



# Meeting Summary

## **Nantucket Memorial Airport Master Plan**

Working Group meeting, February 25, 2014, 1:30 p.m. • Public Safety Facility  
Attendees: See page 5.

### **Welcome**

Dan Drake, Airport Commission chair, opened the meeting. Working Group meetings are noticed so the public may attend but the meeting will not be considered an Airport Commission meeting due of lack of a quorum.

### **Welcome and News**

Tom Rafter, Airport manager, gave an update on airport activities and issues:

- FUDS: The Bunker Road area has been designated a FUDS (Formerly Used Defense Site). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manages and directs environmental restoration of properties formerly owned by or leased to the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense. Unexploded ordnance has been found and a work plan to deal with it is being prepared.
- Inquirer & Mirror article: Rafter said the headline of the Feb. 6 edition, “Airport looking at \$1.2 million deficit for 2015” was more jarring than the article itself. Rafter said the article focused primarily on the budget which is one tool for financial management.. He emphasized the improvements in the airport’s financial situation over last year. The deficit is down by more than half to about \$500,000.
- GA Building: Grand opening in April.
- Current air traffic statistics: Down in January; passenger traffic up slightly.
- Town remote ferry parking concept: The Town is exploring establishing a free parking lot on Fairgrounds Road with shuttle to the ferry. Airport will monitor this.
- Control Tower rehabilitation: The airport will issue an RFP March 5 to upgrade the Control Tower, keeping it in the same location, with construction expected to start in November 2015.
- Runway improvements: ACK has advertised for contractors for runway routine improvements.

Steve Rawding, MassDOT Aeronautics, announced that two Nantucket students were winners in the state level 2014 International Aviation Art Contest “Flying Saves Lives.” Eleanor Hofford and Samuel Hofford were winners and their work has been forwarded to the National Association of State Aviation Officials (NASAO) in Washington D.C. for national judging. Rafter suggested displaying the winning entries in the terminal.

### **Draft Mission Statement**

Anne McKinnon, Jacobs Engineering Group, led introductions. In addition to the Working Group, four visitors and three representatives from MassDOT Aeronautics were present.

McKinnon reviewed the proposed Mission Statement which was developed to better reflect the Airport’s multi-faceted mission. Rafter said the Mission Statement will be part of a detailed business plan due later. Tom Quigley, Surfside Assn., said he wants to ensure the mission includes responding to impacts on the community. The draft says “ACK is to provide operationally safe, environmentally responsible...air service” and Quigley said that appears to cover community impacts. It was agreed the draft Mission Statement is fine. It will become part of the business plan the Commission will review.



## Master Plan Elements

### *Existing Conditions*

Bill Richardson, Jacobs, described the **AIRFIELD INVENTORY** at ACK and how larger aircraft impact the airport's available apron space, hold rooms, security areas, and other terminal areas (slides 9-25). Armando Cardenas, Island Air, asked how many/what percent of operations are larger carriers. Steve Berardo, Jacobs, reported that per FAA ATADS, "Larger air carriers," United, Delta, US Airways and Jet Blue, operate only 4 months per year. In 2013 they generated 793 operations (arrivals and departures), while total annual operations at ACK = 120,947 (arrivals & departures). Larger carriers generated 0.66% of total annual operations (less than 1% of total). Richardson said airport pavement condition is fair to poor; Rafter noted rehabilitating the apron areas is a main focus.

Part of the Bunker Area is now a FUDS with other land continuing to be leased to Locally Unacceptable Land Uses (LULUs). Richardson said the master plan will look at options for the Bunker Area, such as solar or revenue-generating concerns.

Richardson reviewed runway issues and opportunities. Reducing runway occupancy time with an exit taxiway on Runway 33 could help promote use of over-water approaches and an exit on the far end of Runway 24 would minimize taxi noise and fuel burn. The South Apron is congested and should be addressed in the master plan. Quigley suggested a high-speed turnoff from Runway 6/24. Richardson said good idea; it will be studied in the master plan. Ernest Steinauer, Mass. Audubon, asked if parking spaces are allocated and if a reservation is needed. Rafter said no, it's first come, first served, with consideration of the duration of stay. Reservations are not allowed by FAA.

*Discussion:* Arthur Gasbarro, Airport Commission, said a bigger policy question for apron and taxiway improvements is the cost. The Airport should focus on maintaining what it has and should discuss expansion ideas in this context. Rafter and Richardson clarified the goals of the master plan are to identify needs and potential projects and then identify the costs and financial issues. The master plan will identify who benefits from proposed projects and will set priorities using a number of criteria. Rafter said the master plan must identify needs before dismissing potential projects for cost reasons.

Meredith deCarbonnel, Jacobs, reviewed **ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY CONDITIONS** (slides 28-34). Surveys to identify areas of environmental sensitivity and the 2013 surveys show population growth and large numbers of individual plants indicating management techniques are working well. Surveys also identify areas for habitat enhancement to mitigate future impacts. She said coastal resources are being monitored at Nobadeer Beach where erosion is an issue. Noise: Five days of noise measurements were done in August at six residential locations. The average dBA was between 51 dBA and 58 dBA and the maximum noise level was between 73 dBA and 84 dBA. Ground operations measured in 2013 were similar to 2011 and 2012. On sustainability, the airport already has a number of practices in place (geothermal cooling and heating, auto recharging stations, etc.). Sustainability practices will be carried into the master plan for consideration in design and operations.

*Discussion:* Quigley requested noise data for the full period for which it was collected. Yes if available. Noah Karberg, Airport Environmental Coordinator, said the airport will be acquiring a portable Leq sound level meter. Quigley asked if the fence at Nobadeer Beach would be moved. Rafter said they are looking at alternatives.

Berardo reviewed **AVIATION FINANCES** (slides 37-51) providing a framework that identified the numerous federal, state and local requirements that impact the airports finances. He identified airport operating and maintenance expenses, revenue sources (78% of revenues are aeronautical and 22% are non-aeronautical) and that users pay to run the airport. Eligible capital costs are paid 90% by FAA; 5%, MassDOT; 3%, airport; and 2% private (tenants). ACK is pursuing a \$4.50 Passenger Facility Charge for each ticket. Most airports impose



this PFC; Hyannis is looking at raising its PFC from \$2.00 to \$4.50. PFCs can be used for certain airport capital improvements and can also be used to leverage various bonds.

*Discussion:* Re: proposed PFC. Drake said the new GA building is not eligible for PFC funds but the new terminal building is. It costs the airport about \$340,000 per year and most of the proposed PFC would pay that expense. Drake said the airport is not swimming in cash and borrowing all of its share of GA building costs was not considered wise. Gasbarro asked if peak-period aircraft parking pricing is allowed; July and August peak-period pricing for GA should be studied. Berardo said Massport tried it at Logan Airport over 20 years ago and both the FAA and federal court ruled against its peak pricing program; peak-period pricing is not allowed by FAA and the airport cannot discriminate by charging different aircraft different amounts. Drake cautioned that peak-period pricing could drive business away on a day with no congestion, losing fuel sales and more to Hyannis. Berardo said ease of fee collection should also be considered.

Berardo reviewed **AVIATION ACTIVITY** (slides 54-77). Measurements of activity are done using “aircraft operation” (one takeoff or landing) and “passenger enplanement” (one passenger boarding flight). A focus on passenger data allow focus on terminal crowding and space issues. Five separate travel markets to/from Nantucket were identified, and each market has different degrees of price sensitivity and schedule flexibility.

**Nantucket Airport - Activity Trends 2000-2013**

	<b>% change</b>
Total aircraft operations	-29% <sup>1</sup>
Air taxi operations	-26% <sup>1</sup>
Local GA	-94% <sup>1</sup>
Itinerant GA	-31% <sup>1</sup>
Total passenger enplanements	-42% <sup>2</sup>
Year-round passenger enplanements	-21% <sup>3</sup>
Summer passenger enplanements	27.8% <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 2000-2013      <sup>2</sup> 2000-2012      <sup>3</sup> 2009-2012  
Sources: FAA and Nantucket Airport

High-speed ferry service is growing. Ferries carry approx. 78% of all passengers to the island.

Year-round air service (Cape Air, Nantucket Airlines, Island Air) compete with ferries. Cape Air has been expanding to serve subsidized Essential Air Service (EAS) airports [50% of its business] around the country.

Seasonal air service Issues and trends affecting major airlines include mergers, 50-seat regional jets and turboprops are being retired and replaced with larger aircraft 70-100 seat aircraft, airlines growing use of ancillary fees as a revenue source, and they are limiting capacity growth. These issues may impact future service at ACK. Berardo noted the New York metropolitan area is the biggest air service market for ACK—58% of the summer seasonal origin-destination passengers. The top three regions (NY, DC and Boston) account for 85.2% of ACK passengers.

*Discussion:* Farrell noted an issue that may impact the airlines: new FAA rule requiring six times more hours of training to fly commercially than previously (1,500 hours, up from 250 hours). Farrell and Cardenas said the rule could cause a pilot shortage if the airlines need to hire a lot of pilots in the future. Drake disagreed that all year-round residents are have very flexible schedules; some do, some don't. The new air taxi reservation requirement can be a problem. Berardo said he would modify the table. Farrell said the airline business is very different now from 15 years ago (the building boom ended, 9/11, etc.). Cardenas said Island Air will be Caravan-only eventually and it's a business, so it won't fly empty airplanes. Berardo said that the Caravan is more expensive to buy and operate than the C-402 currently used by Cape Air, etc. If Island and Cape Air were to switch to all Caravans in their fleet, ticket prices would have to rise to cover the higher costs, which would make ferry service even more price competitive. Rafter said the traveling public is largely unaware of the paradigm changes



in the airline industry (such as Cape Air and Island shifting from being a shuttle service), and larger issues driving service changes. Communicating this to the public is critical.

Berardo reviewed **FORECASTS OF AVIATION DEMAND** (slides 82-98), beginning with a caveat that there are a lot of unknowns and a number of assumptions. These variables were captured by developing three forecast scenarios. Risks and opportunities for each aviation market were considered.

Forecast scenarios:

- Status Quo: Assumes current factors affecting each type of aviation activity will continue through 2030.
- Downward Pressure: Assumes certain factors adversely impact aviation activity, such as future scarcity of 100LL aviation fuel that could impact air taxi service by Cape Air and Island Airlines, as well as smaller GA airplanes; another economic recession; rising aircraft operating costs, etc.
- Upward Trends: Assumes a variety of factors stimulate aviation activity, such as the economy expanding and Mass. and Cape and Islands tourism increasing.

Conclusions:

- For year-round air service and passenger enplanements for Cape Air, Island and Nantucket Airlines, the Status Quo forecast scenario is considered likeliest, i.e. the carriers will continue to operate the C-402 and they will be able to maintain competitive pricing with the ferry service.
- For summer seasonal passenger enplanements, the Status Quo scenario is anticipated. It is anticipated that ACK will continue to receive service to four hub airports, that the New York metro region will continue to be the primary market for ACK, and that the airlines will replace their current 50-seat regional aircraft with 70 - 100 seat aircraft. Under this scenario it is not anticipated that significant new service will be added, nor that hub service will change from being summer-only.
- For GA, the Status Quo scenario is anticipated. This scenario assumes the cost of aircraft operations will rise at or below the inflation rate and no major new security regulations or procedures are added.
- For corporate aircraft activity, it is anticipated that it will continue to grow throughout the forecast period, although not as quickly as it did between 2004 and 2007. Also, the average size of corporate aircraft will continue to grow.

Berardo reviewed the FAA Terminal Area Forecasts (TAF), which were prepared for a slightly different forecast period (2012-2040). FAA predicted a 55% increase in total aircraft operations at ACK. Disaggregated, FAA estimated a 73% increase in air taxi and air carrier operations and a 8% increase in GA. FAA projected a 142% increase in commuter passenger enplanements, however no increase in air carrier enplanements. The FAA did not explain the basis of their forecasts nor the underlying factors driving their future estimates. The Jacobs team's forecasts are considerably more conservative.

### Next Steps/Milestones/Schedule

Richardson said the next effort will be analyzing facility needs, alternative concepts and potential impacts. The Working Group will meet again in the spring.

### Q & A/Discussion

Rafter asked if the air forecasts would be tied to certain facility triggers related to time periods or actual passenger numbers? The lag time between planning, design and construction of new facilities can be significant, and major airlines can change their business plans frequently—airports must plan for expansion and not wait for the absolute numbers. Berardo said that various triggers in the upward and downward forecast scenarios were clearly identified, and if one or more of those triggers occurred then the airport should re-evaluate the forecasts and the facility requirements. For example, if avgas were to disappear, then Cape Air, Island, Nantucket Airlines would likely be reduced to a fraction of their current size (their C-402s could no longer operate), and year-round air service would change drastically. Also, piston GA activity would dry up – the FBO would sell no more



avgas, small aircraft activity would decline sharply, as well as airport revenues. Berardo noted that compared to other peer airports, ACK is less volatile and less subject to competition. It's unique but not immune.

Drake asked what other resort airports have only a one-season base—most have two seasons—and ACK's infrastructure is geared to the summer season. Berardo said an exact comparable is hard to identify but Jackson Hole and Vail in Colorado have some similar attributes. However, tourist destinations throughout New England are primarily a driving market; for example, a large percentage of tourists fly to Colorado and California, but the majority of visitors to New England, including Massachusetts, the Cape and Islands, drive. In terms of strong peak summer season activity, as well as visits by VIPs, obviously Martha's Vineyard is a comparable airport. P.J. Martin Smith, Chamber, said the shoulder season can be expanded.

Gasbarro noted the forecasts show that 2027 enplanements could be similar to the volume in 2007, and if we were OK with the 2007 situation, maybe we would be fine. Rafter said the master plan looks at multiple variables, including the growing average fleet size that would mean 2027 conditions would differ from those in 2007. Richardson said these are issues we'll get into in the upcoming alternatives phase of the master plan.

The group answered six survey questions using the Keypoint touchpads dealing with travel behavior, preferences toward a few environmental issues, and attitudes about the aviation forecasts. The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m. If your recollection of the meeting is different, please let Janine Torres know as soon as possible ([jtorres@nantucketairport.com](mailto:jtorres@nantucketairport.com)).

### **Follow-up conference call/WebEx on March 11: Key points and questions/answers:**

Eight members of the Working Group participated in a conference call with presentation slides to continue the discussion (Leslie Johnson, Ernest Steinauer, Carol Dunton, Diane Archer, Tom Rafter, Andrew Vorce, Arthur Gasbarro, Armando Cardenas).

Issues discussed:

#### ***A. What is a "penalty box" and why is it proposed for ACK?***

A waiting area for departing planes located near the departure areas created to aid operations. Penalty box gives controllers more flexibility because they are able to allow a plane to depart quickly if issues at destination airports are resolved. Taxi out time is high at ACK due to NY airport issues. APUs run less when planes have access to penalty boxes. Creating penalty box requires more impervious surface and more space and could mean more queuing and congestion. Question: is there a point at which we say we've reached saturation regardless of whether there is a penalty box?

#### ***B. Is the airport allowed to cap the number of planes flying in and out at any given time for safety and environmental reasons? Could it limit not only takeoffs and landings during the day but impose a different standard at night, again for safety reasons?***

FAA constrains the airport sponsors ability to impose any form of access restriction. To accept FAA grants, the FAA requires airport sponsors to formally agree to the "FAA Grant Assurances – Airport Sponsors." The assurances become legally binding on the sponsor. Grant Assurance #22 states in part: "It [the airport sponsor] will make the airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to all types, kinds and classes of aeronautical activities, including commercial aeronautical activities offering services to the public at the airport."

In addition, FAA Order 5190.6B, Airport Compliance Manual, states: "Airport sponsors have limited proprietary authority to restrict access as a means of reducing aircraft noise impacts in order to improve compatibility with the local community." [Source: Chapter 13, para. 13.2, b., (6)]

FAA has a mechanism for airports to analyze the cost-benefits of restricting access by Stage 2 and 3 aircraft for noise purposes. Sponsors must prepare and FAA must approve a FAR Part 150 and a FAR Part 161 study. The sponsor must document that there are incompatible land uses as defined by FAA in the vicinity of the airport,



and that the airport sponsor has fully examined noise mitigation and noise abatement options such as voluntary arrival and departure routes, takeoff procedures, changes to land use and zoning requirements, property acquisition, and soundproofing of structures. Only if it can be documented that those alternatives have not adequately addressed the issue of incompatible land use can an airport sponsor consider potential access restrictions. FAA funded a Part 150 Noise Study for ACK in the late 1980s. The Airport initiated its voluntary VFR flight track noise mitigation program, but the Town did not adopt any compatible land use mitigation measures. Assuming the Town were to adopt land use controls, and that aircraft access restrictions were to be considered, FAA would analyze the potential restrictions in relation to the following factors:

- They do not impose an undue burden on interstate and foreign commerce;
- They do not derogate safety or adversely affect the safe and efficient use of airspace;
- To the extent practicable, the restrictions would meet both local interests and federal interests of the national air transportation system; and
- The restrictions could be implemented in a manner consistent with all of the powers and duties of the FAA Administrator.

Any access restrictions at ACK (by time of day or by type of aircraft) would impact activity at other airports and the ATC system by requiring airlines and pilots to adjust their intended schedules. If access restrictions were imposed at Nantucket Airport by limiting night operations for example, some operators arriving from New York airports would be forced to depart earlier than intended – possibly during peak periods in NY. That would increase delays by adding additional aircraft to peak periods, as well as increased fuel burn, emissions and costs.

Airlines do not like access restrictions for a number of reasons: restrictions increase their operating costs; forces carriers to adjust their schedules to what they perceive as less than optimum, which is particularly challenging for carriers serving the New York metro area and Washington, DC. As a result, airlines either avoid or reduce service at airports with access restrictions. It can be reasonably anticipated that any access restrictions imposed at ACK would result in reduced service by air carrier and air taxi operators.

***C. Can we find out whether we could impose fees for landing and take-off, much like the airlines do with passengers--book early and pay less, but pay upfront? Book last minute and pay more? That would allow air tower control people to have better sense of who's landing when and plan better, again improving safety.***

Imposing landing or access fees based on the amount of advanced planning would infringe on FAA's jurisdiction over airspace and air traffic control. It would also be extremely difficult for ACK to monitor and assess such fees, and they would impact other airports by impacting pilots decisions about departure times. Massport has had a longtime noise surcharge program at Hanscom Field (see below). The FAA requires that pricing programs must be non-discriminatory (i.e. apply to everyone). Imposing such fees increase airport administrative costs to monitor activity and collect the fees; and fees also decrease traffic levels and reduce airport revenues.

In addition to the nighttime fee schedule at Hanscom Field, Massport also prohibits touch and go operations between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; prohibits touch and go activity by aircraft over 12,500 pounds; and prohibits activity by Stage I Aircraft over 12,500 pounds.

It is possible that ACK could consider similar measures – and based on the theory that if Massport could enforce these at Hanscom, then ACK could do something similar. However – the big caveat – such programs have to be justified, and FAA has to formally approve them. Plus, with traffic levels declining at ACK for well over 12 years, and jet aircraft getting quieter, it would be difficult to convince FAA that these types of restrictions are needed or justified at ACK. Finally, there's little nighttime and very little daytime training (touch & go) activity at ACK (compared to Hanscom which has large flight schools), and there are very few (if any) Stage 1 airplanes operating at ACK. So even if similar restrictions were put in place at ACK as are in place at Hanscom Field, they would make virtually no difference to existing noise levels.



## **Hanscom Field - NOISE SURCHARGE**

- In 1980, a field use fee was instituted to help reduce noise exposure by encouraging the use of the field before 11 pm or after 7am.
- Between 11:00 pm to 7:00 am local time, there is a fee for each operation (take-off or landing). This fee is adjusted on an annual basis and is in effect for a period of one year July 1 - June 30. Effective July 2010 the nighttime field use charge is:
  - Aircraft 12,500 lbs or less - \$53
  - Aircraft over 12,500 lbs - \$391
- In addition, an aircraft shall pay double the applicable charge for each nighttime operation in excess of five nighttime operations in a calendar year.

### ***D. How have fees at ACK been set? What are rates and fees based on?***

The user fee structure in place at Nantucket Airport was set some years ago, and has been modified over time. The FAA grant assurances state that fees must be fair and reasonable, and they must also be non-discriminatory. User fees in place at other airports will be studied and compared against Nantucket (a benchmarking study), and presented in the Master Plan. “Peer airports” being studied in terms of their rates and charges include:

#### **Commercial Service Airports**

Aspen, CO  
Vail, CO  
Traverse City, MI  
Palm Springs, CA  
Savannah, GA  
Myrtle Beach, SC  
Punta Gorda, FL  
Glacier Park (Kalispell, MT)  
Great Falls, MT  
Key West, FL

#### **General Aviation/Corporate Service Airports**

Martha's Vineyard, MA  
Hyannis, MA  
White Plains, NY  
Provincetown, MA  
Block Island, RI  
Newport, RI  
New Haven, CT

### ***D. Environmental resources have been inventoried for the Master Plan. We can't just spend, spend, and spend—we need to know if the need is there.***

The next step is the alternatives phase in which the airport's needs will be identified and prioritized and the environmental constraints identified. Documenting why an alternative or proposal was dropped is as important as documenting why a proposal is advanced. The process requires thorough analysis of alternatives before any are dismissed.

### ***E. What is the impact of expanding ferry service on the airport? The table of fares for air service and ferries should include the discounts for same-day round-trip ferry travel.***

Ferries transport about 78% of all travelers between the mainland and Nantucket. More high-speed ferry service has and will continue to impact passenger levels on Cape Air and Island Airlines. It was agreed the “Status Quo” demand scenario is most likely, and although the volumes seen pre-recession are not expected to be seen again until 2030, strong summertime peaks present a challenge from a facilities point of view. Balancing summer peaks with volumes in the rest of the year is a challenge.

### ***F. Can we find out whether FAA would be amenable to different takeoff and landing paths, particularly those paths that require over-island travel? When the landing and takeoff paths were set, it was a different island, with many fewer residences in those takeoff and landing paths.***

The current VFR Noise Abatement Flight Tracks were established based upon community input on affecting the least-developed areas on the Island. Any changes to the existing noise abatement procedures, including the flight



tracks, would have to be analyzed based on actual noise reduction benefits to be achieved, as well as the measurement of the number of people that would benefit or be impacted. When the VFR Noise Abatement Flight Tracks were changed in the 1990s and again after 2000, some people experienced reduced noise levels, while others had an increase. Plus, any proposed changes in flight tracks would have to be evaluated in relation to their impact on flight safety from an air traffic control (ATC) and aircraft operational perspective, as well as from an aircraft operating cost and energy use/fuel burn perspective.

**G. We didn't have a chance to discuss freight and airmail traffic. I wondered about their incremental impact.**

Air cargo and mail data are in Chapter 4, Aviation Activity. Air freight and mail data tables are in Appendix G (shown below). The large majority of freight from the mainland is transported by ferry. Also, Cape & Island mail service is essentially 'belly cargo' – i.e. carried on passenger airplanes. FedEx flies Cessna Caravans dedicated to freight – the majority of their activity is in the summer – and it has been relatively steady/slowly declining over a period of years. No significant changes are anticipated to these air freight and mail activity levels in the future. If something were to happen to Cape/Island/ Nantucket Air, then a lot of their mail traffic would likely transfer to ferries, and some would be carried by another air service provider. There's not enough volume by itself to justify dedicated air service – only is practical as belly cargo.

**Federal Express Courier Traffic Providence-ACK**

	Pounds		
	Summer	Winter	Total
2002	170,280	-	170,280
2003	534,340	135,520	669,860
2004	594,840	138,960	733,800
2005	543,280	181,040	724,320
2006	555,520	145,640	701,160
2007	559,920	136,880	696,800
2008	462,271	123,133	585,404
2009	387,896	92,560	480,456
2010	439,362	117,931	557,293
2011	421,509	94,837	516,346
2012	451,883	103,268	555,151

**Cape Air - Mail - Hyannis-ACK**

	Winter	Summer	Total
2002	276,374		276,374
2003	800,223	303,145	1,103,368
2004	717,135	326,237	1,043,372
2005	688,798	338,418	1,027,216
2006	850,967	316,477	1,167,444
2007	789,103	329,976	1,119,079
2008	692,496	286,580	979,076
2009	714,160	234,830	948,990
2010	596,088	265,649	861,737
2011	557,246	269,345	826,591
2012	613,359	134,845	748,204

**Island Airlines Air Freight – Nantucket to and from Hyannis**

	Pounds	
	Summer	Winter
2010	91,270	-
2011	733,422	182,503
2012	870,070	233,598





Nantucket Airport Master Plan Working Group meeting 2/25/14  
Attendees

<u>Name</u>		<u>Organization</u>
<b>Sam</b>	<b>Bailey</b>	Airport business*
Steven	Berardo	Jacobs Engineering
Mike	Burns	Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission
Tony	Buscaren	resident
<b>Armando</b>	<b>Cardenas</b>	Island Airlines, LLC
Meredith	deCarbonnel	Jacobs Engineering
Dan	Drake	Chair, Nantucket Airport Commission
<b>Bob</b>	<b>Egan</b>	Nantucket Flying Association *
<b>Peter</b>	<b>Farrell</b>	Cape Air
<b>Arthur</b>	<b>Gasbarro</b>	Vice chair, Nantucket Airport Commission
<b>Leslie</b>	<b>Johnson</b>	resident
Noah	Karberg	Airport Environmental Coordinator
Anne	McKinnon	Jacobs Engineering
Drew	Mihaley	MassDOT Aeronautics
<b>Tom</b>	<b>Quigley</b>	Surfside Association*
<b>Tom</b>	<b>Rafter</b>	Manager, Nantucket Airport
Steven	Rawding	MassDOT Aeronautics
<b>Allen</b>	<b>Reinhard</b>	Nantucket Civic League
Bill	Richardson	Jacobs Engineering
Katie	Servis	MassDOT Aeronautics
<b>P.J.</b>	<b>Martin Smith</b>	Director, Nantucket Chamber of Commerce
<b>Ernest</b>	<b>Steinauer</b>	Mass. Audubon Society
<b>David</b>	<b>Sylvia</b>	Compliance Officer, Nantucket Airport
<b>Andrew</b>	<b>Vorce</b>	Director of Planning, Town of Nantucket

Absent:

Carol Dunton and Diane Archer

Working Group members shown in **bold**

\* participated by telephone or video call