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
April 14, 2026

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 PM by Chairman Arthur Gasbarro with the following Commissioners present: Andrea Planzer, 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: 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 03/10/26 Draft minutes.

Mr. Leavitt noted that the packet included minutes from the 03/10/26 meeting but not from the more recent 03/24/26 meeting, and asked why those minutes were not included. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the 03/24/26 minutes were still in progress and Ms. Reuss confirmed that the draft was still being prepared and would be ready for the next Commission meeting.
The Draft Minutes were adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the 03/18/26 and 04/01/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye

Mr. Bouscaren – Aye
Mr. Marks – 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.

- **The United States of America General Services Administration – Lease Agreement**
  A Ten (10) Year TSA Lease Commencing June 1, 2026, at $40,205, with a Three Percent (3%) Annual Increases and a Five (5) Year Renewal Option.
- **ACK Surf School, LLC – License Agreement**
  License Agreement for Surf School Operations at Nobadeer Beach with a $1,500 Annual Business Fee, Expiring October 1, 2026.
- **Unifi Aviation, LLC – Operating Agreement**
  Operating Agreement for Ground Handling Services for United, Delta, and JetBlue with a $1,500 Annual Business Fee, Expiring April 30, 2027.
- **DJ Products, Inc. – Contract**
  Contract for an Aircraft Caddy Tug Used to Move Small‑ to Medium‑Sized Aircraft for $14,736.92, Including Freight.
- **Slate Aviation, LLC – License Amendment**
  License Amendment Approving a Designated FBO Parking‑lot Area for a Temporary Tent, Covering Three (3) Parking Spaces at $1,500 Each Per Year, Expiring March 31, 2026, with Four Automatic One (1) Year Renewals.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract**
  Contract for Task Order MJ‑PA‑06 Related to MEPA/NEPA Work, Totaling $788,448.06.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract Amendment**
  Contract Amendment for Task Order MJ‑EN‑17 Regarding Tank Compliance Services, Increasing the Contract by $15,795 for a New Total of $133,495.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that several members of the public were present regarding the FedEx sublease, which was not yet ready for approval and proposed first addressing the leases and contracts reviewed by Mr. Smith, then briefly turning to the sublease and allowing public comment.

Mr. Gasbarro raised concern about the size and timing of the environmental‑permitting task order, noting that the scope covers all CIP projects and that Commissioners had only recently received the material. Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Lasdin to explain the May 1 FAA grant deadline and what options might exist if the Commission wanted additional time for review. Mr. Lasdin confirmed the May 1 deadline and reported that the FAA had been asked whether an extension was possible, with a response expected the next day. Mr. Lasdin also suggested that, if needed, the Commission could hold a special meeting on April 28, which would still allow the grant to be submitted by May 1. Mr. Lasdin outlined the standard process: projects appear on the CIP, a scoping meeting is held with FAA, MassDOT, and the Airport, the scope is drafted and reviewed by all parties, an

Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) is completed, and the final scope and fee are then presented for approval.

Mr. Gasbarro clarified that the intent was not necessarily to delay but to ensure the full Commission had adequate discussion given the magnitude of the contract and asked what would happen if, after the grant application is submitted, the Commission later decides not to proceed with a particular project, using the Thompson House as an example, and whether the fee could be reduced accordingly. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that the contract is structured as a lump sum but includes fifteen (15) projects. If the Airport decides not to pursue certain projects, the consultant can work with the Airport to reduce the scope and fee.

Mr. Leavitt raised concern about issuing new McFarland-Johnson task orders while the firm's contract with the Airport Commission is scheduled to expire at the end of May and is currently out for re-selection. Mr. Leavitt questioned whether approving the task order could result in two (2) consulting firms working simultaneously if a different firm is selected, and whether this would create coordination or cost issues. Mr. Leavitt also expressed concern that approving a multi-year task order near the end of the existing agreement could function as an indirect contract extension. Mr. Lasdin stated that task orders remain valid beyond the expiration of the master agreement and would continue until completed but could not be amended if McFarland-Johnson is not re-selected. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that, in that scenario, the Airport could have two (2) consultants, which is common at many airports and has occurred previously on Nantucket. Mr. Lasdin clarified that approving the task order does not extend the firm's contract; it only authorizes work under that specific task order and noted that the new consultant selection process is for a three (3) year term, consistent with FAA guidance recommending three (3) to five (5) year consultant agreements.

Mr. Leavitt asked why a lengthy and complex contract was being presented to the Commission only two (2) weeks before a decision was required for grant eligibility and whether any factors had delayed earlier submission. Mr. Lasdin stated that the scope and fee had been under review by Airport staff, MassDOT, and the FAA throughout the development process, and that the timing reflected completion of the IFE and the need to meet the May 1 grant-application deadline.

Mr. Marks expressed concern about the timing and suggested scheduling a meeting on April 28, as previously proposed by Mr. Lasdin, to allow additional review time. Mr. Marks asked whether a provisional vote could be taken immediately, with the option to revisit the matter on the 28th if needed. Mr. Gasbarro responded that the intent in raising the issue was to ensure full Commission awareness of the number and scale of projects included, as well as the implications of the pending engineering-services contract. Mr. Gasbarro questioned what could realistically be changed by delaying action for two (2) weeks, given the advanced stage of the scope, the grant deadline, and the fact that most CIP projects would likely proceed. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the Airport cannot advance capital projects without the environmental permitting work covered in the task order.

Mr. Leavitt raised concern about entering a ten (10) year TSA lease when the terminal optimization project will require relocating TSA office space. Mr. Leavitt asked whether the lease contains a provision allowing the Airport to move TSA to a different location once the existing space is removed or reconfigured. Ms. Ilieva stated that the TSA lease includes a requirement for the Airport to provide TSA with office space in a new terminal and confirmed that the lease contains a clause permitting relocation. Mr. Gasbarro clarified that the Commission was seeking the specific mechanism within the lease that preserves the Airport's right to revise the leased premises. Mr. Smith confirmed that the lease includes a relocation clause and cited Section 2.05, which allows the Airport to require relocation of the premises if necessary for the orderly development of the Airport, provided the new space is similar and suitable for TSA's operational needs.

Mr. Leavitt noted that the DJ Products contract contains a misspelling of Airport in the initial recital, which affects the defined term throughout the document. Mr. Gasbarro requested that the error be corrected prior to execution. Mr. Smith agreed to make the correction.

Mr. Leavitt noted that the Slate Aviation license amendment is structured as a four (4) year agreement with no escalation and that the contract hard codes the annual parking space fee at $1,500, stating that this approach is inconsistent with the Commission's practice of adjusting parking rates annually and results in a tenant paying below the current rate for the duration of the lease. Ms. Basheva explained that parking space fees are set through the Airport's rates and charges process, which the Commission can revise each December through a public hearing, with a vote in January and that the Commission could increase the parking rate in the future. Mr. Leavitt responded that the issue is the contract language itself, which specifies a fixed annual fee rather than referencing the current parking rate, preventing automatic alignment with future rate adjustments. Mr. Gasbarro stated that revising the contract to reference the current published rate appears reasonable and asked whether the change could be made immediately, with the understanding that if the tenant did not accept the revision, the lease could return to the Commission next month.

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

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

Mr. Gasbarro introduced the FedEx sublease item, noting that it was not ready for Commission action and asked Mr. Smith to provide background. Mr. Smith explained that the proposal involves a sublease within an existing sublease. FedEx seeks to allow Poets Corner, a local shipping and printing business, to occupy the former FedEx customer-service counter space in Hangar 1. Mr. Smith stated that the Commission must determine whether the proposed use is appropriate, consistent with all sublease approvals.

Mr. Gasbarro invited comment from Matthew Peel, representing FedEx, while noting that legal review indicated the matter was not yet ready for consideration, emphasizing that the Commission must follow all requirements related to leases and subleases.

Mr. Peel provided background on FedEx's operational changes, including the consolidation of FedEx Express and FedEx Ground under the "FedEx One" initiative, stating that the Nantucket station had originally been slated for closure but was retained after determining that the lease is tied to aircraft parking positions and described FedEx's current operations, including multiple daily flights and plans to upgrade to a larger aircraft, which will require future facility modifications.

Mr. Peel explained that FedEx closed its customer counter, leaving unused space that Poets Corner expressed interest in occupying, stating that FedEx, Brookfield Asset, and Poets Corner all support the arrangement and noted that FedEx would continue to use approximately seventy-five percent (75%) of the building for operations, with Poets Corner occupying only the former counter area. Mr. Peel stated that the proposed use is similar to the prior use and would benefit a local business while keeping the space active.

Mr. Peel expressed concern about recent communication from legal counsel suggesting that approval might require renegotiation of the master lease or adjustment to market rates, which FedEx and Brookfield would not accept and stated that if the sublease is not approved, the space would remain vacant until the lease expires in 2032. Mr. Peel reiterated that FedEx intends to remain on Nantucket and is seeking to make productive use of the space while continuing operational improvements. Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Smith to explain what the master lease permits regarding subleasing and whether the proposed Poets Corner use is consistent with those terms. Mr. Smith stated that the master lease identifies the premises as a "FedEx freight facility," and noted uncertainty about whether Poets Corner's broader retail and printing services align with that definition, as his understanding of a freight facility is limited to typical shipping-related retail items such as packaging materials.

Mr. Gasbarro stated that the Commission must ensure any sublease complies with the master lease and that recent information indicates Poets Corner provides printing and copying services beyond a freight-related use. Mr. Gasbarro also noted that staff and legal counsel identified a potential inconsistency between the master lease's permitted use and the proposed sub-sublease and resolving the issue may require revising the master lease to align with the proposed use. Mr. Bouscaren suggested that novating or modifying the master lease could address the issue, potentially with financial consideration. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that this may be the eventual path but reiterated that the matter was not ready for action because any required lease revisions must be fully evaluated.

Mr. Marks asked whether Poets Corner would act solely as a shipping agent. Mr. Gasbarro responded that the proposal involves relocating the business's full printing and retail operations, not just the shipping counter, which raises concerns because the master lease specifies a freight facility. Mr. Leavitt stated that Poets Corner operates two (2) distinct businesses: Poets Corner Press and Sally's Shipping Counter, noting that only the shipping counter function aligns with the master lease. Mr. Leavitt expressed concern about allowing a retail print shop to operate under a freight-facility lease, noting that other retail tenants at the Airport pay an annual business fee and a percentage of gross sales and stated that allowing Poets Corner to operate under FedEx's lease could create inequity and would not have been contemplated when the master lease was executed. Mr. Leavitt also emphasized that Brookfield, as the main tenant, is the appropriate party for any lease modification discussions.

Nathan Roberts, the owner of Poets Corner Press, stated that the Poets Corner website references "Sally's Shipping Counter," but clarified that this is only the name of the shipping counter, created in honor of a family member, and not a separate business entity. Mr. Roberts explained that Poets Corner Press is the actual business and is a FedEx Authorized Ship Center, describing the current layout of the existing location, noting that the front area functions as a shipping counter with limited retail items, while printing operations occur in a separate back room of approximately five hundred fifty (550) square feet. Mr. Roberts stated that the intent is to replicate this arrangement at the Airport because maintaining two (2) separate locations is not financially feasible and staffing is limited.

Mr. Gasbarro thanked Mr. Roberts for the clarification and stated that the Commission must ensure consistency across all Airport leases and compliance with legal requirements, acknowledging Mr. Roberts' operational needs but emphasized that any approval involving both printing and retail activity would require renegotiation of the master lease to ensure alignment with permitted uses.

Mr. Roberts asked whether the Commission was referring to retail sales from the shipping counter or printing-related revenue. Mr. Gasbarro responded that all aspects would need to be addressed as part of any lease renegotiation and reiterated the need for fairness and consistency across tenants. Mr. Gasbarro encouraged Mr. Roberts to continue working with staff and legal counsel and noted that the Commission will be discussing sublease guidelines more generally.

Mr. Roberts stated appreciation for the discussion and expressed interest in continuing to work toward a solution, noting that the Airport location offers strong visibility for the FedEx shipping component of the business and that the intent is to grow that portion of operations while maintaining printing at its current level. Mr. Roberts stated that the goal is to support FedEx operations and avoid imposing unnecessary costs on the Airport, FedEx, or Brookfield.

041426-01 Sub-lease Guidelines

Mr. Gasbarro noted that several pending sublease matters prompted Mr. Leavitt to draft the proposed sublease guidelines for Commission consideration. Mr. Leavitt explained that the draft resulted from multiple iterations with Airport counsel and was prompted by recent sublease requests that revealed inequities in long-term master leases. Mr. Leavitt stated that some tenants with fixed, below-market rents were subleasing portions of their premises at increasing rates, resulting in declining effective rent to the Airport and emphasized the need for clearer standards to ensure fairness and consistency across tenants.

Mr. Leavitt outlined the purpose of the guidelines was to provide staff and counsel with a framework for negotiating future master leases and recognizing that existing leases cannot be revised unless a change is requested, such as a modification of permitted use. Many existing Airport retail tenants pay an annual business fee and a percentage of gross sales, and that similar structures should be considered for future leases. Mr. Leavitt also highlighted the need to ensure tenants are not in default before sublease discussions begin and stated that sublease related legal and administrative costs should be paid by the tenant or subtenant, not the Airport. The draft also proposes a one thousand dollar ($1,000) application fee and reimbursement of legal expenses.

Mr. Marks suggested considering a percentage of sales structure that applies only above a certain revenue threshold to avoid burdening smaller businesses. Mr. Gasbarro asked how such a provision would be drafted and noted that sublease guidelines should remain consistent with the structure of base lease terms. Mr. Marks stated that he did not have specific wording but described an example in which a tenant would pay a percentage of gross sales only after reaching a defined revenue amount.

Mr. Leavitt stated that tying payments to profit or net income is problematic because profit can be easily manipulated and emphasized that gross sales percentages are the industry standard and noted that the proposed four percent (4%) rate reflects the midpoint of the three to five percent (3-5%) range recommended by Airport legal.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for additional background on the proposed seventy-five percent, twenty-five percent (75% / 25%) revenue sharing split included in the draft sublease guidelines and whether there was a specific rationale for that percentage rather than another ratio.

Mr. Leavitt stated that the seventy-five percent, twenty-five percent (75% / 25%) split was intended as a reasonable starting point. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the broader purpose of the guidelines is to ensure the Airport is not placed in a position where it incurs staff and legal costs without receiving any corresponding benefit, particularly when a tenant subleases space at a higher rate while the Airport's rent remains unchanged. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that the guidelines establish expectations and provide a framework for negotiation, while still allowing flexibility if a tenant makes a compelling case for different terms. Mr. Leavitt clarified that the seventy-five percent, twenty-five percent (75% / 25%) split applies only to the amount by which a sublease exceeds the rent paid under the prime lease.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to adopt the proposed Sub-lease Guidelines. **Second** by Ms. Planzer and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

<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 six (6) homes remain in progress. Two (2) homes on Madequecham Valley Road were recently connected, one (1) home on Nobadeer Farm Road is in the contracting phase, one (1) home at 6 Evergreen Way is still awaiting a signed contract, the home at 1 Monohansett Road is already connected, work at 90 Skyline Drive is expected to begin soon, and Ms. Collins noted that only one (1) homeowner has not yet responded, and outreach efforts are ongoing.

Mr. Smith added that the homeowner at 1 Nobadeer Farm Road intends to use the same contractor who completed the Madequecham Valley connections. That contractor was waiting for those homes to be finished, and with that work now complete, the Nobadeer Farm Road connection is expected to proceed imminently. Mr. Smith also noted that a certified letter regarding the 6 Evergreen Way property was drafted and should have been delivered the previous week. The Airport is now awaiting a response from the residents, and the outreach process is already underway. Mr. Gasbarro requested an update at the next meeting if these items have not advanced.

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project

Mr. Smith reported that the Airport held a massing meeting with Fennick McCredie Architecture regarding the Terminal Optimization Project, and the discussion went well. Mr. Smith also met with TSA to review future layout needs, particularly the potential repurposing of the Checked Baggage Inspection System (CBIS) area to accommodate a second CBIS machine. Mr. Smith explained that the Airport currently has only one (1) CBIS machine, which has been unreliable, often forcing TSA to hand-inspect bags and causing delays in baggage processing and aircraft loading. TSA advised that, based on Nantucket's passenger and baggage volumes, the Airport does not qualify for a second TSA provided CBIS machine. Mr. Smith outlined two possible paths to continue designing the space in hopes of eventually securing TSA approval or have the Airport purchase a second machine independently. If purchased by the Airport, all future maintenance costs would fall to the Airport. Initial cost estimates range from approximately five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) to one million dollars ($1,000,000). The Commission will need to determine how to proceed once more detailed pricing and maintenance information is available.

031026-01 Housing Production Plan

Mr. Smith reported that a bed assignment plan was prepared following the previous Commission meeting. The Airport currently has eight (8) beds available in the dormitory and five (5) beds at the Thompson House for the upcoming season. Mr. Smith has been coordinating with Operations and FBO management to determine how best to allocate these rooms to seasonal employees who require housing. Seasonal hiring is still underway, with an anticipated need for approximately fifteen (15) seasonal staff. At present, ten (10) to eleven (11) seasonal employees have been selected, and the number of employees requiring housing is still being confirmed. Mr. Smith noted that housing needs vary from year to year, as some returning seasonal employees do not require accommodations. Mr. Smith also explained that incorporating full-time staff into the available rooms is challenging because doing so would limit the Airport's ability to meet seasonal housing needs. Based on current availability and anticipated demand, there appears to be little to no capacity to offer housing to outside support services or other Town departments.

031026-02 Fuel Subcommittee Update
Fuel Farm Expansion FY 2027 Capital Request

Mr. Marks reported that the Fuel Subcommittee reviewed the fuel farm expansion plan in light of the fact that it could not be advanced for the upcoming Town Meeting. The subcommittee agreed to regroup and focus on developing a complete design, using guidance from the committee and staff, to ensure the layout accommodates increased fuel storage and future decommissioning of the underground tanks, including the eventual conversion to two (2) Avgas tanks and one (1) Jet A tank. Mr. Marks noted that the goal is to sequence the work so that future changes do not disrupt existing operations. The subcommittee also discussed the possibility of filing a separate MEPA/NEPA review, given the immediate operational need demonstrated by recent fuel shortages. This separate filing would allow the project to proceed independently from the broader environmental review approved earlier in the meeting. Mr. Marks added that the subcommittee continues to evaluate a four (4) tank configuration.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the proposed approach aligns with the environmental permitting contract recently approved by the Commission. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that the fuel farm expansion is included in the current MEPA/NEPA scope and that the Airport has already asked the state whether the project can be segmented and advanced sooner as a standalone filing. The state has not yet provided an opinion. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of ensuring that the work remains covered under the existing contract and associated grant funding, even if segmented, and Lasdin confirmed that it does.

Mr. Leavitt added that, at the prior meeting, the Commission discussed attempting to secure funding for the project in the current budget cycle. Although there was support for that approach, the warrant had already gone to press, and the complexity of the request made late-cycle amendments impractical. The Fuel Subcommittee therefore recommends deferring the funding request to the next budget cycle while continuing engineering work. Mr. Leavitt noted that, because the Commission previously voted to include the project in next year's budget, a clarifying vote to formally move the request forward one (1) year would be appropriate.

Mr. Leavitt made a **Motion** to defer the fuel farm expansion to Fiscal Year 2027 as a $3,000,000 capital request. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Seasonal Staffing

Mr. Leavitt reported that both the Commission and the Fuel Subcommittee have discussed the need for adequate ramp staffing, particularly with increased fuel supply expected this year and in future seasons. Based on staff input, the subcommittee recommends increasing seasonal staffing from ten (10) to eleven (11) line employees and from two (2) to three (3) supervisors. Ms. Basheva confirmed that the budget can accommodate the additional positions, and the subcommittee understands that the positions must be processed through the union's posting requirements. The recommendation is to move these positions forward to ensure safe ramp operations and support the Airport's goal of increasing fuel delivery capacity.

Mr. Leavitt also reviewed the subcommittee's discussion on recruitment. In prior years, seasonal hiring relied largely on local outreach. The subcommittee recommends expanding recruitment to counter-seasonal FBOs in ski regions and warm weather locations such as Palm Springs, Scottsdale, and South Florida. Staff noted that training time for new hires is typically two (2) weeks, but experienced FBO line staff can be trained in about one (1) week, making targeted outreach more efficient. Because many of these FBOs will soon be winding down their winter seasons, the subcommittee strongly encouraged staff to expedite outreach to capture experienced applicants.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on a comment that the Thompson House had been decommissioned. Mr. Smith explained that the building is winterized annually and that some furniture and appliances had been moved into storage, but staff have already begun returning items and preparing the building for use. The Thompson House is expected to be ready by the end of the month.

Mr. Leavitt requested an update at the next meeting on staffing progress and the results of the expanded recruitment effort.

Mr. Gasbarro clarified the distinction between the Commission's policy setting role and management's responsibility for implementing staffing decisions. Mr. Gasbarro stated that the Commission provides direction and expectations, while operational execution rests with Airport Manager.

Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of ongoing communication from management regarding any concerns or constraints to ensure alignment, avoid misunderstandings, and support effective implementation of Commission objectives.

Mr. Harimon added that outreach to other seasonal FBOs has begun, including contact with World Fuel to identify potential experienced candidates.

Retail Fuel Pricing Policy

Mr. Leavitt presented a slide illustrating fuel inventory trends and storage capacity. The chart showed last year's maximum available storage compared to actual end-of-day inventory levels, highlighting periods when fuel levels dropped near the forty thousand (40,000) gallon threshold that triggers operational concern. Mr. Leavitt noted that increased truck capacity this year will raise total on-site storage, allowing the Airport to fill tanks earlier in the season and reduce the risk of summer runouts.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for clarification on the chart's lines, specifically what the blue line represented. Mr. Leavitt explained that it showed end-of-day inventory from September 2024 through August 2025, while the orange line reflected inventory from September 2025 onward.

Mr. Gasbarro then asked whether the graph could be interpreted as a projection for the upcoming season, noting that if this year's sales follow last year's pattern, the increased storage capacity should raise the entire inventory curve above the red forty thousand (40,000) gallon warning threshold, reducing the risk of runouts, emphasizing that this interpretation assumes sales remain consistent and does not yet account for any additional demand. Mr. Leavitt confirmed that, under those assumptions, the Airport should be able to maintain higher inventory levels and added that the Airport already has an additional three hundred thousand (300,000) gallons of confirmed fuel reservations for July and August and will receive seventeen (17) fuel truck deliveries per week instead of fourteen (14), further supporting the ability to keep tanks full during peak season.

Minimum Jet Fuel Purchase Policy

Mr. Leavitt presented a detailed review of regional Jet A and Avgas pricing, noting that Nantucket's retail fuel prices remain below those at major competing airports such as White Plains, Teterboro, Bedford, Boston, East Hampton, and Bar Harbor. Because approximately forty percent (40%) of turbine traffic to and from Nantucket is associated with these airports, Mr. Leavitt explained that the Airport has room to increase pricing while remaining competitive. Mr. Leavitt also noted that many competing airports require minimum fuel purchases, which significantly increases the effective cost for operators, whereas Nantucket does not impose such requirements.

Mr. Leavitt then reviewed how the Airport currently sets retail fuel prices. Airport Finance calculates the blended cost of fuel in storage using FIFO and provides that information to the Airport Manager, who then sets the retail fuel price. The average margin over the past year has been approximately four dollars fifty-five cents ($4.55) per gallon. The Fuel Subcommittee recommends replacing the variable margin with a fixed margin of four dollars ninety cents ($4.90) per gallon and incorporating the cost of fuel-truck rentals, which is approximately eight cents ($0.08) per gallon, into the base cost. Under the proposed system, retail prices would update automatically with each new delivery, preventing revenue loss during periods of rapid price fluctuation and reducing the administrative burden on management. A similar fixed-margin approach is recommended for Avgas as well.

Mr. Leavitt also presented data on customers who frequently use the FBO but rarely purchase fuel. Several operators showed extremely low purchase rates despite high numbers of annual arrivals. Mr. Leavitt noted that many comparable airports impose minimum fuel purchase requirements, and preliminary analysis suggests that applying similar standards to heavy aircraft could generate more than two million dollars ($2,000,000) in additional annual revenue. The subcommittee does not recommend implementing minimums at this time due to current supply constraints but plans to continue evaluating options as storage capacity improves.

Mr. Leavitt made a **Motion** to set the fixed margin for fuel that the finance department will automatically adjust the retail price based on each time a new fuel delivery is received. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

041426-02 Ramp Management Plan Discussion
Mr. Gasbarro provided an overview of the draft Ramp Management Policy for the General Aviation Ramp, noting that the North Ramp, used by commercial operators, will also require review, particularly regarding lease compliance for GPU use and the potential for electrification as part of the terminal optimization project.

Mr. Gasbarro explained that the policy's primary objectives are to reduce emissions, noise, and unnecessary ground run time. The Commission's longstanding fifteen (15) minute APU limit is no longer workable for all aircraft types, so the draft policy proposes tiered time allowances based on aircraft class. The policy also emphasizes education through signage, pilot outreach, and integration with the Airport's existing "fly friendly" efforts. A key component of the policy is the use of the new 1200 Aero monitoring software, expected to be delivered in early May. The system will allow line staff to view real time and historical engine run data through a dashboard, enabling both immediate notifications to operators and post-operation audits.

Mr. Gasbarro stressed that the policy is intended to give staff clear, Commission approved tools so they can enforce limits consistently and point to an adopted standard rather than relying on subjective judgment. The proposed enforcement structure includes an optional verbal warning, followed by written warnings, and then escalating consequences. Rather than financial penalties, the draft policy proposes withholding certain Airport provided amenities, initially catering services, then vehicle escorts, if operators repeatedly exceed allowable run times. Continued noncompliance could result in additional measures at the Airport Manager's discretion, subject to Commission review. An appeal process is included, first to the Manager and then to the Commission. Mr. Gasbarro also described a companion policy formalizing the requirement that aircraft park with engines pointed toward the runway rather than toward the road, which is increasingly important with the new bike path adjacent to the fence line. Exceptions would be allowed only when required for safe aircraft operation, not for convenience.

Mr. Marks noted that there are legitimate air side operational reasons, such as sudden flow‑control delays, that may require extended APU use. Mr. Gasbarro agreed and emphasized the need for clear allowances when delays are outside a pilot's control and suggested that staff document such situations and that the policy may need an explicit exception for justified operational holds. Mr. Gasbarro reiterated that the goal is fairness and environmental stewardship, not penalizing necessary aviation activity, and highlighted the importance of reducing unnecessary run times given Nantucket's clean air and noise sensitive environment.

Mr. Leavitt explained that many large fractional operators allow passengers to book with a two (2) hour departure window, requiring crews to pre‑condition cabins well in advance. Pilots must follow their company operations manuals and cannot independently alter procedures. Mr. Leavitt also noted that financial penalties are ineffective for these operators, while operational inconveniences, such as limiting ramp access, are more impactful, cautioning that enforcement tied to specific crews may be difficult because aircraft often return with different pilots. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged these operational considerations and stated that the policy will require further refinement, and viewed withholding catering as a minor deterrent compared to restricting ramp access.

Mr. Bouscaren stated that withholding services is not advisable and suggested that the most practical approach is direct communication by alerting pilots when they exceed enforced APU times and encouraging them to shut down when feasible, noting that pilots can often manage cabin temperature and ATC coordination without prolonged APU operation. Mr. Gasbarro stated that previous efforts to reduce excessive APU run times have not been effective and emphasized the need for a workable policy that supports ramp staff and improves customer service. Mr. Gasbarro suggested that, in addition to enforcement, the Airport should consider dedicating seasonal staff to data tracking and communication, and noted that publishing APU run time data from the 1200 Aero system by tail number may help prompt cooperation from operators.

Mr. Marks raised questions about GPU availability and whether expanding the GPU fleet or charging for extended GPU use could help reduce APU reliance. Mr. Harimon confirmed that the Airport currently has five (5) GPUs, and Mr. Gasbarro noted that while GPUs cannot cover peak periods, they are useful during lower traffic times and should remain part of the strategy. Mr. Gasbarro reiterated that the Commission made commitments during the South Ramp Expansion Project to better manage run times and encouraged Commissioners to review the draft policy and propose revisions and suggested tabling the item for a month to allow further consideration and to develop a version that can be used in discussions with major operators.

Mr. Bouscaren suggested imposing financial penalties for extended APU use. Mr. Gasbarro responded that while some airports use per‑minute charges, the intent of the draft policy was to avoid financial enforcement and instead focus on cooperation and operational expectations. Mr. Leavitt cautioned that financial penalties are ineffective for large operators, as they have little impact on overall operating costs, stating that the two (2) measures most likely to influence behavior are operational inconvenience, such as parking aircraft in less desirable locations or limiting ramp‑access escorts, and public transparency. Mr. Leavitt suggested publishing data showing tail numbers and operators with excessive run times, noting that reputational pressure is more likely to prompt compliance than monetary fines.

Mr. Harimon supported the need for a stronger APU management policy but emphasized the impact on frontline staff. Ramp employees will be the ones facing frustration from pilots, owners, and passengers if services such as vehicle access or catering are restricted, or if individuals must walk long distances or wait for transportation. Mr. Harimon also noted that tracking violations will require substantial administrative effort, and current staffing levels are already stretched. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged these concerns and clarified that the policy is not intended to require constant real-time monitoring. Violations could be documented during slower periods or identified retrospectively, with notices issued up to thirty (30) days later. To reduce the burden on ramp staff, Mr. Gasbarro suggested creating a seasonal administrative position dedicated to auditing APU data and supporting implementation. The new 1200 Aero software is expected to automate much of the tracking and reduce manual workload.

Mr. Gasbarro also expressed willingness to revise the draft policy to lessen immediate consequences, such as delaying any service restrictions until after multiple documented warnings. The goal is to provide staff with a clear, Commission approved policy to reference when addressing operators, while also giving the Airport a structured framework for discussions with corporate flight departments about reducing excessive run times.

Ms. Collins noted that much of the APU run time discussion has focused on individual pilots, aircraft, and operators. Ms. Collins suggested that once the new 1200 Aero software is operational, the Airport will be able to generate tail number specific data that can be correlated to known operator codes. Ms. Collins proposed developing an outreach strategy at the company level by sharing periodic reports of non-compliant activity to highlight the cumulative impact of each operator's fleet and to encourage corrective action from management rather than individual crews. Mr. Gasbarro agreed, stating that the new software will support this type of operator-level engagement and provide the data needed to reinforce the policy.

Mr. Leavitt cautioned that delayed notifications, such as issuing notices up to thirty (30) days later, would be ineffective because most APU related issues occur during a concentrated sixty (60) to ninety (90) day peak season. By the time a notice is sent, the operator may not return until the following year. Mr. Leavitt recommended a much shorter notification window and emphasized the importance of proactive outreach before the season begins. Mr. Leavitt also noted that most decision makers are not the pilots on the ramp, underscoring the need for direct communication with operator leadership. Mr. Gasbarro agreed and noted that a meeting with major operators has already been scheduled as a season-kickoff discussion focused on customer service, operational expectations, and collaborative problem-solving. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that the intent is to build relationships, gather operator feedback, and introduce the draft APU policy as part of a broader conversation about improving ramp operations.

Mr. Leavitt added that the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA) may be a valuable resource for coordinating best practices between airports and operators and could assist in mediating competing interests. Mr. Gasbarro agreed to follow up and reiterated the goal of developing a revised draft policy for further Commission discussion.

Finance:

041426-03 Airport Fuel Revolver Spending Limit Increase
Mr. Smith reported that the fuel revolver will need to be raised again due to the significant rise in fuel prices. Finance has reviewed projected costs for the remainder of the fiscal year and determined that the current authorization will be insufficient. Mr. Smith requested a motion to increase the fuel revolver to eleven million dollars ($11,000,000).

Mr. Bouscaren made a Motion to increase the fuel revolver spending limit from $8.5 million to $11 million dollars. Second by Mr. Leavitt and Passed by the following roll call vote:

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

Manager's Report – Mr. Smith reported on:

Project Updates – AIP
No update.

Project Updates – Non-AIP
No update.

RFP/Bid Status:

- The Invitation for Bids (IFB) Commuter Apron Rehabilitation Project is out for bid with a deadline of April 22.
- The Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation of the Effectiveness of PFAS Containing Firefighting Foam Treatment Systems will be issued April 15, with a pre-bid meeting scheduled for April 23.
- The Invitation for Bids (IFB) Construction of Concrete Hardstands for Gate 2A construction began last week and remains on schedule for the May 21 completion date. Victor Brandon is currently paving the Airport drive in preparation for the upcoming season, and the work is progressing well, though it has generated some noticeable noise.
- Three (3) Invitations for Qualifications (RFQ) for On-call Planning Services, On-call Engineering Services, and Owners Project Manager (OPM), each receiving three (3) proposals. Mr. Smith requested Commissioner participation to evaluate the proposals. Mr. Bouscaren agreed to join the evaluation committee.
- The Invatation for Bids (IFB) Airport Perimeter Fence Repairs was completed on April 3 and awarded to Premier Fence.
- The Request for Proposals (RFP) Annual Aviation Fuel Farm Fire Protection System Testing was completed on April 8 and awarded to Carlysle Engineering.

- ✈ The Request for Quotes (RFQ) FAA Traffic Control Tower Windows has been issued on April 8 with a deadline of April 22.
- ✈ The Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) Former Administration Offices for Aeronautical Use for possible aviation school, flight training organizations, and aircraft maintenance repair was issued on April 8 with a deadline of May 6.

Operations Updates:

- ✈ **Airline Service** – Mr. Smith reported that there will be no up-gauge to the A319 this summer. However, an up-gauge is strongly anticipated for next summer, supported by the fact that the airline has doubled its on-island workforce after purchasing additional employee housing. Mr. Smith also noted that there will be no dual operations this summer, in an effort to keep activity minimal

Personnel Report:
No update.

Commissioners' Comments
Mr. Leavitt reported receiving multiple notices from major Northeast FBO chains about a significant uptick in expected traffic tied to the FIFA World Cup this summer. FBOs in the New York and Boston regions are already seeing heavy reservation activity, and they anticipate that visitors traveling for matches may make side trips to Nantucket for leisure. Mr. Leavitt asked whether the Airport has planned for any additional traffic impacts and offered this as an early heads-up.

Public Comments
None.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

05/14/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
03/10/26 Draft Minutes
03/18/26, 04/01/26 Warrant Approvals

Exhibit 1
TSA Lease Agreement
ACK Surf School License Agreement
Unifi Aviation Operating Agreement
DJ Products Contract
Slate Aviation License Amendment
McFarland Johnson Task Order MJ-PA-06
McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-EN-17 Amendment No. 1
Sub-Lease Guidelines
PFAS Table
Sub Committee Update
Ramp Management Policy Draft
Fuel Revolver Analysis
February 2026 Statistics
February 2026 APU Log