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
May 12, 2026

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

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

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

Also present: Rich Lasdin, McFarland-Johnson; Priyanka Menon, Fennick-McCredie Architecture; Johnathan McCredie, Fennick-McCredie Architecture; and Jim Soukup, Weston Solutions.

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 03/24/26 and 04/14/26 Draft minutes.

Mr. Marks made a **Motion** to ratify the 04/15/26 and 04/29/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Bouscaren and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

Ms. Planzer – Aye
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.

- **Aloft Aviation Management, LLC – Lease Agreement**
  Lease agreement for $6,800 for approximately 170 square feet in the former Administration Building (flat roof) for aviation school or aircraft maintenance office use, including ramp access.
- **Hyannis Air Services, Inc. Dba Cape Air – Counter Freight Agreement**
  Counter freight agreement to provide service within existing leased premises, with a monthly fee of $0.07 per pound of gross weight in accordance with Airport rates and charges.
- **Forme Barre Nantucket – License Agreement**
  License agreement for fitness classes on Nobadeer Beach with a $1,500 annual business fee, with weekly and biweekly Saturday sessions at 9:00 AM from June 5, 2026 through August 29, 2026.
- **Jet East, Inc. – License Agreement**
  License agreement for aircraft maintenance services with a $1,500 annual business fee, for a one (1) year term.
- **Kapiloff's Glass, Inc. – Contract**
  Contract for $42,670 to supply and install a replacement window at the Air Traffic Control Tower, to be completed before the start of the season.
- **American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) – Contract**
  Contract for $48,510 for a three (3) year Interactive Employee Training Learning Suite (IET-LS) service agreement, providing Service Level No. 2.
- **Ascent Aviation Group, Inc. – License Agreement**
  Contract, $123,768, Perimeter Fence Repair, Repairing Approximately 1,700 Feet of Airfield Perimeter Fence, Permanent Repair, work to be Completed by September, 2026
- **Carlysle Engineering – Contract**
  Contract, $59,600, Fuel Farm Protection System Testing, Annual Inspection and Testing for Fire Pump and Foam Protection System, 3-Year Agreement.
- **Premier Fence – Contract**
  Contract for $123,768 for permanent repair of approximately 1,700 feet of airfield perimeter fence, to be completed by September 2026.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract**
  Contract for $173,435 under Task Order MJ-PN-27 for PFAS Phase IV IRA operation, maintenance, and monitoring services, with a service period through November 2026.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the perimeter fence damaged by the storm is covered by insurance or if reimbursement is expected. Mr. Smith said that all necessary information was submitted to the Town for FEMA review but has not yet received any updates and is still waiting for a response.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on the refueler lease agreement, including whether delivery and fees were included and whether the six (6) month term extended beyond operational needs. Mr.

Harimon confirmed the fees were part of the package and recommended maintaining the term through October to allow flexibility in equipment removal.

Mr. Gasbarro and Mr. Leavitt raised concerns about additional charges, including modem fees, a four thousand five-hundred-dollar ($4,500) hub license fee, and monthly location fees, questioning whether these were already being paid and ensuring they were not duplicative. Mr. Harimon indicated the fees were included but would confirm details.

Mr. Gasbarro noted his support for the Lease Agreement with Aloft Aviation, highlighting that it is especially positive to see a flight school benefit from the arrangement, confirming that fees are waived under the current Rates and Charges and emphasized that supporting such opportunities is a strong benefit to the community.

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

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

<u>Pending Matters</u>:

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project
Mr. Smith introduced the Terminal Optimization Project and invited Priyanka Menon and Jonathan McCredie of Fennick-McCredie Architecture to provide an update on the schematic design progress. Ms. Menon reported that the schematic design package had been completed on schedule and is included in the packet for review.

Mr. Gasbarro expressed support for the design and asked about the likelihood of approval from the Historic District Commission (HDC). Mr. Smith reported that he met with the HDC on May 11 and received positive feedback on the exterior design.

Mr. Gasbarro inquired about the next steps and timeline. Ms. Menon identified submission of agency applications and the upcoming design development phase, scheduled for early June, as the next major milestones. Mr. Gasbarro suggested placing the project on the June agenda for further Commission review and input.

Mr. Leavitt asked about potential Planning Board involvement. Mr. Smith explained that the Planning Board preferred to wait until after HDC review and Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Gasbarro emphasizing early coordination with Planning and legal counsel to confirm permitting requirements.

Mr. Leavitt questioned the number of “excluded” line items in the schematic budget, expressing concern that these items could later increase project costs through change orders. Ms. Menon explained that the primary exclusions relate to a potential redundant TSA baggage screening machine, which is not currently included but has been accommodated in the design should the Airport choose to add it. Additional exclusions include tenant-provided items such as concessions furniture. Ms. Menon clarified that other items may appear excluded in one section but are often accounted for under renovation or other categories within the overall estimate.

Mr. Leavitt emphasized the importance of clearly identifying where excluded items are accounted for to avoid confusion and unexpected costs. Mr. Gasbarro requested that future updates refine these details and reduce ambiguity.
Ms. Menon agreed to improve the clarity of the estimate in the next phase by adding notes and references to show where costs are included elsewhere as the design and budget are further developed.

Mr. Marks asked whether the project scope would conflict with the potential addition to geothermal system, noting that it is a separate project and may require use of the same area. Mr. Smith confirmed the geothermal system would be located outside. Mr. Gasbarro clarified the question, asking whether the current design accounts for and coordinates with any future geothermal system. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that while the geothermal system is not included in this project, coordination between the two (2) efforts is being considered, though not reflected in the current budget.

Mr. Gasbarro also inquired about ramp electrification and whether it is included in the scope. Mr. Lasdin explained that electrification is being incorporated into the design but is not yet finalized in the estimate, noting that the current figures are preliminary and will be updated as design progresses.

Mr. Smith added that the FAA grant award remains pending, with other airports beginning to receive funding decisions, and noted that a meeting with the Airlines is scheduled to review the schematic designs. Initial cost estimates for a potential additional CEBIS machine was discussed, with clarification that the cost would be approximately five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) to purchase the machine and one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) annually for maintenance.

Mr. Gasbarro raised concerns about the cost and timing of the decision, noting that the Commission should determine whether to design space for a future machine, proceed with purchase, or continue operating with a single unit. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that including space in the design would require accommodating associated HVAC and electrical capacity, while excluding it would remove those requirements.

Mr. Leavitt asked about the FAA threshold required to justify funding for an additional screening machine, questioning how much passenger volume would need to increase. Mr. Lasdin and Ms. Menon indicated that no specific threshold had been provided, though it may take up to a decade to reach the required level, and Mr. Lasdin agreed to follow up.

Mr. Leavitt also questioned whether purchasing a machine now could allow reimbursement later, while Mr. Gasbarro suggested designing space for a future machine and making the purchase decision separately.

Mr. Leavitt suggested identifying long lead-time parts with the manufacturer and potentially maintaining spare parts at the Airport. Mr. Lasdin explained that the TSA owns and maintains the current screening machine, including parts and repairs, but noted ongoing challenges due to the Airport's island location, which can delay part deliveries. The possibility of coordinating with TSA to stock spare parts locally was raised as a potential solution. Mr. Leavitt also suggested exploring transportation options to expedite part delivery.

Mr. Harimon noted that designing space for a future screening system would require relocating TSA offices, training, and break areas into the former gift shop space. Mr. Gasbarro observed that this relocation would not be necessary if the space were not planned, but emphasized that it would be short-sighted not to include redundancy in a terminal project of this magnitude. Mr. Leavitt proposed a balanced approach of installing necessary infrastructure, such as power and HVAC, to accommodate a future screening machine.

Mr. Gasbarro proposed preparing and conditioning space for a future screening machine while using it for other purposes in the interim, noting concern that a prime location should not sit unused. Ms. Menon agreed that TSA back-of-house spaces could be relocated to the former gift shop area and that HVAC upgrades could be included, but cautioned against completing full electrical upgrades due to evolving TSA planning standards that could create future compatibility risks. Mr. Lasdin clarified that electrical planning at this stage focuses on understanding overall demand, while Ms. Menon noted that panel upgrades would also be required. Mr. Marks suggested a phased approach, installing certain infrastructure such as cabling while deferring more substantial electrical work.

Mr. Gasbarro summarized the general direction as providing the space without immediately purchasing the machine, while exploring interim uses and considering options such as maintaining spare parts separately. Mr. Lasdin agreed that the design team could further evaluate these options. Mr. Bouscaren questioned whether the project would proceed without grant funding, and Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that, regardless of funding, addressing long-term Airport needs remains important, noting that the current seasonal tent is not a sustainable solution for passenger experience or operations.

071420-03 Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Investigation

Mr. Smith deferred to Jim Soukup, the Airport's Licensed Site Professional (LDP) from Weston Solutions, to provide an update on the PFAS Remediation Status.

Mr. Soukup provided an update on the PFAS remediation project, noting that Phase III was completed in March 2025 and involved identifying contamination, assessing risks, and evaluating remedial technologies, resulting in four (4) alternatives each for soil and groundwater that were reviewed against regulatory criteria to determine recommended approaches. He explained that Phase IV, which focuses on selecting and designing the final remedy, was originally due in March 2026 but required an extension due to the project's scale and complexity; in coordination with MassDEP, a consent order was executed extending the timeline to three (3) years. As a result, the project is now scheduled for the selected remediation system to be constructed and operational by June 30, 2028.

Mr. Soukup reviewed the PFAS Remediation Status presentation and provided an overview of the regulatory framework and remedial alternatives guiding the PFAS cleanup, highlighting the disposal site boundary, the Zone 2 wellhead protection area with stricter requirements due to potential impacts on drinking water, and the non-potential drinking water source area designation for the Airport. A range of soil and groundwater remediation options were outlined, including monitored natural attenuation, capping in place, excavation with on-site treatment or excavation with off-site disposal, groundwater extraction and treatment, geothermal well treatment, and in situ permeable reactive barriers, all evaluated based on effectiveness, cost, feasibility, and impacts on operations and the community.

A combined approach was recommended, using monitored natural attenuation and capping in lower-risk areas, and more active remediation such as in situ soil stabilization and groundwater extraction and treatment within the Zone 2 to address potential risks to the public water supply. In situ soil stabilization was identified as the preferred soil method due to lower cost, reduced disruption, and effectiveness in limiting PFAS migration.

Mr. Soukup emphasized that cost estimates are preliminary, with next steps including refining treatment areas, developing a groundwater model to guide system design, conducting bench-scale testing to confirm treatment methods, and coordinating with regulatory agencies. The process is expected to be iterative, and input from the Commission is sought to proceed with design and permitting.

Mr. Gasbarro summarized that the Commission has until June of the following year to finalize the PFAS remediation plan, with a series of interim steps required to reach that deadline, which was confirmed by Mr. Soukup. Mr. Gasbarro outlined that the immediate task is to proceed with initial steps outlined in the plan, with more advanced actions to follow after additional data, modeling, and conceptual design are presented. It was also noted that the Commission should consider whether it agrees with the recommended remedial approaches for both soil and groundwater among the alternatives presented.

Mr. Marks asked whether runway expansion and planned hangar development in certain areas could help mitigate PFAS remediation by allowing contaminated soil to be capped, particularly in the Sun Island and Runway 15 approach areas. Mr. Smith confirmed that proposed hangar locations could potentially be paved and used as caps, which may reduce remediation costs, but noted that the Sun Island area presents challenges due to protected habitat and coordination with environmental agencies. Mr. Marks suggested that integrating hangar construction and pavement expansion into the Airport's Master Plan could reduce the need for more costly groundwater treatment systems. Mr. Smith added that potential runway shifts would also need to be considered, as future construction could impact remediation planning. Mr. Lasdin clarified that capping is effective for soil contamination only and does not address groundwater impacts. Mr. Soukup agreed, noting that while capping can help reduce contamination entering groundwater over time, a separate groundwater remediation approach would still be required to fully address existing plumes.

Mr. Marks asked whether the northern edge of the PFAS plume is shifting south with groundwater flow or continuing to move north. Mr. Soukup explained that the plume is not moving north, describing the system as a "conveyor belt" in which contamination continues to leach from soil into groundwater and flow toward the ocean, meaning the plume will not recede until the soil source is addressed. Mr. Marks observed that this confirms the need for both soil treatment and groundwater remediation in certain areas, noting that otherwise cleanup efforts would continue indefinitely.

Mr. Gasbarro indicated support for proceeding with the consultant's recommended approach and asked whether any additional direction was needed from the Commission. Mr. Lasdin responded that the next steps include developing a task order and advancing conceptual design and coordination with Natural Heritage.

Mr. Bouscaren emphasized the importance of early coordination with MEPA to avoid major revisions later in the process. Mr. Soukup confirmed that coordination is ongoing in collaboration with McFarland-Johnson, with an iterative approach to ensure regulatory alignment. Mr. Gasbarro stressed the importance of engaging regulators at an appropriate stage in design development to avoid unnecessary rework, and Mr. Lasdin confirmed that such coordination would occur as the project advances through the conceptual design phase.

Mr. Smith outlined the timeline under the consent order, noting that the first year is dedicated to design and the second year, through 2028, is dedicated to implementation and construction, and emphasized the need to prepare a capital article prior to meeting with the Capital Committee for next year's Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Gasbarro recommended adding a placeholder for PFAS remediation to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to ensure it is tracked and updated as costs are refined, which Mr. Smith confirmed is not currently included.

Mr. Gasbarro also inquired about the remaining residences receiving bottled water, and Mr. Smith reported that the number has decreased and is expected to be reduced further, with encouragement to fully phase out bottled water as soon as possible.

031026-02 Fuel Subcommittee Update

Mr. Leavitt provided an update of the Fuel Subcommittee, noting that there has been no recent Fuel Subcommittee meeting but one (1) is scheduled for May 19, and asked Mr. Lasdin for an update on efforts to obtain approval from MEPA/NEPA for a standalone review of the expanded fuel farm. Mr. Lasdin reported that multiple inquiries have been made but no response has been received, indicating that follow-up efforts will continue. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the request relates to project segmentation or modification of existing permits. Mr. Lasdin clarified that the request is for a standalone waiver of the review process, similar to a prior approval granted for Taxiway E.

Mr. Leavitt provided an update on fuel inventory and storage capacity, highlighting increased capacity from additional refuelers and progress toward entering the peak season with higher inventory levels. Mr. Harimon confirmed that inventory levels are expected to meet the target by the end of the week. Mr. Leavitt emphasized the importance of maintaining higher starting inventory to better manage summer demand. Mr. Gasbarro commented that the data visualization clearly shows improved capacity and reduced risk of inventory dropping below critical thresholds, expressing appreciation for the progress and the effectiveness of the approach.

Mr. Leavitt presented additional fuel data visualizations, including cumulative sales versus deliveries, noting that in the prior season deliveries followed behind sales, creating a widening gap that reduced inventory, while current season data shows deliveries ahead of sales, helping maintain tighter inventory levels. Mr. Leavitt emphasized the goal of minimizing the gap between supply and demand throughout the season. Mr. Leavitt also reviewed regional pricing data, noting that while pricing has been slightly adjusted upward, the Airport remains well below comparable regional airports, and further clarified that when accounting for additives, the Airport's pricing remains even more competitive. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether further recommendations would be provided at the next meeting, and Mr. Leavitt confirmed that additional updates are expected.

051226-01 Amend Rules & Regulations Related to Ramp Parking and APU Use

Mr. Gasbarro introduced a proposed amendment to the Airport Rules and Regulations addressing APU use, explaining that, following coordination with legal counsel and Airport staff, it was determined that revising the existing regulations was preferable to adopting a standalone policy.

The proposal replaces the current single provision limiting APU use to fifteen (15) minutes with a more detailed structure that separates arrival and departure operations, requiring APU shutdown within fifteen (15) minutes after parking regardless of scheduled departure time, prohibiting APU use until fifteen (15) minutes prior to departure, and encouraging the use of ground power units (GPUs) when available and practicable. The amendment also incorporates a requirement that aircraft orient engines toward the runway when feasible, formalizing a previously informal or historical practice.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that the proposal aims not only to clarify operational expectations but also to promote increased use of GPUs, highlighting that the Airport currently has limited GPU capacity for larger aircraft and suggesting that a gradual expansion of available units be considered in future budgeting to better support compliance. The revisions are intended to reduce emissions, noise, and fuel burn associated with extended APU use, while providing clearer guidance for both operators and staff.

Mr. Gasbarro further outlined changes to enforcement provisions, explaining that earlier concepts such as catering restrictions were removed in favor of a structured fine system modeled after other airports and state regulations. The proposed enforcement framework includes an initial warning, followed by a two hundred dollar ($200) fine and then a three hundred dollar ($300) fine for repeated violations, with amounts set in accordance with statutory limits to avoid potential legal challenges. Additional enforcement authority includes discretion for the Airport Manager to suspend vehicle escort privileges, recognizing that monetary fines alone may not deter all operators and that operational consequences may provide stronger incentive for compliance. It was also noted that the proposal formalizes procedures for issuing violations, similar to a ticketing system already permitted under local code, and is intended to give ramp staff and administration clear authority and support when enforcing the rules.

Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that consistent application and fairness are important considerations, while acknowledging that some level of administrative discretion will remain. Prior ramp management approaches involving zoning, signage, and segmented restrictions were described as less effective and potentially confusing, with the current proposal intended to provide a more straightforward, enforceable framework. Implementation would likely involve additional seasonal administrative support and the use of new software tools from 1200 Arrow to monitor compliance and track violations in a timely manner, allowing for prompt notification rather than delayed enforcement, with the overall goal of improving compliance, reducing environmental impact, and supporting operational efficiency.

Mr. Marks raised concerns about how pilots are made aware of the APU regulations, noting that the rules are not obvious and questioning whether they are included in widely used aviation tools such as NOTAMs or flight planning platforms. Mr. Gasbarro stated that it is included in the Airport's posted Rules and Regulations and noted the need to make them more visible and accessible. Mr. Marks emphasized the importance of publishing the information in commonly used pilot resources, such as ForeFlight, to ensure awareness and compliance, noting that pilots cannot follow rules they are unaware of. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that broader outreach is needed, while also noting that operators share responsibility for understanding airport regulations, though practical visibility remains a key challenge.

Mr. Leavitt expressed concern that monetary fines would be ineffective for private and corporate jet operators, noting that such costs would be insignificant and unlikely to influence behavior. It was suggested that more effective enforcement would involve operational consequences that directly impact passengers, such as limiting ramp access or increasing inconvenience, which would prompt operators to comply.

Mr. Leavitt proposed an alternative approach focused on incentives, including eliminating GPU usage fees to encourage compliance with reduced APU use, and emphasized the importance of ensuring sufficient GPU availability to meet demand. Mr. Leavitt asked how many GPUs would be needed to meet peak simultaneous demand and raised cost considerations. Mr. Harimon estimated that approximately six (6) to eight (8) GPUs would be needed to meet demand, noting that the Airport currently has six (6) units, with one (1) out of service. Mr. Marks suggested renting additional GPUs for the summer to evaluate demand before committing to purchasing more units. Mr. Harimon noted that prior rental inquiries indicated costs comparable to purchasing, with limited availability from vendors.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about current budget capacity, and Mr. Harimon confirmed funding is available but noted procurement challenges, including long lead times and timing constraints related to the fiscal year and contract approvals. Mr. Leavitt suggested exploring temporary availability from other FBOs, while Mr. Gasbarro recommended moving forward with planning to purchase additional units in the next cycle. Mr. Marks emphasized using current operations to better assess actual demand.

Mr. Leavitt proposed using communication and incentives to encourage compliance, suggesting that GPU fees be waived and clearly promoted to operators as part of efforts to reduce noise and emissions. Mr. Gasbarro supported this approach, noting it would require updates to rates and charges but would be a helpful strategy. Mr. Leavitt also suggested framing GPU use as a higher-value service to emphasize its benefit, while raising concerns about ambiguity in the proposed APU timing language tied to "scheduled departure." Mr. Gasbarro agreed that the language could be simplified, recommending removal of the reference to scheduled departure and retaining a clearer standard limiting APU use to fifteen (15) minutes prior to departure.

Mr. Leavitt raised operational concerns that strict APU limits may not account for real-world situations such as weather delays or ATC restrictions, where aircraft may need to keep passengers onboard and continue running the APU for extended periods. Mr. Bouscaren suggested relocating aircraft to more remote areas of the ramp to reduce noise impacts in such cases. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged these challenges, noting the importance of distinguishing between situations within an operator's control, such as waiting for passengers, and those outside their control, such as ATC delays. It was emphasized that the goal is to curb discretionary APU use while allowing reasonable flexibility for operational constraints, with enforcement and implementation requiring judgment by staff and supported by improved tracking and reporting tools. Mr. Marks added that publicly available ATC delay data could potentially be incorporated into monitoring tools to help verify compliance in real time.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on how penalties would be applied, specifically whether they would be issued to the crew, tail number, or operator. Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that, based on legal guidance, penalties would be issued to the operator, not individual crews, even though this could involve different aircraft or crews under the same organization.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns about fairness and effectiveness, noting that different crews within the same operator could be penalized for others' actions. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the concern but emphasized the importance of engaging operators at an organizational level to encourage compliance, noting that APU overuse has become more widespread and that stronger measures are needed to address environmental and community impacts.

Mr. Gasbarro also discussed balancing enforcement with reasonableness and consistency, suggesting that additional operational measures, such as less desirable parking locations for aircraft using APUs, could help influence behavior. It was noted that improved tracking and reporting of APU usage, including distinguishing between minor and significant violations, would support more targeted enforcement and communication.

Mr. Leavitt proposed shifting the focus from penalties to incentives and outreach, encouraging operators to reduce APU use by offering free GPU service and ensuring availability, while reserving stricter penalties for repeated noncompliance. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that incentives and clearer communication should complement the regulatory framework and supported simplifying ambiguous rule language.

Mr. Smith provided an update on the implementation of new monitoring software from 1200 Arrow, noting that it is nearing readiness and will provide detailed, real-time tracking of APU usage by operator and aircraft, with a full rollout expected by Memorial Day.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to adopt the amended rules and regulations with the modification to keep the existing number eight (8) and strike the proposed number nine (9). **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

051226-02 Investigation of Solar Installation Alternatives

Mr. Leavitt proposed that the Airport investigate solar installation opportunities, noting that electricity is the Airport's largest operating expense and that other regional airports have successfully implemented solar systems. Mr. Leavitt suggested evaluating options including rooftop and ground-mounted installations, ownership versus third-party development, and available grants and programs, and recommended tasking staff with researching feasibility and reporting back. Mr. Marks emphasized that the most effective approach would be systems that offset on-site energy use and are owned by the Airport, noting stronger financial returns under that model. Mr. Gasbarro supported revisiting the concept but suggested focusing on smaller, building-mounted systems rather than large-scale projects, highlighting prior efforts, infrastructure challenges such as carport installations, and the need to consider glare studies and compatibility with airport operations.

Mr. Leavitt also noted advancements in battery storage and potential community benefits from reducing island energy demand. Mr. Gasbarro raised questions about whether the effort should be handled internally or with consultant support and noted that building-mounted installations may face fewer permitting challenges than ground-mounted systems.

Ms. Collins noted that ground-mounted solar installations would face environmental constraints due to priority habitat designations and regulatory requirements under state environmental laws, while building-mounted systems would need to comply with architectural and design standards. Ms. Collins recommended further evaluation of solar feasibility, including analysis of sun exposure and return on investment, and suggested a combination of staff involvement and potential consultant support. Mr. Bouscaren reiterated opposition to ground-mounted systems, emphasizing a preference for installations on existing buildings. Mr. Marks provided context on expected solar output and performance, noting that actual energy generation is typically a fraction of installed capacity, and emphasized the importance of glare studies for aviation safety.

Mr. Gasbarro and Mr. Marks identified hangar rooftops and similar structures as viable locations for installations. Mr. Leavitt suggested initially engaging vendors and using available tools and local examples to gather information before pursuing formal consulting services.

051226-03 Annual Town Meeting Review
Mr. Smith reported that three (3) articles were presented at Annual Town Meeting for the Airport's budget, capital projects, and stabilization fund, which were all approved.

<u>Finance</u>:

051226-04 3rd Quarter Report FY26
Mr. Smith presented the third quarter financial report, noting that Airport revenue totaled $8,186,730, essentially unchanged from the same quarter last year, increasing by just $2,089. The fuel revolving fund spending limit was increased to $8.5 million during the quarter, with an additional increase approved in April, contributing to a year to date increase in total fuel sales of about $3,174,079 (+25%), with some adjustments reflecting reclassification of revenue into the revolving fund. Rental income increased by $105,109 (+13%), and vehicle related income, including parking and taxi permits, increased $19,549 (+16%), while fee income decreased by $19,549 (-10%) and interest income declined $109,333 (-25%) due to lower interest rates. Total revenue, including other financing sources, ended the quarter at one hundred twelve percent (112%) of the annual budget. Operating expenses excluding debt service totaled $2,520,287, a two percent (-2%) decrease year over year. Salaries and Medicare increased modestly by $12,551 (+1%) and $183 (+2%), respectively, along with typical increases in medical insurance. FBO expenses increased $5,652 (+10%), while operations expenses decreased by $51,237 (-74%). Administrative expenses, including utilities and credit card fees, increased by $8,792 (+3%), and repairs and maintenance increased $185,786 (+114%) due to fuel farm inspections and building repairs. Other expenses showed no spending compared to the prior year due to previously paid off town debt. Overall operating expenses including debt service were significantly lower than the prior year, and total expenses ended the quarter at sixty-four percent (64%) of the annual budget.

051226-05 Discuss Supplemental Finance Reports
Mr. Leavitt proposed presenting the Airport's financials in a more business-oriented format rather than the standard municipal accounting format, explaining that the current system does not effectively reflect the Airport's operations as a thirty million dollar ($30,000,000) enterprise. By reorganizing the data using tools such as QuickBooks, financials can be aligned more closely with GAAP principles, allowing for clearer analysis of seasonal performance by shifting the reporting period to better capture full operating seasons. Mr. Leavitt outlined key improvements including separating revenue by business lines, incorporating cost of goods sold to better reflect fuel operations, and reallocating expenses to functional areas such as FBO, terminal, and housing,

noting the importance of smoothing irregular items such as insurance payments and rental income across periods for more accurate reporting. The revised format highlights metrics such as gross margin and EBITDA to better evaluate operational performance, while distinguishing noncash items like depreciation and interest. Mr. Leavitt noted that the approach provides clearer insight into profitability and cash flow available for capital projects and can be maintained with minimal additional effort using the developed templates.

Ms. Basheva acknowledged the effort behind the proposed GAAP-style financial reporting format but explained that, from an operational standpoint, it is not as useful for day-to-day management within a municipal framework, which follows GASB standards, cash-based accounting, and requires separate tracking of funds such as the fuel revolver. Ms. Basheva emphasized that the Airport's primary focus is maintaining balanced budgets rather than profit analysis, though expressed willingness to provide the alternative format if the Commission finds it helpful.

Mr. Marks noted that the revised format aligns with how financials are typically reviewed in a business setting and found it beneficial. Mr. Gasbarro expressed initial concern about workload but supported using the format if it can be produced efficiently, highlighting its value in identifying trends and informing policy decisions. Mr. Leavitt emphasized that the intent is not to increase staff workload but to provide more meaningful financial insight for the Commission, particularly given the Airport's enterprise-like operations. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that the Airport functions more like a business within municipal constraints and that the enhanced reporting could improve understanding of financial performance.

Manager's Report – Mr. Smith reported on:

Project Updates – AIP

- ✈ **Master Plan** – Mr. Smith reported that final signature approval for the Airport Master Plan has been received, marking the completion of the plan. It was noted that additional details and comments will be reviewed and shared with the Commission at a future meeting as follow-up information becomes available.
- ✈ **Commuter Apron** – Mr. Smith reported that only one (1) bid was received for both the Commuter Apron Resurfacing Project and the Fuel Farm PFAS Remediation Project, and that the Airport is awaiting award of the contracts for each before proceeding.

Project Updates – Non-AIP

- ✈ **Sound Barrier Noise Wall** – Mr. Smith reported that the sound barrier wall has been completed and is ready for the season, inviting Commissioners to visit for a tour. Mr. Marks asked about feedback from nearby residents, and Mr. Smith noted that no negative feedback has been received. Ms. Collins added that outreach to abutters has resulted in positive responses, with residents expressing satisfaction with recent noise mitigation efforts and the installation of the wall.
- ✈ **Concrete Hardstands** – Mr. Smith reported that work at Gate Two (2) is nearing completion, noting that the area is currently curing and expected to be ready for the May 21 start of the season, with final painting of lead-in lines scheduled for early the following week.

Tenant Alteration Applications – No update.

RFP/Bid Status:
Mr. Smith reported that the evaluation committee for on-call engineering services, on-call planning services, and Owner's Project Manager (OPM) services are scheduled to meet the following week, with recommendations expected to be presented for approval at the June Commission meeting. Mr. Smith also noted that several procurement efforts are currently underway, including Requests for Quotes for replacement of a terminal chiller compressor, due May 19, and the Invitations for Bids for ARFF truck maintenance inspection and automatic door repairs with a deadline of May 20.

Operations Updates:

- **Airline Service** – Mr. Smith reported that commercial air service will begin on May 21, with Delta, JetBlue, and United all starting operations on the same day, marking the first time three (3) carriers have launched simultaneously at the start of the season, while American Airlines is scheduled to begin on June 12.

  Mr. Gasbarro raised concerns about readiness, including ground handling equipment and staff badging, noting that some preparations appear incomplete. Mr. Harimon expressed similar concerns regarding equipment availability, and Mr. Smith added that only about half of required personnel have been badged. Mr. Smith noted that JetBlue will operate a variable schedule with increased capacity using larger aircraft, such as the A220, despite fewer flights, while American Airlines is expected to operate a high frequency of service on peak days. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of closely monitoring operations and communicating any capacity or logistical challenges to the Commission.

Personnel Report:
Mr. Smith reported that fifteen (15) seasonal staff have been hired and are ready for the season, with dormitory and Thompson House housing now at full capacity.

Mr. Leavitt asked about training timelines, and Mr. Harimon explained that training is being conducted on a rolling basis as staff arrive, rather than in groups. Ms. Basheva and Mr. Harimon noted that many returning employees are among the hires, reducing overall training requirements and onboarding time.

Commissioners' Comments
Mr. Gasbarro reported attending a meeting with FAA staff to discuss flight paths and ways to encourage use of voluntary noise abatement routes. The discussion focused on promoting outreach, improving signage, and exploring coordination with air traffic control to encourage offshore routing where feasible, particularly during non-peak periods. Mr. Gasbarro noted that while these routes remain voluntary and complaints are limited, there is interest from groups such as the Surfside and Civic Associations in minimizing overflight impacts. It was acknowledged that air traffic procedures are complex and influenced by broader system changes, including transitions to Boston TRACON and runway modifications. The meeting was described as a constructive step toward increased collaboration, though the effectiveness of these efforts will need to be evaluated over time.

Mr. Gasbarro announced that a decision had been made not to seek another term, noting appreciation for working with the Commission and that participation will continue through the next meeting before stepping away for family reasons. Mr. Bouscaren expressed thanks for Mr. Gasbarro's many years of service.

Public Comments
None.

Having no further business for Open Session, Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to go into Executive Session, under G.L. c.30A, §21 (a), not to return to Open Session, to review Executive Session Minutes as enumerated on the Agenda for possible release;
Clause 3: To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining or litigating position of the public body and the chair so declares – LIUNA;
Clause 2: To Conduct Strategy Session in Preparation for Contract Negotiations with Non-Union Personnel – Airport Manager Annual Salary and Bonus Assessment.
Second by Mr. Marks and **Passed** unanimously, by the following roll-call vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

05/12/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
03/24/26 and 04/14/26 Draft Minutes
04/15/26, 04/29/26 Warrant Approvals
Exhibit 1
Aloft Aviation Management LLC Contract
Hyannis Air Services, Inc. Counter Freight Agreement
Forme Barre Nantucket License Agreement
Jet East, Inc. License Agreement
Kapiloff's Glass, Inc. Contract
American Association of Airport Executives (AAAE) Contract
Ascent Aviation Group, Inc. Lease Agreement
Carlysle Engineering Contract
Premier Fence, LLC Contract
McFarland-Johnson Task Order
PFAS Table
PFAS Remediation Status Update
Terminal Optimization Schematic Design Drawing and Cost Estimate

Fuel Subcommittee Jet A Inventory
Airport Rules and Regulations
Third Quarter Report FY26
ACK Management Financials