Bids for the Gate 2A concrete hard stands will be issued at the end of the month, with construction planned to begin in March. A sixty (60) percent review meeting with the FAA and MassDOT is scheduled for Tuesday, March 12, to review the project's current progress.
- **Electric Aircraft Charging Station –** No update.
- **ARFF Transition** – No update.

- ✈ **Tenant Alteration Applications** – No update.

**RFP/Bid Status:**

- ✈ **RFP Flat Roof** – The bid opening for the Flatroof RFP was held on January 21, and two (2) proposals were received. A review committee has been formed, and proposal evaluations are scheduled for February 13.
- ✈ Request for Qualifications for on-call engineering services, on-call planning services and for OPM services are currently being drafted and expected to be released very soon.

**Operations Updates:**

- ✈ **Grass Landing Operations** – The draft for the grass landing operations plan has been completed by the assistant manager and sent to legal counsel for review. The Airport is now awaiting legal feedback, and the goal is to have the finalized document ready for presentation at next month's Airport Commission meeting.
- ✈ **TSA** – TSA's Confirm ID program went into effect February 1, and since implementation there have been no reported issues or operational changes.
- ✈ **CDL Training –** Two (2) staff members will begin CDL training during the week of March 16, and the Airport is coordinating this effort with the Town, as was done successfully last year.
- ✈ **Union Collective Bargaining** – The kickoff meeting for collective bargaining took place before the holiday season, followed by the first negotiation session on January 28 and remains in the negotiation phase.
- ✈ **Ramp Management Plan** – No update.
- ✈ **Airline Service** – No update.
- ✈ **Runway 6-24 Rehabilitation** – No update.
- ✈ **Town of Nantucket Roadway Project –** No update.

**Statistics:**

Mr. Smith reported that December statistics and February numbers will be presented at the next Airport Commission meeting.

The APU log reflected four (4) action entries, and four (4) initial warnings were issued to pilots in command. After receiving those warnings, all pilots complied with APU limitations and provided explanations for their actions. Mr. Smith noted that plans are underway to refine the APU log by adding tail numbers, reasons for any non-compliance, and possibly startup and departure times. Work with the operations staff will determine whether these additions are feasible, with the intention of including the improved information in future commission meetings.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the planned community outreach regarding TSA's upcoming Confirm ID program had been completed. Mr. Gasbarro recalled seeing an advertisement in the newspaper. Ms. Ilieva confirmed that outreach had indeed been carried out.

Mr. Leavitt asked for an update on how the Airport handled the recent snow and ice storm, including whether operations were disrupted and whether additional staffing or overtime was needed. Mr. Smith deferred to Assistant Airport Manager Preston Harimon, who oversees airfield operations. Mr. Harimon explained that the storm lasted from January 25-27 and brought eight (8) to ten (10) inches of snow. The maintenance team was called in on Sunday, which generated overtime, and was able to open one runway that evening before temperatures dropped and conditions froze. Staff returned early Monday to improve the braking action on the airfield, and by midday the sun allowed enough melting to reopen runway 33 and associated taxiways. Strong winds up to forty (40) miles per hour caused drifting snow throughout the day, requiring constant plowing and sanding. Mr. Harimon praised the maintenance team, janitorial staff, operations personnel, and others working outside the terminal, noting that many team members were new and performed well. An after-action review was held to evaluate improvements, and overall the response to the storm was considered successful.

**Personnel Report:**
No update.

**Commissioners' Comments**
None.

**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. Leavitt – Aye
Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Gasbarro – Aye

The meeting adjourned at 6:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

---

**Master List of Documents Used:**

02/03/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
01/13/26 Draft Minutes
01/07/26 and 01/21/26 Warrant Approvals
Exhibit 1
Fresh Air Services License Amendment
GMSTEK-X1 Contract Amendment
World Fuel Services, Inc. Contract
Letter of Authorization
PFAS Table
Second Quarter Report FY26
December 2025 APU Log Summary