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

AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING
March 10, 2026

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM by Chairman Arthur Gasbarro with the following Commissioners present: Anthoney Bouscaren, Philip Marks III, and Michael Leavitt.

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: Dhruv Patel, McFarland-Johnson; Johnathan McCredie, Fennick McCredie Architecture; Priyanka Menon, Fennick McCredie Architecture; and Laura Martin, 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 02/03/26 Draft minutes; hearing none, the Draft Minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the 02/04/26, 02/18/26, and 03/04/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

- **Tradewind Aviation, LLC – Lease Agreement**
  Lease Agreement for the Flat Roof Building for $122,220.00 with an Annual Business Fee and an Annual Parking Fee for Two (2) Parking Spaces, Expiring March 31, 2029, with Two (2) One-Year Options.
- **Airport Gas, Inc. – Consent to Sublease**
  Consent to Sublease for Office Space Between Airport Gas and the Town of Nantucket, Expiring February 28, 2029, with One (1) Two-Year Renewal Option.
- **L&C Company, Inc. – Contract**
  Contract totaling $165,000.00 for the Emergency Repair of Approximately One Thousand Five Hundred (1,500) Feet of Perimeter Fence, Including Removal of the Damaged Chain-Link Fence and Installation of a Temporary Galvanized Chain-Link Fence.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns regarding the proposed sublease of the Airport Gas Office Space, stating that the original twenty (20) year lease executed in 2018 is with no price adjustment for the first ten (10) years. The tenant would like to sublet a portion of the space at what appears to be current market rent, approximately forty percent (40%) of what is paid under the Primary Lease Agreement. Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that this allows the tenant to benefit from increased market value without providing a corresponding benefit to the Airport as the primary landlord. Mr. Leavitt raised questions regarding the absence of revenue sharing, how the sublease pricing was established, and the overall fairness of the arrangement.

Mr. Gasbarro stated that he had similar questions and raised concerns regarding the lack of a formal survey plan clearly defining the sublease area, which is typically required by policy to avoid ambiguity in long-term leases. Mr. Gasbarro supported the concerns regarding rent, and questioned whether the original 2018 lease includes escalation provisions, as CPI-based adjustments were believed to be required under revised policy at that time. Clarification was also requested regarding the Town's intended use of the space, which was listed only as office use.

Mr. Smith stated that outreach had been made to the Town to clarify which department would utilize the subleased space, but has not yet received a definitive response, and clarification remains pending.

Tracy MacDonald, the Town of Nantucket's Real Estate Specialist, explained that the Town intends to use the space as flexible office space for Town employees, primarily to accommodate temporary relocations during renovations at 16 Broad Street. The space is not intended for permanent occupancy by a single department and will function as a rotating workspace during renovation phases. Mr. Gasbarro noted that understanding the space would be used primarily as static office space helped address concerns related to traffic and demand at the location. Ms. MacDonald stated that the Town requested a clearly defined lease area plan but was provided only sketch versions. The marked-up exhibit included in the meeting packet reflects those limitations, and agreement was expressed that a more definitive lease area plan would provide greater clarity.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that the markup was helpful in providing context, while emphasizing that long-term leases require clear terms at the time of execution. Mr. Gasbarro indicated that additional information regarding the lease area would be important for consideration and reiterated concerns regarding the rent structure and approval of a sublease that appears to benefit the tenant without providing value to the Airport. It was further noted that participation by the primary tenant would be appropriate when the sublease is formally considered.

Mr. Gasbarro stated that the materials were received that day and expressed discomfort with moving forward without additional information. While noting a desire not to delay the Town unnecessarily, Mr. Gasbarro indicated that further discussion would be needed with the tenant regarding how the overall lease might be adjusted if the sublease were to be approved.

Mr. Leavitt agreed and clarified that the concern was not with the Town paying market rent, but with the lack of benefit to the Airport from increased property value since the lease was executed six (6) years ago. Mr. Leavitt stated that review of the lease showed the first rent adjustment occurs at ten (10) years, with another at fifteen (15) years, meaning the Airport is still currently receiving the original rate at year six (6). Mr. Leavitt added that the lease provides the landlord full discretion to approve or deny subleases, and that the Airport receives a percentage of retail sales under the existing lease, but subleasing the space for office or commercial use would eliminate that revenue component, further reducing the Airport's financial benefit.

Mr. Gasbarro proposed holding the sublease item for a future meeting and asked **Mr. Smith** to follow up with the tenant to explore potential options or solutions before bringing the matter back for further discussion.

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

Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Leavitt – Aye
Mr. Marks – 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 the Administrator Consent Order (ACO) has been signed and is pending execution by MassDEP. Ms. Collins also stated that Immediate Response Action (IRA) Report No. 19 was submitted on February 27. The report documents a drinking water sampling event conducted in August, installation of six (6) new permanent monitoring wells in July, installation of seven (7) new lysimeters with pore water sampling in July and August, and soil sampling conducted in July. Based on the results of these activities, Ms. Collins stated that no new significant site information was identified during the reporting period.

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project
Mr. Smith deferred to Johnathan McCredie and Priyanka Menon of Fennick McCredie Architecture, to present the Terminal Design Layout Options. Ms. Menon provided a recap of the

prior Airport Facilities Sub-Committee meeting, noting that that a previous terminal layout study focused on expanding capacity largely within the existing terminal footprint, after which the Commission requested the exploration of a second approach to further increase secure hold room capacity. In response, the subcommittee evaluated two (2) options: Option A, a repurposed renovation within the current terminal, and Option B, a permanent hold room addition replacing the existing tent. The purpose of the meeting was to present findings, compare the two (2) options, and identify a preferred path forward consistent with the Airport Terminal Program (ATP) federal grant submitted in January. The presentation reviewed Airport goals, long-term capacity targets based on ACRP guidance, required operational and code upgrades, and set the stage for a comparison of the two (2) design approaches.

Mr. Leavitt asked how much passenger capacity is needed in the nearer term, specifically over the next five (5) to ten (10) years, rather than focusing primarily on the 2042 planning horizon, and emphasized interest in passenger capacity in terms of how many passengers the hold room can support, rather than square footage, noting that passenger limits are constrained by the number of aircraft the ramp can accommodate. Ms. Menon responded that interim capacity had been analyzed as part of the terminal study completed in 2023, which included a 2027 midpoint scenario. For that timeframe, the analysis indicated that even with removal of the seasonal hold room tent, approximately six thousand six hundred (6,600) square feet of sterile hold room space would still be required. Ms. Menon explained that passenger count figures are contained within a detailed ACRP spreadsheet and offered to follow up with the specific passenger capacity numbers.

Mr. McCredie added the projected hold room capacity for 2027 and 2042 are relatively close. The 2042 target of approximately three hundred sixty (360) to three hundred eighty (380) seats is based on the existing number of aircraft stands, with no additional stands planned due to Airport constraints. The 2027 projection is roughly eighty percent (80%) of the 2042 capacity, indicating modest growth over that period and reinforcing that the project is largely intended to meet near-term needs. Mr. McCredie also noted that because design and construction together take several years, planning horizons typically extend beyond five (5) years to ensure the facility meets demand once it becomes operational. While a five (5) year planning horizon is reasonable, it is important to account for approximately one year for design, followed by eighteen (18) months to two (2) years of construction, meaning the additional space would not become operational for roughly three (3) years.

Ms. Menon presented Option A, the repurposed renovation approach, noting that it builds on the previously defined terminal capacity baseline. At the building level, the option adds approximately one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet under the existing roof eaves and involves roughly eleven thousand five hundred (11,500) to fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500) square feet of renovations. The design achieves an estimated two hundred ninety (290) to four hundred seventy (470) seats in the hold room, depending on configuration, placing it within the overall capacity target range. On the airfield side, gates 2, 3, and 5 are configured to accommodate aircraft up to the A220, gate 1 accommodates E175 aircraft, and gates 6 and 7 continue to support slightly larger aircraft such as the E190. Landside circulation remains largely unchanged, while removal of the tent allows passenger flows on the airside to return to the terminal's original design intent. The secure hold room expands southward from its current location, increasing seating capacity and providing a fully enclosed interior environment. Departing passengers would gain access to a permanent indoor post-security concession, additional restrooms, and four (4) gates. To enable this expansion, the Checked Baggage Inspection System (CBIS) area is relocated behind the ticket

counters, with the baggage belt reversed to feed a new CBIS machine and space provided for a redundant unit. A fully indoor baggage makeup area is added to improve baggage handling efficiency, while airline back-of-house spaces are relocated to the basement. Basement improvements include airline and TSA locker rooms, shared break rooms, office space, and a new unisex restroom to address code compliance and improve employee amenities. At the main level, the renovated interior hold room alone provides approximately two hundred ninety (290) to three hundred (300) seats, which falls short of the long-term target of three hundred sixty (360) to three hundred eighty (380) seats. To address this, the option incorporates a seasonal secure rooftop hold room on the existing flat roof, allowing capacity to reach the design target during peak summer months. Ms. Menon concluded by outlining key considerations of the rooftop component, noting that it could serve as a distinctive architectural feature reinforcing Nantucket's island airport character and provide an outdoor service animal relief area, preserving valuable interior space. However, the rooftop option carries higher costs due to accessibility requirements, including the addition of a new elevator and modifications to two (2) existing stairs to serve the secure rooftop area.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the airlines had been consulted about relocating their support and back-of-house spaces to the basement and whether doing so would allow operations to function smoothly. Ms. Menon said that during the earlier terminal study, the design team held one (1) or two (2) discussions with the airlines regarding the possibility of moving certain back-of-house spaces to the basement, and that the airlines are aware of the concept.

Mr. McCredie added that while some airline support functions need to remain on the first floor due to operational requirements and frequent movement to and from the ramp, other functions such as offices and storage can be relocated to the basement. The proposed approach is a mix of basement and first-floor uses, which has been analyzed and still allows sufficient space for the CBIS to be installed in areas currently occupied by airline support spaces. Mr. McCredie also clarified for the public that CBIS refers to the equipment used to screen checked baggage behind the ticket counters, noting that this system requires a significant amount of space and is a key component of the project.

Ms. Menon presented Option B, the permanent addition approach, which replaces the existing seasonal tent with a fully enclosed hold room addition. This option adds approximately seven thousand seven hundred fifty (7,750) square feet of new construction and renovates about five thousand two hundred fifty (5,250) square feet of the existing terminal, resulting in a hold room capacity of roughly three hundred seventy five (375) to three hundred ninety five (395) seats, comfortably meeting the long-term design target. On the airfield, most gate configurations remain similar to Option A; however, by consolidating smaller aircraft positions between gates 2, 3, and 4, the design reduces airfield clearance requirements and allows a larger permanent hold room footprint. Landside circulation remains largely unchanged, while the airside addition introduces new exterior walls and roof forms that would require Historic District Commission (HDC) review but are intended to match the existing terminal's architectural character. Internally, Option B expands toward the airfield while retaining the existing hold room, creating a fully enclosed post-security environment with a permanent concession, additional restrooms, four gates, and a new concourse. The concourse separates and streamlines arriving and departing passenger flows, improving wayfinding, reducing redundant circulation space, and creating an opportunity for a distinctive Nantucket-specific interior experience. Because the hold room expansion occurs outside the existing terminal footprint, the CBIS largely remains in its current location, with

modifications to accommodate a redundant screening machine. Instead of relocating airline support spaces to the basement, some TSA back-of-house functions are shifted into an underutilized pre-security gift shop area, allowing airline back-of-house operations to remain unchanged and keeping basement and roof uses largely the same. Ms. Menon concluded with a comparison of Options A and B against the project's key goals. Both options are considered feasible from aeronautical, code, operational, and capacity perspectives. Option A meets capacity targets only with the use of a seasonal rooftop hold room, while Option B meets capacity needs entirely within a conditioned interior space. Both options satisfy post-security concession needs and improve baggage operations, though Option A offers a fully indoor baggage makeup area and slightly simpler TSA certification requirements. Passenger experience improves under both options through better wayfinding and elimination of the tent. Preliminary cost estimates show both options to be comparable overall, with Option B appearing slightly lower at this early feasibility stage, subject to refinement as design advances.

Mr. Marks questioned whether either design option would require changes to aircraft layup or hard-stand locations that could introduce hidden costs, noting that aircraft positions appeared to shift in the drawings and asking whether any modifications to airfield infrastructure might affect overall cost. Ms. Menon responded that both options account for some civil work, including grading and relocation of an electrical duct bank, and that these items are already included in the cost assumptions. Aircraft positions largely remain the same, though Option A includes alternate sub-positions for gates 2 through 5 (such as 2A, 3A, and 5A) to accommodate wingspan clearances for larger aircraft like the A220. Mr. Patel added that Option B would require rerouting approximately three hundred (300) linear feet of a main airfield electrical duct bank currently located near the tent. Mr. Patel also noted that some proposed aircraft positions could result in main landing gear resting on asphalt instead of concrete.

Mr. McCredie clarified that preliminary cost estimates already include site civil work, with Option B carrying a higher allowance due to the additional scope. Specifically, the project is carrying approximately two million dollars ($2,000,000) for site work under Option B compared to one million dollars ($1,000,000) for Option A. When asked by Mr. Marks whether these estimates included adjustments to hard-stand locations, Mr. McCredie and Mr. Patel confirmed that the Option B site work cost is an all-inclusive figure, covering duct bank relocation as well as any required hard-stand modifications.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the site work costs discussed for the terminal options included electrification at the hard stands. Mr. Patel clarified that electrification was not included in the current cost estimates, noting that while the idea had been discussed at subcommittee level, it was intentionally excluded until there was clearer direction. Mr. Gasbarro expressed strong support for including electrification if duct banks and site work are already being constructed, emphasizing that providing power to aircraft at the hard stands would reduce reliance on ground power units (GPUs), lower runtime, and align with standard practices for larger commercial aircraft. Mr. Gasbarro indicated that incorporating electrification now would be more efficient than adding it later. Mr. McCredie explained that the preliminary cost comparisons include an owner's contingency intended to cover potential additions, discussed but not yet scoped items, and unforeseen conditions uncovered during construction. Mr. Gasbarro responded that overly large contingency amounts can create uncertainty and suggested that if electrification is an anticipated design feature, it would be preferable to include it directly in the project scope rather than relying on contingency funds.

Mr. Leavitt raised concern about ongoing hard-stand construction plans, emphasizing that the Airport is already preparing to spend significant funds on new hard stands and cautioned against proceeding without confirming that their locations align with whichever terminal option is ultimately selected. Mr. Leavitt requested an overlay showing existing and proposed hard-stand locations to avoid installing infrastructure that might need to be relocated shortly thereafter. Mr. Gasbarro agreed, urging coordination between projects and warning that it would be worse to proceed now only to undo work later, particularly if Option B is selected and affects airfield layout.

Mr. Gasbarro summarized subcommittee discussions comparing Options A and B and explained the evolving preference toward Option B. While initially supportive of Option A's rooftop hold room concept and airfield views, Mr. Gasbarro expressed concern that rooftop capacity would be underutilized during Nantucket's frequent poor weather, pushing passengers back into already crowded indoor spaces. Option B, by contrast, provides comparable or greater seating capacity entirely within a climate-controlled interior, avoids rooftop accessibility complexities such as elevators, and reduces long-term operational risk. Mr. Gasbarro indicated that these factors ultimately weighed in favor of Option B and suggested the Commission focus on confirming a preferred option, coordinating hard-stand work accordingly, and determining whether electrification should be incorporated into the design now rather than deferred.

Mr. Leavitt raised an additional cost-related question about Option B, observing that the proposed layout includes multiple angled walls with numerous ninety (90) degree turns and asking whether a simpler, straight wall configuration could reduce construction costs while also capturing additional usable square footage. Ms. Menon explained that the irregular wall layout shown is the result of a feasibility-level exercise focused on maximizing hold room capacity while respecting aircraft positioning, tug maneuvering, and required airfield clearances. The geometry reflects efforts to keep sufficient space around aircraft, particularly the A220, while expanding the hold room footprint as much as possible. The jagged edges are not intended as a final architectural solution and could be refined as the design evolves to better balance capacity, cost, and architectural quality.

Mr. McCredie added that the positioning of the A220 aircraft is fixed by operational constraints, including proximity to taxi lanes, and that a defined safety and operational buffer around the aircraft, including space for ramp crews and tug operations, drives the building setback and resulting shape. Mr. McCredie noted that the exact configuration remains flexible and will be further refined through the design process, particularly when evaluating building massing and working with the Historic District Commission, which often favors breaking larger volumes into smaller, Nantucket-appropriate forms. Mr. McCredie emphasized that future design development will balance operational needs, regulatory requirements, cost efficiency, and maximizing usable interior space.

Mr. Gasbarro concluded by reiterating that a central goal of the project is eliminating the seasonal tent and replacing it with a permanent solution that supports long-term Airport operations. Mr. Gasbarro expressed optimism about securing grant funding to offset project costs but emphasized that, regardless of funding outcomes, the Airport must move forward with a permanent hold room solution and stated that commercial air service at Nantucket is expected to continue long term, describing the seasonal tent as an interim measure and characterizing the current level of demand as the "new normal" for the Airport and its passengers.

031026-01 Housing Production Plan
Mr. Gasbarro deferred the Housing Production Plan discussion to the next Commission meeting.

031026-02 Fuel Subcommittee Update
Mr. Leavitt provided an update regarding the first meeting of the Fuel Subcommittee held on February 10, explaining that the core strategy discussed was increasing fuel sales, as fuel revenue directly supports Airport operating and capital expenses while reducing unnecessary aircraft movements and noise. When aircraft cannot purchase fuel on Nantucket, they are forced to reposition elsewhere or tanker fuel in, both of which increase noise, runway use, emissions, and airport wear while reducing revenue. Mr. Leavitt outlined key challenges and potential solutions identified by the subcommittee. Fuel supply limitations were a primary concern, noting that ferry deliveries will increase from fourteen (14) to seventeen (17) loads per week during peak summer months, adding roughly three hundred thousand (300,000) gallons of fuel. Additional options under consideration include chartering extra ferries or barges. Storage capacity was also identified as a constraint, with proposed solutions including additional fueling trucks from World Fuel, leaving two (2) fuel trucks on site to add twenty thousand (20,000) gallons of temporary storage, and expanding the Airport's fuel farm. Mr. Leavitt also summarized operational and staffing challenges associated with increased fuel sales. While staffing has improved, Airport operations remain understaffed, and recruiting additional seasonal fuel staff remains difficult. The subcommittee discussed pursuing counter-seasonal staffing sources such as ski resorts and warm-weather destinations, with follow-up outreach planned. Additional topics included moving ferry reservations into the Airport's control rather than the fuel supplier's name, developing clearer specifications and competitive bidding for a future fuel supply contract while maintaining the current contract in the interim, and refining the Airport's fuel retail pricing strategy.

Mr. Marks explained that substantial research and cost estimating has been completed for expanding fuel storage using a double-wall tank system that would not require a containment moat. Mr. Marks gathered quotes for tanks, transportation and steamship fees, concrete piers, piping, pumps, crane installation, fencing, and project management, noting that fire-protection costs and environmental requirements still need refinement. Based on preliminary estimates, excluding some remaining scope items, the current cost is approximately seven hundred thousand dollars ($700,000), including one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) for contract management. Mr. Marks suggested that purchasing equipment directly and using local contractors could help control costs. Mr. Marks recommended using two million dollars ($2,000,000) as a conservative upper-limit budget while developing a more detailed plan. At that investment level, the project could provide approximately seventy-two thousand (72,000) gallons of additional fuel storage capacity, representing a significant improvement over existing conditions.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about the next implementation steps for the fuel farm expansion, specifically whether a task order would be needed for design and how the project should move forward, including McFarland-Johnson's potential role in preparing specifications. Mr. Marks said the next step is to develop a formal plan to expand the existing fuel farm, incorporating the subcommittee's direction and clearly defining the preferred approach. Mr. Gasbarro agreed, noting that the research completed to date helps establish the scope for design services and identify any potential regulatory or unforeseen challenges. The intent is to move forward with a clearly defined direction consistent with subcommittee recommendations. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether McFarland-Johnson could develop a task order reflecting that scope. Mr. Patel indicated that the information gathered

is sufficient to develop a design scope and noted recent experience with similar fuel farm expansion projects at other airports. Mr. Marks confirmed that developing a task order aligned with the subcommittee's direction is the subcommittee's recommendation and expressed willingness to work with Mr. Patel to convey the design intent and approach.

Mr. Harimon added that expanding the fuel farm will involve significant regulatory requirements, including fire and electrical codes, and will require review and approval by the State Fire Marshal with stamped engineering plans. Because of these requirements, Mr. Harimon emphasized the need to engage an experienced engineering and planning firm, noting prior coordination with Code Red on similar projects.

Mr. Gasbarro asked if there were any additional operational considerations for defining the project scope. Mr. Harimon confirmed agreement on the need to increase fuel storage capacity and noted that sufficient space exists on site, although some rental car relocation will be necessary. A key advantage identified is that the existing fire suppression system has capacity to serve additional tanks, though new tanks will still require fire protection, the final configuration of which will be determined during design and regulatory review. Mr. Harimon also provided a short-term operational update, explaining that the option of storing spare Noonan fuel trucks on site as temporary storage was reviewed with the fire chief and ultimately rejected due to added regulatory complications and State Fire Marshal involvement. Instead, the recommended approach is to lease additional refueling trucks, which are less regulated since they remain on private, secured Airport property. Mr. Harimon noted that one (1) additional refueling truck has already been received, and that Noonan trailers would remain a contingency option for emergency situations, subject to ferry reservation constraints.

Ms. Basheva raised concerns about funding for the proposed fuel farm design task order, noting that there is no existing capital article for the project in the upcoming town meeting. Ms. Basheva explained that while a stand-alone design effort could potentially be funded through the operating budget, a larger capital request would need to be addressed in a future fiscal year, and clarified that a home rule petition would not apply since no grant funding is involved. Mr. Gasbarro responded that the likely path would be to treat the design work as a professional services expense under the operating budget, then advance the larger capital project into the formal capital planning process. Mr. Gasbarro suggested preparing the project so it could move forward, potentially through a transfer or future Town Meeting action, once design costs and scope are better defined.

Mr. Leavitt presented a financing strategy that would allow the project to move forward without waiting another full budget cycle, explaining that preliminary estimates suggest the fuel farm expansion could be completed for under two million dollars ($2,000,000) and that the investment could effectively pay for itself through increased fuel sales, given the Airport's margin per gallon. Mr. Leavitt proposed using the fuel revolver fund as the funding source and outlined a potential pathway to add a two million dollars ($2,000,000) capital article to the current capital plan, subject to CAPCOM, FINCOM, and Town Meeting approval. This approach would allow the project to begin with design and engineering immediately, preserve unspent funds if costs come in lower, and avoid delays associated with waiting until a future fiscal year.

Ms. Basheva cautioned that while advancing the fuel farm project through a technical amendment this year might be possible, it would require coordination and agreement from the finance director, town administration, CAPCOM, and FINCOM, all of whom would need detailed supporting information.

Mr. Gasbarro expressed concern that moving the project forward too quickly could raise questions about whether sufficient planning and analysis have been done, particularly since the project is not yet fully designed. While supportive of the project, Mr. Gasbarro cautioned that regulatory and engineering requirements, particularly fire suppression and engineering safety standards, could drive costs beyond the current estimate and suggested increasing contingency or adding a separate line item to avoid under-appropriation.

Mr. Leavitt suggested increasing the proposed funding from two million dollars ($2,000,000) to three million dollars ($3,000,000) to address concerns about cost uncertainty, noting that the additional amount could be supported by the fuel revolver fund and that any unused funds would return to that fund, minimizing downside risk. Mr. Gasbarro agreed with this approach but recommended clearly identifying major potential costs, particularly fire suppression, as a separate line item rather than absorbing them into contingency, to improve transparency and better prepare for likely regulatory requirements. Mr. Marks noted limited experience with fire suppression systems and acknowledged uncertainty around how extensive those requirements might be. While the expectation is that costs may primarily involve piping and sensors. Mr. Gasbarro suggested adding a separate line item for fire suppression rather than relying heavily on contingency, noting that similar systems, such as those at gas stations, can involve significant infrastructure and upfront costs.

Mr. Gasbarro proposed allowing time to refine cost estimates, potentially with McFarland-Johnson's assistance, and recommended further discussion and additional meetings to finalize a revised budget before seeking formal approvals. Mr. Leavitt explained that the initial budget presentation was intentionally streamlined but that more detailed internal estimates and additional line items already exist. Mr. Leavitt emphasized the importance of building sufficient contingency and detail into the budget to avoid under-funding the project after approvals are sought.

Ms. Basheva outlined the proper process for advancing the project by adding a capital article under Article 19, Enterprise Fund Capital Expenditures, noting that funding could be designated from either the fuel revolver or borrowing. Listing borrowing would not require immediate debt and allows flexibility to later transfer funds from retained earnings or the fuel revolver once costs are clearer.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested that even if fuel revolver funds are the intended source, using borrowing as the authorization might preserve flexibility if fuel revolver balances are needed for operational purposes. Ms. Basheva clarified that the fuel revolver referenced is a fund balance and does not affect fuel purchasing. Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that identifying borrowing as the funding source could raise unnecessary red flags, preferring to clearly state the fuel revolver as the source since it represents existing cash. Ms. Basheva confirmed that using the fuel revolver directly would work and acknowledged it may present a stronger case to CAPCOM and FINCOM.

Ms. Basheva recommended contacting the Finance Director as soon as possible, even while final pricing is still being developed by the fuel subcommittee. Mr. Gasbarro agreed and emphasized the importance of framing the project as self-sustaining, supportive of Airport operations, and aimed at avoiding fuel restrictions. Mr. Gasbarro stressed that early communication would help explain the value and intent of the project. Ms. Basheva further suggested that outreach to the Finance Director would be most effective if led by the Airport Manager and Mr. Leavitt.

Finance:

031026-02 Annual Town Meeting – Airport Warrant Articles
Mr. Smith deferred to Ms. Basheva, the Airport's Business Finance Manager, to provide an update on the Airport Warrant Articles. Ms. Basheva noted that there were no concerns with the warrant articles and offered to answer questions if the Commission had any.

Mr. Leavitt asked Ms. Basheva to review Article 19, Enterprise Funds Capital Expenditures. Ms. Basheva explained that Article 19 includes all capital projects approved by the Capital Program Committee and that listing borrowing as a funding source is a standard practice when grant funding from FAA or MassDOT is anticipated. This approach does not indicate an intent to take on long-term debt, but rather provides flexibility to manage project timing, grant reimbursements, and future re-appropriations using retained earnings, fuel revolver funds, or surplus balances.

Manager's Report – Mr. Smith reported on:

Project Updates – AIP

- **Ramp Lighting** – The High Mast Lighting Project has been delayed because compatible light fixtures are on manufacturer backorder until September. As a result, construction is now expected to begin in the fall and will no longer overlap with peak summer operations. The delay is solely due to manufacturing availability, as production of the required fixtures has been temporarily paused.
- **Airport Master Plan Update** – The FAA has officially approved the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) included in the Master Plan. The ALP had previously been reviewed by the Commission and was distributed to Commissioners for a final review before being submitted to the FAA, which has now completed its approval.
- **DBE/ACDBE** – No update.
- **Commuter Apron** – The geotechnical work has been completed and submitted to the FAA for final review. The project is pending FAA feedback and approval of the specifications before it can move forward.
- **Continued Environmental Monitoring** – 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** – One hundred five (105) shafts have been drilled and sixty-six (66) concrete footings poured, out of a total of one hundred eleven (111) piers. Seven (7) piers had been installed as of this afternoon. Mr. Smith also noted that recent snow removal caused some dirt to be deposited on the ramp, and Airport Operations are assisting with sweeping to prevent dust or visibility issues. Looking ahead, panel deliveries have begun, drilling and rebar cage installation are nearing completion, grading and post placement are planned next, and vegetation management will be coordinated for topsoil work.

- **Concreate Hardstands** – The notice of award was signed, and confirmation has been received that TRAC Builders has accepted. The combined bid total and McFarland-Johnson's costs exceeded the five hundred thousand dollar ($500,000) appropriation limit, so McFarland-Johnson is revising the scope to reduce costs and bring the project within budget. The finalized contract is expected to be ready for approval at a special meeting in approximately two (2) weeks, allowing the project to remain on schedule for completion ahead of anticipated air service beginning in mid-May.
- **Electric Aircraft Charging Station** – No update.
- **ARFF Transition** – No update.
- **Tenant Alteration Applications** – No update.

RFP/Bid Status:

- The Requests For Qualifications (RFQs) for on-call engineering and planning services are currently underway, with submissions due by March 25. A site visit for interested firms was held on March 9 and was well attended, with more than six (6) companies and approximately fifteen (15) participants present. The strong turnout indicates significant interest in the Airport's upcoming three (3) year engineering and planning services contract.
- A Request For Qualifications (RFQ) for Owner's Project Management (OPM) services related to the terminal optimization and geothermal projects was issued on February 18, with submissions due by March 25. The Airport is currently awaiting responses to that RFQ.

Operations Updates:

- **Airport Perimeter Fence** – Approximately one thousand five hundred (1,500) linear feet of perimeter fencing were damaged during a recent winter storm, primarily at Madequecham Valley Road and Nobadeer Beach. Temporary fencing has since been installed to secure the area. Because the damage constituted a security breach, TSA required a twenty-four (24) hour fence line watch until the temporary repairs were in place. Airport staff provided extended overtime coverage to maintain TSA compliance and prevent wildlife from entering the airfield, and their efforts were formally commended. The airport is now coordinating with the Town regarding insurance matters related to the fence damage, with further updates to follow.
- **Airline Service** – Progress is beginning to pick up with airlines for the upcoming season and the Airport expects to receive seasonal flight schedules prior to the April Commission meeting.
- **TSA** – The Department of Homeland Security is currently shut down due to a lack of funding, which is affecting the TSA, including missed paychecks for TSA staff. While this shutdown has been quieter than prior shutdowns and has raised some concern among TSA personnel, operations at Nantucket continue as normal with no disruptions to date.
- **Wildlife Training** – Annual wildlife hazard training was conducted on March 9 for management, operations, and maintenance staff.
- **Union Collective Bargaining** – No update.
- **Ramp Management Plan** – No update.

- **Runway 6-24 Rehabilitation** – No update.
- **Town of Nantucket Roadway Project –** No update.

Personnel Report:
A fifth full-time janitor has been hired to oversee cleaning of the ARFF and FBO buildings and to provide backup support in the terminal during peak season. Mr. Smith also noted that an Operations/ARFF staff member recently departed to pursue further education, and that a replacement has been hired. With this addition, the Airport is back to full staffing capacity.

Commissioners' Comments
None.

Public Comments
None.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

03/10/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
02/03/26 Draft Minutes
02/04/26, 02/18/26, and 03/04/26 Warrant Approvals
Exhibit 1
Tradewind Aviation, LLC Lease Agreement
Airport Gas, Inc. Consent to Sublease
L&C Company, Inc. Contract
PFAS Table
Nantucket Terminal Improvements: Phase II
ACK Housing Production Plan
Airport Warrant Articles
January 2026 APU Log Summary