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
June 9, 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; Philip Cox, Cox Aviation; and Kevin Bartlett, Cox Aviation.

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 05/12/26 Draft minutes.

Mr. Marks made a **Motion** to ratify the 05/13/26 and 05/27/26 Warrants. **Second** by Mr. Bouscaren and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Public Comment:
None.

060926-01 Agenda Production and Distribution
Mr. Gasbarro introduced the agenda item on Agenda Production and Distribution, explaining that agendas are typically drafted by staff one (1) week in advance, reviewed by the chair and vice chair, and supplemented by commissioner requests made either at meetings or at least forty-eight (48) hours before posting. Mr. Gasbarro then invited Mr. Leavitt to present the item.

Mr. Leavitt explained that the Fuel Subcommittee had reviewed its process and found that receiving minutes only the night before meetings made it difficult to track prior discussions and follow-up responsibilities. Other Town committees were noted as issuing minutes within a few days using automated transcription tools. The subcommittee unanimously adopted a requirement that minutes be distributed within seven (7) calendar days, which has already improved clarity and preparation. Based on that experience, Mr. Leavitt proposed adopting the same practice for the full Commission, with minutes distributed within seven (7) days and any substantial edits redistributed within an additional seven (7) days.

Mr. Smith acknowledged the workload required to meet a seven (7) day timeline and noted that Ms. Reuss has been exploring AI-based software to accelerate drafting. Ms. Reuss confirmed that a software demonstration occurred and that a trial will take place at the following monthly Commission meeting.

Mr. Gasbarro recalled a prior policy drafted more than a decade ago calling for a ten (10) day timeline and suggested that ten (10) calendar days may be more workable than seven (7), given weekends and the need for Commissioners to review materials and resolve questions before meetings. Receiving minutes too close to the meeting can limit the ability to address issues in advance.

Mr. Leavitt made a **Motion** that minutes be distributed within ten (10) calendar days following each meeting, and that substantial edits received be redistributed within ten (10) calendar days of receipt. **Second** by Mr. Bouscaren and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Pending Leases/Contracts Mr. Smith presented Exhibit 1 for approval of the following contracts, leases, and contract amendments.

- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract Amendment**
  Contract amendment reducing Task Order MJ-PA-06 (MEPA/NEPA 2027–2029 Services) by $68,312.15, establishing a new total contract value of $720,135.91.
- **TRAC Builders, Inc. – Contract**
  Contract for $195,000 to evaluate the PFAS Treatment System in the Fuel Farm area, requiring the contractor to provide all labor and materials, with a completion date of August 9, 2027.

- ✈ **McFarland-Johnson – Contract**
  Contract for $1,500,000 under Task Order MJ–EN–18 for Terminal Renovation and Expansion Design and Bid Services.
- ✈ **Veoci – Contract**
  Contract for $100,625 for a three (3) year software subscription effective July 1, 2026.
- ✈ **Allegion – Contract**
  Contract for $96,900 for automatic door service, repair, and maintenance, effective July 1, 2026, with a three (3) year term.
- ✈ **Blown Away – Contract**
  Contract for $24,000 for the replacement and installation of Chiller Compressor No. 2, with a three–month completion timeline.

Mr. Smith requested that the McFarland–Johnson Task Order MJ–EN–18 be placed on hold, explaining that the Airport has just selected its OPM and is still completing the Independent Fee Estimate (IFE). A clearer scope and fee will be available in the coming weeks, and a special meeting is already anticipated later in the month to address expiring on–call contracts. Deferring the task order until that meeting will allow consideration with complete pricing and a finalized scope.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the previously authorized one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000) for McFarland–Johnson reflected funds already spent for preliminary design work submitted with the FAA grant application. Mr. Smith explained that the amount came from a February authorization letter allowing design work to begin on a not–to–exceed basis, but no invoices have been paid.

Mr. Lasdin clarified that design work has been performed and invoices exist, but payment cannot be processed due to confusion between the authorization letter and the absence of a formal task order. The task order on the agenda was intended to release funds for work completed to date. With the new OPM recommending a pause until the full scope and independent fee estimate are finalized, the intent is to issue one (1) comprehensive contract rather than multiple amendments. Mr. Lasdin will provide the total spent to date, noting that the amount is well below one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000). Mr. Gasbarro confirmed support for ensuring payment for completed work while proceeding with the revised contracting approach.

Mr. Marks made a **Motion** to approve the leases, contracts, and contract amendments as set forth in Exhibit One (1), excluding the McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-EN-18. **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>:

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

Mr. Smith reported that 90 Skyline Drive is awaiting a Wannacomet Water inspection before the connection can be activated. The estimate for 1 Nobadeer Farm Road was approved on May 27, and the Airport is waiting for the contractor to complete the work. The final outstanding property, 6 Evergreen Way, did not accept certified mail sent by McFarland-Johnson; the Airport will attempt one (1) additional in-person delivery, consistent with counsel's guidance, to encourage connection to municipal water. Mr. Smith also noted that the PFAS HALT project is scheduled to begin July 6, including painting work in the fuel catch basin and fuel farm area.

021324-01 Terminal Optimization Project

Mr. Smith reported on a recent scoping meeting with the FAA and MassDOT regarding potential discretionary funding for the terminal project. Neither agency had funding available for the terminal at this time; MassDOT indicated that limited support may be possible in Fiscal Year 2029. Updated estimates place the terminal project cost at approximately thirty-three million dollars ($33,000,000). Three (3) options were presented: discontinue the project and continue using the temporary tent structure; complete the design only to create a shelf-ready, biddable project; or proceed through full design and construction. Long-term borrowing projections for a thirty (30) year general obligation bond at an estimated four and one-half percent (4.5%) interest rate indicate total payments of roughly sixty million dollars ($60,000,000), with annual debt service of approximately two million thirty thousand dollars ($2,030,000).

Mr. Gasbarro noted that the Commission is at a decision point, emphasizing the need to determine whether completing design is appropriate without a commitment to full construction, or whether the Airport should advance the entire project given the terminal's long-term operational needs. Mr. Bouscaren expressed support for completing the design, citing the approximately one million dollars ($1,000,000) already invested. Completing design would position the Airport for future funding opportunities and provide a shovel-ready project. Electrification of the hardstands was identified as a likely requirement regardless of whether the terminal expansion proceeds. Mr. Marks agreed that advancing the project is necessary, noting that the temporary tent structure has exceeded its useful life and represents an ongoing annual expense. Completing design was described as an important step toward meeting sustained passenger demand.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) eligibility. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that preliminary calculations indicate approximately fifty-three percent (53%) eligibility for the proposed terminal project, compared to fifty-nine percent (59%) eligibility for the existing facility. Mr. Gasbarro reiterated support for completing the design and noted that the Airport should begin evaluating rates and charges to prepare for the long-term cost center associated with the terminal.

Mr. Leavitt asked why the FAA declined to fund the terminal while nearby airports with lower traffic volumes received awards. Mr. Lasdin explained that the FAA referenced significant prior federal investment at Nantucket, including approximately thirty-four million dollars ($34,000,000) for the South Apron, and acknowledged that the Airport is seeking substantial future federal support for a major runway project. FAA funding priorities also tend to favor pavement projects over buildings.

Mr. Leavitt asked for clarification on the cost of completing design work, noting support for advancing design but requesting confirmation of the portion of the thirty-three million dollars ($33,000,000) total project cost associated with this interim phase. Mr. Lasdin explained that the cost breakdown appears in the materials distributed to the Commission, showing approximately three million dollars ($3,000,000) in design-related consultant costs and approximately two hundred fifty thousand dollars ($250,000) in OPM costs. The combined amount to reach bidding readiness is estimated at three million two hundred fifty thousand dollars ($3,250,000).

Mr. Smith noted that the updated figures were received earlier in the day and had not yet been circulated. Ms. Menon shared the cost comparison document, outlining three options: maintaining the existing hold room tent, completing design documents only, or completing full design and construction. The presentation summarized capital costs incurred to date, anticipated near-term capital needs, and long-term life-cycle considerations. Maintaining the tent is projected to require approximately seven hundred thousand dollars ($700,000) in near-term capital investment due to fabric replacement and structural deterioration, reflecting the tent's approaching end of useful life. The design-only option reflects approximately three million three hundred thousand dollars ($3,300,000) in soft costs, including design and OPM services. Full construction remains estimated at thirty-three million dollars ($33,000,000), inclusive of design, construction administration, and a ten percent (10%) contingency at the current schematic stage. Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that the Commission's potential commitment under discussion is approximately three million three hundred thousand dollars ($3,300,000), consisting of roughly three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) for design and two hundred forty-six thousand dollars ($246,000) for OPM services. Mr. Lasdin added that both figures will undergo Independent Fee Estimates (IFEs) and remain preliminary.

Mr. Marks requested information on the tent's life cycle and long-term cost implications. Mr. Lasdin stated that the tent was installed in 2018 and is now approximately eight (8) years old. Fabric has already been replaced twice, and structural components are showing rust. Anticipated capital needs include approximately five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) in 2028 for structural replacement, bringing total tent related capital investment to approximately one million six hundred thousand dollars ($1,600,000) over the next five (5) years. Mr. Gasbarro noted that this equates to roughly one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) per year in ongoing costs, which is relevant when evaluating rates and charges and comparing long-term financial impacts of maintaining the tent versus advancing the terminal project.

Mr. Leavitt requested clarification on the differing project totals shown in the cost comparison table, noting that earlier discussion referenced a thirty-three million-dollar ($33,000,000) project cost, while the Option 3 column displayed approximately thirty-five million dollars ($35,000,000). Mr. Leavitt asked whether the higher figure included the design costs shown in the center column. Mr. Lasdin directed attention to the detailed cost summary on the second page, which lists a total project cost of thirty-three million four hundred thousand dollars ($33,400,000). Ms. Menon confirmed that the $34.9 million figure appearing in the Option 3 column was a typographical error and likely reflected a duplicated line item. The correct total remains approximately $33.4 million. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that the working estimate for decision-making purposes is approximately thirty-three and one-half million dollars ($33,500,000), noting that the project has not yet undergone an Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) and that the figures presented are preliminary.

Ms. Planzer noted that FAA terminal funding has historically been limited and asked whether the recent availability of terminal-specific grants was ending. Mr. Gasbarro recalled that the most recent round of funding was expected to be the final year under the current federal authorization. Mr. Lasdin explained that remaining unallocated funds exist within the original ATP program, but it is unclear whether those funds will be released for another year. Current expectations suggest they may be redirected within the FAA budget, though outcomes depend on political factors, including the fall elections.

Mr. Gasbarro observed that recent federal attention appears focused on air traffic control and contract tower improvements, suggesting that remaining funds may be directed toward those priorities. Mr. Lasdin stated that the consulting team will continue monitoring federal programs and will assist the Airport in applying should another opportunity arise. Mr. Gasbarro added that any decision to proceed with design should assume full self-funding, with any future grant awards treated as an unexpected benefit.

Mr. Cox noted that terminal grants have existed for decades under various federal programs and are likely to continue in some form beyond FY2028. Completing design documents and having a shovel-ready project will significantly strengthen the Airport's position when future grant rounds open. Mr. Cox also observed that expectations for receiving a grant this year were optimistic given the limited remaining funds.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about next steps for contracting. Mr. Smith confirmed that the Airport still needs to finalize the on-call engineering and planning contract before the end of the month. Due to delays in receiving cost proposals, a special meeting will be required, and the terminal design task order can be included on that agenda.

031026-02 Fuel Subcommittee Update

Mr. Marks reported that the Fuel Subcommittee met with Mr. Lasdin to review preliminary concepts for the fuel-farm project. The discussion focused on potential funding models that would avoid reliance on Airport capital by pursuing private-interest participation, including coordination with existing fuel suppliers. The subcommittee also reviewed preferred design approaches, including use of above-ground, double-wall tanks installed at grade rather than in containment pits to reduce construction costs. Mr. Lasdin is preparing preliminary cost information to support next steps.

Mr. Leavitt asked Mr. Lasdin whether the preliminary estimate was available for the meeting as previously anticipated. Mr. Lasdin stated that two (2) parallel efforts are underway: outreach to the state to determine whether a privatized fuel-farm model could proceed under applicable regulations, and outreach to additional consulting firms to obtain comparative cost estimates for private versus public construction. Responses have not yet been received, but work is ongoing.

Mr. Leavitt reported on recent fuel-related metrics reviewed at the Fuel Subcommittee meeting. With the newly permitted on-site storage now operational, fuel inventory levels are consistently above the same period last year, tracking seasonal patterns but with greater volume available due to the additional storage capacity. Memorial Day and Wine Festival weekend activity showed an increase of approximately ten and one-half to eleven percent (10.5–11%) in gallons sold. Given current market volatility, the subcommittee emphasized focusing on gallons pumped rather than revenue as the more reliable performance indicator. Mr. Leavitt also summarized the ongoing initiative to convert non-fuel purchasers into fuel purchasers. Airport staff distributed a flyer in the FBO prior to Memorial Day explaining that fuel sales fund Airport capital needs and encouraging operators to resume the regional tradition of purchasing courtesy fuel, with suggested minimums aligned with neighboring airports. Fifty (50) targeted letters were also sent to operators with the lowest purchase rates, ranging from zero (0) to less than twenty percent (20%). The subcommittee will review impacts at the end of June. The subcommittee additionally began work on specifications for a new fuel-supply RFP. Staff are collecting examples from other municipally owned FBOs in the region, including Martha's Vineyard, with the goal of assembling a draft RFP for release in the fall. Mr. Leavitt noted that, based on preliminary calculations, funding the terminal design-only option would require approximately six hundred sixty-three thousand (663,000) additional gallons of annual fuel sales, while funding full construction would require approximately six million eight hundred thousand (6.8 million) gallons.

Mr. Gasbarro requested copies of the flyer and the targeted letter, noting that the Commission had not previously discussed the decision to send individualized letters. Mr. Gasbarro stated that subcommittees are advisory to the Commission and that actions of this nature should be reviewed and authorized at the Commission level. Mr. Leavitt acknowledged the concern and indicated that the subcommittee would adjust its process as needed. Mr. Smith confirmed that the letter was issued under the Airport Manager's signature and agreed to provide copies to Mr. Gasbarro.

Mr. Gasbarro asked about next steps for the subcommittee. Mr. Leavitt stated that the subcommittee is awaiting cost information from Mr. Lasdin and will continue meeting, with updates brought back to the full Commission as a standing agenda item.

051226-02 Investigation of Solar Installation Alternatives
Mr. Gasbarro opened the discussion on the investigation of solar alternatives and asked whether the item should remain on the agenda or be treated as a staff-level project with updates provided as information becomes available. Mr. Smith stated that the investigation is being handled as a staff project and is being evaluated in connection with the terminal project. An update was provided regarding prior conversations with a solar consultant shortly after Mr. Smith's arrival at the Airport. The earlier concept involved a solar farm, which was not feasible due to Natural Heritage and protected-species constraints. The consultant recently re-established contact and will be on-island on July 16, at which time staff will meet to discuss potential solar applications for the terminal and other Airport buildings.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether Commissioners had additional input and requested clarification from Mr. Leavitt, who originally raised the topic. Mr. Leavitt stated that the intent at the prior meeting was for staff to investigate options and report back, and suggested establishing a general sense of timing for when findings might be presented.

Ms. Collins reported that preliminary research has been conducted and outlined two (2) possible approaches: engaging McFarland-Johnson through a task order to perform a siting analysis and cost-benefit review, or conducting an internal staff analysis without consultant support. Mr. Gasbarro expressed a preference for treating the effort as a staff project at this stage, given existing consultant workload, suggesting a general update at the August or September Commission meeting. Mr. Marks recommended beginning with a review of existing Airport buildings and hangars using readily available online solar-capacity calculators, which can estimate potential output, installation capacity, and projected savings based on roof orientation and size.

<u>Finance</u>:

060926-02 FY2028 Capital Project Requests
Mr. Smith reported that executive staff has begun drafting the upcoming Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), using the existing five (5) year plan as a baseline. A preliminary review suggests deferring the runway project by two (2) years due to the absence of engagement from elected

officials and ongoing challenges securing FAA funding. Advancing Taxiway Charlie and Taxiway Bravo improvements into the next project year is recommended, as these projects address two (2) high–traffic hot spot areas and align with recent national focus on runway–incursion mitigation. Standard vehicle replacements remain included. A placeholder has been added for the groundwater and soil investigation (Phase IV), pending updated cost information from Weston Solutions; the current figure is expected to be revised downward once data is received. Placeholders also remain for solar panel evaluation, the fuel–farm expansion, and the proposed fourteen (14) unit T–hangar complex. For the T–hangar project, staff is evaluating whether to pursue Airport–funded construction or a ground lease to a third–party developer. Staff will review the draft CIP with Mr. Lasdin later in the week. FAA and MassDOT have scheduled regional CIP meetings between July 13 and August 31, and early participation is encouraged due to the significance of their input on grant–funded projects.

Mr. Gasbarro offered several comments. Given the Commission's current focus on the terminal project, non–AIP–eligible items in the next project year may warrant shifting to later years. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the proposed fourteen-million-dollar ($14,000,000) T–hangar project may not be essential in the immediate term and could be moved to an out–year such as FY31. The proposed five-million-dollar ($5,000,000) SRE building expansion may also be deferrable given the return of existing space to service. Mr. Gasbarro recommended relabeling the groundwater and soil investigation line item as "PFAS Remediation" to more accurately reflect the scope and to ensure clarity for local and federal reviewers.

Regarding the terminal placeholder, Mr. Gasbarro noted the discrepancy between the twenty-million-dollar ($20,000,000) supplemental request and the thirty-three million dollar ($33,000,000) project estimate discussed earlier. Ms. Basheva clarified that the Airport has an existing seventeen million five hundred thousand dollars ($17,500,000) appropriation from FY2023 for terminal improvements, of which only eight hundred twenty–four thousand dollars ($824,000) has been spent, leaving approximately sixteen million dollars ($16,000,000) available. The twenty million dollar ($20,000,000) placeholder represents a supplemental request should the Commission elect to proceed. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the smaller sub–$1 million items appear reasonable, and that prioritization should focus on non–AIP–eligible projects requiring local funding.

Mr. Marks stated that the proposed T–hangar project should be pursued through a land–lease arrangement, allowing a private party to construct the facility rather than the Airport undertaking the project directly. This approach would meet demand for enclosed aircraft storage while avoiding the Airport's capital expense. Mr. Gasbarro questioned whether the project should remain in the next CIP year given the number of competing priorities and noted that even a privately built hangar would still require Airport oversight, administration, and compliance with procurement requirements. Mr. Marks responded that a land–lease model would eliminate the need for Airport–funded construction and associated OPM services, and therefore the fourteen–million–dollar ($14,000,000) project cost should not remain in the CIP if the Commission elects to pursue a private development model. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that, under a land–lease structure, the project could be evaluated separately from the CIP.

Mr. Gasbarro noted concerns with the CIP listing for employee housing, observing that the current entry describes a single duplex at a cost of six million dollars ($6,000,000), which is significantly higher than the market cost of purchasing an existing dwelling. Mr. Gasbarro stated that this framing has repeatedly drawn criticism in prior hearings and suggested reconsidering how the request is presented. Ms. Basheva explained that the CIP list shown to the Commission reflects last year's entries and has not yet been reviewed with Mr. Lasdin. The purpose of presenting the draft at this stage is to obtain Commission direction before the CIP is submitted to the Capital Program Committee (CAPCOM) in July. Staff is seeking guidance on whether the Commission wishes to continue pursuing an employee-housing initiative and, if so, how it should be structured.

Mr. Gasbarro agreed that early Commission review is the appropriate process and recommended avoiding a description that specifies a single dwelling at a cost of one million dollars ($1,000,000) per bedroom. Mr. Gasbarro suggested that if the Commission wishes to retain a placeholder, it should be labeled more broadly as "employee housing" to allow flexibility in determining whether to purchase, build, or pursue another model. A broader description would also avoid repeating past objections from review bodies. Mr. Leavitt concurred, recalling prior discussions in which the Commission agreed that presenting the request as a six-million-dollar ($6,000,000) townhouse project would not be supported by CAPCOM or FINCOM. Mr. Leavitt stated that the request should not be presented in that form again.

Mr. Leavitt requested a report showing all previously approved capital projects with remaining unspent balances, along with projected spending timelines for those projects. Mr. Leavitt noted that several items listed for Fiscal Years 2027 and 2028 may not occur within a single year and asked for a clearer picture of anticipated cash requirements across multiple fiscal years. Ms. Basheva agreed to prepare the report and listed several previously approved articles that are either underway or scheduled to begin shortly, including MEPA/NEPA work, apron reconstruction, the high-speed exit, ramp mast lights, the GSE storage building, geothermal improvements, environmental permitting and monitoring, Taxiway G and the South Apron, Bunker Road rehabilitation, the tent appropriation of five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000), hardstand completion, and various vehicles and equipment. These items have been approved at Town Meeting but work has not started yet. Mr. Gasbarro stated that a consolidated report would be helpful for decision-making, as it is difficult to evaluate the next CIP year without understanding the full set of active and pending obligations. Ms. Basheva confirmed that the report will be prepared for the next meeting.

Mr. Leavitt also requested a schedule outlining all required meetings, deadlines, and approval steps for the CIP process, including CAPCOM, Town Finance, FAA, and MassDOT. Understanding the sequence of required submissions would help avoid last-minute deadlines. Ms. Basheva explained that the Town has not yet issued its formal schedule, but historically CAPCOM submissions occur between the first and second week of August, followed by review meetings. A draft timeline can be prepared using prior-year patterns and updated once official dates are released. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the Airport must also account for its own internal timeline, including Commission review and approval, and that the compressed August schedule leaves limited time for revisions. Earlier CIP discussions, ideally in May, would provide more flexibility in future years. Mr. Leavitt requested that the draft schedule include both Town-level and FAA/MassDOT milestones.

Mr. Leavitt asked whether the Airport is tracking actual coastal erosion rates at the runway end, noting that the original master plan relied on projected erosion of approximately eight (8) feet per year. Mr. Leavitt suggested that updated measurements could inform whether the runway-shift schedule should be accelerated or delayed. Mr. Smith and Mr. Harimon stated that prior erosion estimates were based on modeling performed during the master-plan process and that additional physical measurements may warrant consideration.

Mr. Gasbarro noted that some survey data was collected during the fence relocation Notice of Intent process, but emphasized that the need to shift the runway is driven not only by erosion but also by existing deficiencies in the runway safety area. The Airport is already operating with less than the required one thousand (1,000) foot safety area, and the coastline's angle results in uneven encroachment. Mr. Gasbarro added that pavement deterioration and changes in the design aircraft also contribute to the need for full reconstruction. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that historic erosion on that section of coastline averages approximately eight (8) feet per year, based on long-term data from coastal zone management and the Town's resiliency study. Erosion is episodic rather than linear, with some storms causing significant single-event losses. FAA asset-management standards assume a twenty (20) year pavement life, and applying the erosion rate over that period, combined with the existing safety-area deficit, resulted in the determination that the runway must shift four hundred (400) feet toward Runway 24. Mr. Lasdin noted that requesting a smaller shift would require reopening the FAA study and demonstrating that a reduced distance is justified.

Mr. Gasbarro observed that part of the underlying question is whether the current out-year placement of the runway project remains appropriate. Mr. Lasdin stated that reconstructing the runway in place was previously estimated at approximately one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000), while shifting the runway increases the cost to approximately one hundred twenty-eight million dollars ($128,000,000). Most of the cost is attributable to reconstruction itself, and the FAA is unlikely to support a rebuild without addressing the safety-area deficiency.

060926-03 Ratify MassDOT Grant Award–AIP 90–Runway 6-24 Centerline Rehabilitation Construction Only $34,885.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the MassDOT Grant Award, AIP 90, for the Runway 6-24 Centerline Rehabilitation. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

060926-04 Ratify MassDOT Grant Award–AIP 91–Install Apron Lights $44,341.32.

Mr. Bouscaren made a **Motion** to ratify the MassDOT Grant Award, AIP 91, for the Installation of Apron Lights. **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

Manager's Report – Mr. Smith reported on:

Project Updates – AIP

- **Master Plan** – Mr. Smith reported that the master plan has now been officially completed. The final documents will be uploaded to the Airport's website for public access, consistent with how the draft materials were previously shared.

Project Updates – Non-AIP

- **Concrete Hardstands** – Mr. Smith reported that the concrete hardstand at Gate 2 was completed on May 21, including all lead-in line painting, and is fully operational in time for the start of the commercial air-service season.

Tenant Alteration Applications – No update.

RFP/Bid Status:
Mr. Smith reported that the IFB for ARFF Truck Maintenance and Inspection was reissued on June 1, with bids due June 15. The solicitation was previously advertised last month but received no responses, prompting a second issuance in hopes of attracting bidders.

Operations Updates:

- **Ramp Management Plan** – Mr. Smith reported that 1200 Aero has activated the extended-ramp monitoring feature, which now displays the duration an aircraft remains stopped with its APU running. Automated operations-monitor emails are being sent to management and the environmental coordinator, providing real-time APU run time data. A display error previously affecting the live dashboard has been corrected by 1200 Aero, and staff may need to refresh their browsers to view updated information. Mr. Smith noted that the system is already identifying aircraft exceeding the fifteen (15) minute APU limit, enabling staff to engage crews directly. Mr. Harimon used the new data earlier in the day to address a non-compliant aircraft and ensure the APU was shut down.
- **PFAS Treatment System** – Mr. Smith reported that the fuel-farm PFAS project, led by TRAC Builders, is scheduled to begin on July 6. The work includes installation of system components and painting of the fuel-catchment basin. Maintenance is also scheduled to remove accumulated leaf litter from the catch basin within the next week to prepare the area for the start of construction.
- **Airline Service** – Mr. Smith reported that American Airlines is the final commercial carrier to begin seasonal service at the Airport, with operations commencing this coming Friday.
- **Runway Safety Action Training (RSAT) Meeting** – Mr. Smith reported that the annual Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) meeting was held this past Friday with Air Traffic Control Tower personnel. The Airport recorded zero (0) vehicle-pedestrian deviations or incursions for the year, reflecting strong adherence to movement-area safety procedures

and the established letters of agreement with the tower. Mr. Smith commended the security team for ensuring all airfield drivers are properly trained and for maintaining consistent communication discipline, noting that this continued focus has directly supported the Airport's clean safety record.

- ✈ **Geothermal** – Mr. Smith reported that the geothermal treatment-system progressed through an IFE process with Weston Solutions and Tetra Tech. Negotiations are underway, and Weston Solutions is currently adjusting its pricing. Revised costs are expected to be submitted for review by June 10.
- ✈ **Part 139 Inspection** – Mr. Smith reported that the annual Part 139 inspection was completed successfully. Five (5) corrective items were identified, including excess glass-bead material on the airfield caused by equipment malfunction; the area has since been swept and cleared. Required fire equipment gear that had not been replaced in time has now been received and is back in compliance. Additional signage and marking issues were noted, including a sun-faded airfield sign. Mr. Harimon confirmed that the sign has been replaced and that staff are reviewing other signs and placing orders to maintain adequate stock for future replacements.

Statistics:
Mr. Smith reported that one (1) April noise comment had been received but was inadvertently omitted from the statistics and has now been added. The Airport has updated its noise comment form for the current year to require more specific event information, improving data quality and tracking. Mr. Smith encouraged the public to use the revised form. Operations recorded fifteen (15) APU warnings and two (2) second-level APU warnings in April. Mr. Smith noted that May appears to be similar, with approximately eighteen (18) warnings to date.

Personnel Report:
Mr. Smith reported that hiring efforts remain underway for an operations manager, an operations agent, and a seasonal noise-monitoring agent. The Airport currently has twelve (12) operations staff on duty, with two (2) additional hires scheduled to start at the end of June and two (2) more awaiting drug-screen results. All seasonal FBO staff are already in place and working.

Mr. Smith recognized two (2) staff members for recent professional achievements. Madison Collins attended AAAE training in Virginia and successfully earned her Environmental and Planning Certification. Elizabeth Reuss completed the Massachusetts Certified Public Purchasing Official courses for procurement and has received her certification. Mr. Smith commended both for their accomplishments.

Commissioners' Comments
Mr. Leavitt noted that the Air Traffic Control Tower has reduced its operating hours, closing one (1) hour earlier, and referenced a NOTAM indicating the change. Mr. Leavitt asked why the hours were reduced and expressed concern that Airport users received notification before the Commission, and that the change was not included in the Manager's report. Mr. Leavitt requested clarification on the notification process and whether Commissioners should be included on the same distribution list used for Airport users. Mr. Smith stated that the tower reduced its hours due to staffing shortages for the upcoming summer season, as relayed during the recent RSAT meeting. Mr. Smith agreed that Commissioners should be included in notifications going forward.

Mr. Leavitt noted several warrant charges for new furnishings at the Thompson House and asked why replacements were necessary. Mr. Smith explained that the Thompson House was brought back online to meet increased seasonal housing demand, particularly for additional fuelers. Some furnishings had been moved into dormitory storage, but not enough remained to fill all those beds this year. Other items were no longer usable and had been disposed of, requiring new purchases. Mr. Smith reiterated that "decommissioning" historically referred only to shutting off water for the winter, but some furnishings had been removed or disposed of over time.

Mr. Gasbarro added that, during his own warrant review, he noticed a recurring monthly expense for water-cooler service that appeared unusually high and suggested evaluating whether installing filtered bubblers would be more cost-effective, given the quality of local water. Mr. Smith agreed to review the issue. Mr. Gasbarro noted that careful warrant review can surface useful operational questions.

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.
Second by Ms. Planzer and **Passed** unanimously, by the following roll-call vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

06/09/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
05/12/26 Draft Minutes
05/13/26 and 05/27/26 Warrant Approvals
Exhibit 1
McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-PA-06 Amendment No. 1
TRAC Builders, Inc. Contract
McFarland-Johnson Task Order MJ-EN-18

Veoci Contract
Allegion Contract
Blown Away Contract
PFAS Table
Terminal Improvements
Fuel Subcommittee Charts
CIP FY2028
MassDOT Grant Award – AIP 90 – Runway 6-24 Centerline Rehabilitation Construction
MassDOT Grant Award – AIP 90 – Runway 6-24 Centerline Rehabilitation Construction Award Letter
MassDOT Grant Award – AIP 91 – Install Apron Lights
MassDOT Grant Award – AIP 91 – Install Apron Lights Award Letter
April 2026 Statistics
April 2026 APU Log