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
March 24, 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 was conducted remotely by video conference via Zoom and will be aired at a later date on the Town of Nantucket YouTube Channel.

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

Also present: Rich Lasdin, McFarland-Johnson.

Mr. Gasbarro read the Town's virtual meeting statement.

Mr. Gasbarro announced the meeting was being audio and video recorded.

Mr. Gasbarro asked for comments on the Agenda; hearing none, the Agenda was adopted.

Public Comment:
None.

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

- **The United States of America General Services Administration (TSA) - Lease Agreement** A Lease Agreement for TSA Office, Breakroom, and Training Space Totaling $40,205, Commencing June 1, 2026, with a Ten (10) Year Term and a Five (5) Year Renewal Option.
- **McFarland-Johnson – Contract Amendment**

A Contract Amendment for Task Order MJ–EN–16 for the Design and Construction of Hardstand 2A, Decreasing the Amount by $23,850 for a New Total of $150,350.

✈ **Trac Builders – Contract**
A Contract for Construction of Hardstand 2A Totaling $348,460, Sized for an A220 Aircraft, with Work to be Completed by the End of May.

✈ **Nantucket Island Rent-a-Car – Landlord Waiver & Agreement**
A Loan Financing Agreement with the Bank of Canton, Pursuant to Lease Agreement Dated January 1, 2022.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns regarding the absence of any rent escalation over the full term. The proposed rate of fifty-five dollars ($55) per rentable square foot would remain unchanged for ten (10) years, despite prior Commission discussions about avoiding long term leases without market rate or CPI based increases. Mr. Smith and Ms. Ilieva explained that the rate was based on a current–market appraisal and that TSA leases at the Airport have historically followed this structure. Mr. Leavitt objected to relying on past practice, noting that commercial rents typically rise five to ten percent (5–10%) annually and that a flat rate would cause the Airport to fall further below market each year.

Mr. Gasbarro questioned why no escalation clause was included and whether TSA would accept one, especially since most of the Airport's leases include annual CPI adjustments. Ms. Ilieva confirmed that no negotiation occurred on this point and could not explain why this lease differed from standard practice. Mr. Bouscaren suggested shortening the term to five (5) years to allow renegotiation, while Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that predictable escalation is reasonable given rising Airport costs. Mr. Leavitt requested benchmarking against other regional airports to determine whether TSA commonly accepts CPI or other increases.

Mr. Smith agreed to contact Martha's Vineyard and Hyannis for comparative information, and Ms. Planzer offered to consult a federal security director for insight into TSA's typical lease terms. The Commission agreed unanimously to hold the TSA lease and revisit it at the next meeting after gathering additional information and clarifying negotiation options.

Mr. Leavitt revisited the discussion about constructing all hard stands at once, noting that during the prior meeting, when the Commission supported terminal plan option B, questions were raised about whether the terminal modification would require relocating the hard stands. Mr. Leavitt expressed concern about proceeding with construction if the hard stands might need to be moved within the next one (1) to two (2) years and recalled that staff planned to review this issue and report back. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that the review had been completed and that the current hard stand location, identified as 2A, would remain compatible with the terminal modification. Mr. Lasdin added that the planned work would remain valid through the upcoming terminal changes.

Mr. Marks made a **Motion** to approve the leases, contracts, and contract amendments as set forth in Exhibit One (1), excluding the United States of America General Services Administration (TSA) Lease Agreement. **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

Pending Matters:

031026-01 Housing Production Plan

Mr. Gasbarro introduced a draft housing strategy prepared by Mr. Smith, intended to outline the Airport's challenges with housing, staffing, and cost-of-living pressures. Mr. Smith explained that the effort stemmed from a January discussion and focused on compiling data illustrating the severe constraints facing Airport employees on Nantucket. Mr. Smith highlighted the island's extremely high housing costs, noting average home values near three million dollars ($3,000,000), limited inventory, and rental and utility expenses far above national averages. Mr. Smith also reviewed comparative information gathered from several remote or seasonal airports, including Sun Valley, Eagle County, Telluride, and Jackson Hole, each facing similar affordability issues and using various approaches such as stipends, temporary housing, bunkhouses, transportation support, or remote-work arrangements.

Mr. Smith then presented current Nantucket housing data, including recent listings and cost per square foot figures, and compared those to estimated construction costs for potential Airport-built housing. Mr. Smith referenced earlier staff surveys showing average employee rent around two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500) per month and identified seven (7) immediate housing needs among Airport personnel. Based on the collected information, Mr. Smith outlined several strategic options: rehabilitating the Thompson House as planned in the CIP, maximizing use of the existing dormitory, constructing a four (4) unit townhouse building, offering monthly stipends to full-time staff, and exploring hybrid or remote work to reduce on-island housing pressure. Mr. Smith concluded by emphasizing the goal of developing a practical strategy to support Airport employees facing high living costs, utility burdens, and limited housing availability on Nantucket.

Mr. Gasbarro opened the discussion by noting that the housing strategy contains many elements for the Commission to consider, including how to use the dormitory, whether to continue relying on the Thompson House, and whether to pursue construction or purchase of additional housing units. Mr. Gasbarro also emphasized that any direction must account for financial impacts. Mr. Bouscaren cautioned against purchasing individual homes for staff, noting that allocating specific houses to specific employees would create fairness concerns and suggested that a universal housing allowance or stipend, scaled by salary level, would be more equitable and avoid the complications of selecting who receives housing.

Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the fairness concerns but noted that stipends do not solve the problem of limited housing availability, especially when recruiting off-island candidates who may be unable to secure rentals even with financial assistance. Mr. Gasbarro stated that having at least some Airport controlled housing ensures the ability to house critical hires and maintain operational stability and suggested that a balanced approach may be needed by combining a small number of Airport owned units with a stipend program for employees not housed in Airport units. Mr. Gasbarro also raised the question of whether building or buying units is more practical, given the high cost of public construction under procurement and OPM requirements.

Mr. Leavitt noted that presenting basic cost of living data for Nantucket is not useful because the Commission already understands the island's high expenses, and some of the difference is offset by higher island salaries, and also pointed out that the presentation mixed the needs of full-time and seasonal employees, which complicates decision making. As an example, Mr. Leavitt questioned the proposal to spend four and a half million dollars ($4,500,000) rehabilitating the Thompson House for seasonal use and compared that cost to renting a four (4) bedroom house for twelve (12) weeks each year and calculated that the present value of renting would be far lower than the present value of owning and maintaining the Thompson House and that seasonal needs should be met through rentals, similar to how many seasonal island businesses operate.

Mr. Leavitt then raised concerns about pursuing new construction. The prior dormitory project created reputational issues with FINCOM and CAPCOM due to high costs and overruns. Mr. Leavitt stated that another request for a large construction appropriation would likely fail and suggested that public construction is inherently more expensive because of procurement and OPM requirements and noted that other Town departments are exploring public private partnership models to avoid these cost premiums. Mr. Leavitt concluded by expressing concern that the strategy presented only listed building and repairing as options and did not include rental solutions, which should be part of the overall approach. Mr. Gasbarro agreed that rental options could provide controlled housing for staff and avoid leaving new hires to search for housing on their own.

Mr. Marks stated that the ideas raised by the Commission are all valid and that solving the Airport's housing challenges will require a combination of approaches, describing his personal experience as a business owner who secures rental housing by guaranteeing rent to property owners and then subletting to employees, which creates stable housing without purchasing property. Mr. Marks also noted that for employees who live off island, transportation support can function as a housing subsidy and agreed that stipends can help if structured to balance differences in employee rent burdens. Mr. Marks emphasized that rental arrangements, private construction partnerships, and Airport controlled housing all have value, and that the key is ensuring the Airport can place essential staff in stable housing when needed.

Mr. Gasbarro responded that the housing strategy document should be updated to reflect the ideas raised during the discussion, noting that the Commission will eventually need to determine whether the final product is a policy, a set of action items, or another format. Mr. Gasbarro also highlighted the need for short-term decisions about how to use the Thompson House and the dormitory for the upcoming season. The original plan had been to move occupants from the Thompson House into the dormitory once the dormitory was built, but current staffing needs require both facilities. Mr. Gasbarro suggested focusing briefly on how seasonal employees will be housed this season and how that affects dormitory availability.

Mr. Bouscaren suggested exploring the possibility of moving an existing house onto Airport property as a lower cost alternative to new construction, noting that many houses on Nantucket are demolished and relocated, and that placing a relocated three (3) or four (4) bedroom structure on Airport land with a new foundation and utility connections could cost a fraction of a traditional build. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the concept but expressed concern about whether such an approach could be executed within municipal procurement constraints, which often require rapid action that is difficult for public entities. Mr. Gasbarro stated that the idea should remain on the table but may be challenging to implement.

Mr. Smith confirmed that the Thompson House can continue to function for the upcoming season. Historically, seven (7) or eight (8) seasonal employees have lived there despite the house having only three (3) bedrooms. With the new dormitory available, four (4) or five (5) of those employees could be moved into dorm rooms, allowing each remaining Thompson House occupant more space. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the Commission agreed that continuing to use both facilities would provide needed flexibility while longer term planning continues. Mr. Smith added that the dormitory could house three (3) to five (5) full-time employees and still leave room for seasonal staff, including two (2) larger rooms that could be shared.

Mr. Gasbarro then raised the question of whether one (1) dorm room should be made available to a non-Airport emergency responder if it is not needed by Airport staff, emphasizing that Airport needs must come first and that any such arrangement would require careful consideration. Mr. Smith agreed and noted that once a room is assigned, it can be difficult to reclaim it if Airport staffing needs change. Mr. Smith suggested that if a room were offered to a Town first responder, it could be limited to a temporary stay, similar to a model used in Eagle County, where outside personnel may stay for a defined period while seeking permanent housing.

Mr. Leavitt raised concerns about the Nobadeer dormitory remaining underused since receiving its Certificate of Occupancy in August, noting that seven (7) rooms have been empty for roughly seven (7) months and questioned why the Airport invested significant funds without a clear occupancy or rental strategy. Mr. Leavitt also asked whether summer seasonal staff have been identified and whether housing assignments are known. Mr. Smith explained that some seasonal staff work extended seasons from April through the holiday period and that two (2) such employees lived in the dormitory for several months after the Certificate of Occupancy was issued. Mr. Smith added that the full list of summer seasonal employees is typically confirmed around mid-April, when returning staff commit and new applicants are evaluated.

Mr. Gasbarro stated that the Airport should begin mapping out bed assignments, especially for extended season staff who should be placed in the dormitory rather than the Thompson House. Mr. Gasbarro noted that the Commission had been uncertain about whether the Thompson House would continue to be used, which contributed to delays in fully utilizing the dormitory. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that the dormitory must be brought to full or near full use to justify the investment and to ensure an appropriate return on the funds spent. Mr. Gasbarro added that internal evaluation and future executive session discussions will be needed to address bargaining and operational considerations related to housing assignments.

Mr. Gasbarro then asked the Commission to weigh in on whether vacant dorm rooms should be made available to non-Airport first responders. Any such arrangement would require a license agreement with clear provisions for termination if Airport needs arise. Mr. Gasbarro noted that legal counsel has already prepared license agreements for current occupants, but agreements for non-Airport personnel may need to differ because the Airport would not be the employer. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the Commission prefers to offer unused rooms to eligible responders or to keep a buffer of empty rooms to avoid the need to remove someone if Airport staffing needs change.

Mr. Marks clarified that the Nobadeer dormitory was never intended to be filled year-round. The purpose was to house summer seasonal staff, with space for only a small number of full-time employees. Mr. Marks argued that the facility should not be rented to outside individuals unless absolutely no Airport staff need the space, since removing someone later would create public controversy. Mr. Marks also noted that staffing needs may increase if Airport operations expand, such as through higher fuel sales, and cautioned against committing rooms prematurely.

Ms. Planzer agreed that the dormitory should be reserved for Airport use. Mr. Leavitt added that the Airport risks negative public perception if the dormitory has empty rooms during the summer, given that it was built specifically for seasonal employees. Mr. Leavitt suggested establishing a clear plan for filling the dormitory first, possibly using seniority or early commitment as criteria, to ensure the building is fully utilized.

Mr. Gasbarro emphasized the need to understand how many rooms will be filled and agreed that having multiple empty rooms would reflect poorly on the Airport. If only one (1) room remains open, keeping it as a buffer may be reasonable, but that depends on staffing needs. Mr. Gasbarro also raised the question of whether the dormitory should be used for winter rentals when seasonal staff are gone, provided that strict license agreements require occupants to vacate by April 1. This could improve utilization but would introduce management challenges. Mr. Gasbarro encouraged Mr. Smith to evaluate options and return with recommendations, noting that one (1) employee is already serving as a house manager.

Ms. Planzer asked whether the dormitory is suitable for year-round staff, and Mr. Gasbarro confirmed that it is and while not all employees may want dorm-style living, some full-time staff could use the space, and the remainder could then be managed according to Commission guidance. Mr. Gasbarro also noted that the Thompson House should continue to be fully utilized rather than left partially empty simply to create extra space.

Mr. Harimon noted that the Thompson House is listed within the Nantucket Historic District, which means any rehabilitation work will require additional review and coordination. Mr. Gasbarro acknowledged the point and explained that historic status depends on whether a structure is considered contributing under the HDC's enabling legislation. Demolition is sometimes permitted if a building is deemed non-contributing, but the Airport would need to navigate those requirements carefully.

Mr. Harimon then shared observations from years of managing seasonal housing as an Operations Supervisor and then Superintendent. The building has an open, cottage style layout, including one (1) room with two (2) bunk beds that sleeps four (4), making it very tight when eight (8) people are living there. Despite its limitations, Mr. Harimon believes the house remains well-suited for short summer seasons, such as late May or early June through mid or late August. Some repairs have already been completed, including deck work and window replacements, and the house remains usable. Mr. Harimon recommended continuing to use the Thompson House for seasonal employees so that the dormitory can be reserved for full time staff.

Mr. Gasbarro suggested that the next step should be a detailed bed mapping exercise for the dormitory and Thompson House, with Mr. Smith returning to the Commission once the layout is drafted. That information would allow the Commission to evaluate how many rooms will be filled, how many might remain open, and whether any buffer space should be maintained. Mr. Smith agreed and said that preparing a bed mapping plan is the appropriate next step for the upcoming summer season and plans to bring that information to the next Airport Commission meeting, which aligns with the mid-April period when hiring decisions begin and staff will need to be placed in housing.

Mr. Gasbarro then raised a related operational question about staffing on the ramp. If additional employees are needed to support fueling or customer service, housing availability could influence the ability to hire those positions. Mr. Gasbarro noted that if the Airport has the space to house an additional employee, that could directly support service levels and operational efficiency. Mr. Gasbarro emphasized that staffing needs and housing availability are interconnected and should be considered together as part of the broader planning effort.

031026-02 Fuel Subcommittee Update

Mr. Leavitt provided an update on the fuel farm expansion discussion from the previous meeting. The Commission had previously reviewed the operational benefits and the reasons for pursuing additional fuel storage, and the remaining question was whether the earlier estimate of two million dollars ($2,000,000) was sufficient. After further review with staff and independent research, Mr. Leavitt concluded that the project could be completed for slightly more than two million dollars ($2,000,000). To ensure adequate funding, Mr. Leavitt proposed budgeting three million dollars ($3,000,000). As a comparison point, Martha's Vineyard is installing a single twenty thousand (20,000) gallon tank for roughly five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000), which supports the conclusion that three million dollars ($3,000,000) is more than enough for the Airport's planned expansion, including engineering work by McFarland-Johnson.

Mr. Leavitt emphasized that the Airport has a short window to add this funding to the FY2027 capital plan using existing money in the fuel revolver. If the project does not proceed, the funds simply remain in the revolver, with no impact on the Town budget or borrowing. To meet the schedule, the Commission would need to approve the request immediately so it can be reviewed by FINCOM and CAPCOM and included in the warrant's technical updates.

Two (2) motions were recommended. The first is to request three million dollars ($3,000,000) in additional capital funding, to be reviewed by CAPCOM, FINCOM, and the town at the annual meeting, funded entirely through the fuel revolver. The second is to authorize up to fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) from the current professional services budget to advance design work, allowing the Airport to confirm that the project can be completed within budget. No funds would be spent until a more detailed plan is developed and brought back to the Commission. Mr. Leavitt concluded that acting now would allow the Airport to begin work this year rather than waiting another full budget cycle.

Ms. Basheva clarified that if the Commission designates the fuel revolver as the funding source for the proposed three million dollars ($3,000,000), those funds will not automatically return to the revolver if the project does not proceed. Instead, the money would remain in the specific capital article until a future Town Meeting authorizes transferring it elsewhere. The funds would not be lost, but they would be locked in place until Town Meeting action is taken. Mr. Gasbarro asked whether this creates any concerns beyond requiring an additional procedural step. Ms. Basheva responded that there is no concern and that the clarification was simply to explain the process. If the Commission later decides to reallocate the funds, it can do so at a subsequent Town Meeting. Mr. Leavitt confirmed that the three million dollars ($3,000,000) currently sits unused in the fuel revolver and is not needed for any other purpose over the next year. Ms. Basheva agreed, noting that the funds are earning interest but are not otherwise committed.

Mr. Gasbarro asked Mr. Lasdin whether McFarland-Johnson had reviewed the fuel farm expansion concept and what the firm's capacity and process might look like if the Airport moves forward. Mr. Lasdin explained that he had discussed the matter with Mr. Smith and noted that the project underway at Martha's Vineyard Airport is structured very differently. In their case, Titan Fuel is paying for, designing, and overseeing the entire fuel farm installation project. McFarland-Johnson's role there is limited to designing a foundation for one (1) tank and preparing a site plan to support permits being handled by another engineering firm. Titan Fuel is funding the project and will recover its costs through a long-term flowage-fee arrangement, which allows the work to proceed within public procurement requirements. Mr. Lasdin advised the Commission to fully understand that structure before proceeding.

Mr. Leavitt responded that the Commission has already reviewed detailed information from Martha's Vineyard, including the contract with Titan Fuel, and believes similar cost efficiencies can be achieved. Mr. Leavitt noted that the Vineyard project involves a single twenty thousand (20,000) gallon tank, while the Airport is considering four (4) tanks, and the cost should not scale linearly. With a substantial contingency built into the proposed budget, Mr. Leavitt believes the project is financially feasible. The intent is to begin with preliminary engineering to confirm viability; if the numbers do not work, the funds remain in the fuel revolver.

Mr. Lasdin reiterated that his prior discussions with Mr. Smith focused on understanding how the Vineyard project complies with procurement laws, emphasizing that Titan Fuel is paying for and constructing the facility, stressing the importance of ensuring the Commission follows proper procurement procedures. When asked about permitting, Mr. Lasdin explained that Tetra Tech, serving as the Vinyard's Licensed Site Professional (LSP), is handling fire marshal permitting and requested a site plan from McFarland-Johnson. Titan Fuel is purchasing the tank from Highland Tank and hiring Mike Trask, who services the Airport's tanks, to complete the plumbing and installation. Mr. Lasdin confirmed that he can assist with early engineering if the Airport pursues its own fuel farm project.

Mr. Smith reported that an initial cost estimate from World Fuel placed the fuel farm project in the range of eight to ten million dollars ($8,000,000–10,000,000). Mr. Smith also explained that, by law, the project must undergo both Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) review and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Airport is already preparing the Independent Fee Estimate (IFE) for the combined MEPA/NEPA review, which will cover all airfield projects planned over the next three (3) years. The FAA and MassDOT strongly encourage bundling projects so that environmental review is completed once rather than in multiple phases. Because of this, permitting for the fuel farm cannot begin until the MEPA/NEPA review is finished, which is expected in fall 2027.

Mr. Gasbarro asked whether the subcommittee had considered this timing issue. Mr. Leavitt responded that the subcommittee did discuss whether fuel farm permitting could be separated from the broader environmental review, but no definitive answer was available. Mr. Leavitt argued that the uncertainty around permitting should not prevent securing funding now, since the money would remain unused in the fuel revolver until needed and could position the Airport to move quickly if a shorter permitting path becomes available.

Mr. Gasbarro agreed but expressed hesitation about pushing a late cycle capital request without clarity on timing or need, noting that the Airport has secured more fuel reservations for the upcoming season than ever before, and with additional refuelers available, the immediate operational pressure may be reduced. Mr. Gasbarro questioned whether a fast-track request is necessary when the project cannot affect the upcoming season. Mr. Leavitt explained that increasing storage remains essential for long-term fuel sales growth and described a program to increase fuel sales by five hundred thousand (500,00) to 1 million (1,000,000) gallons annually, but said it would be unwise to pursue that strategy without adequate storage.

Mr. Bouscaren noted that if permitting cannot begin until 2027, construction cannot proceed. Mr. Leavitt explained the Commission still needs clarity on whether the fuel farm could be permitted separately and more quickly. Mr. Gasbarro added that the proposed location within the car rental lot adjacent to the existing fuel farm avoids environmental resource areas, which may influence permitting requirements.

Ms. Basheva confirmed that, if approved, the funds would be available for engineering and design beginning July 1. Mr. Gasbarro asked how the process would unfold if the Airport pursued the project, completed the preliminary work, and later determined that the actual cost was significantly higher, noting that in that scenario, the Airport would need to return to Town Meeting the following April for supplemental funding. Ms. Basheva confirmed that this would follow the standard process through CAPCOM, FINCOM, and Town Meeting, adding that the fuel revolver would likely not generate enough additional fund balance to cover the difference, so any remaining amount would probably come from retained earnings.

Mr. Gasbarro then asked whether the subcommittee viewed the proposed storage volume as the appropriate long-term solution. Mr. Leavitt replied that there is no guarantee the proposed capacity will meet all future needs, but it appears to be a reasonable midpoint that should provide adequate storage for the next several years. Mr. Leavitt noted that the Airport will not know the exact requirement until fuel sales initiatives are implemented and until additional options for ferrying fuel are evaluated.

Mr. Marks added that the existing underground tanks will eventually need to be removed and replaced, and that the proposed project positions the Airport to manage that transition. Mr. Marks stated that installing new above ground tanks now would help avoid falling behind when the older tanks must be taken out of service, emphasizing that increased storage supports both operational needs and revenue growth, which is essential for funding future Airport improvements.

Mr. Bouscaren expressed support for the project but noted concern about permitting timelines, stating that if the Commission secures funding, completes engineering, and prepares the necessary applications, the Airport will be in a stronger position once approvals are granted.

Mr. Leavitt made a **Motion** for the Airport to begin the process of adding three million dollars ($3,000,000) to the fiscal year 2027 capital appropriation, with the fuel revolver identified as the funding source, and present the request to CAPCOM, FINCOM, and town meeting, and using fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) from the existing professional services budget to advance pricing and planning work for the proposed fuel farm expansion. **Second** by Mr. Marks and **Passed** by the following roll call vote:

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

Mr. Leavitt left the meeting at 6:36 PM.

Commissioners' Comments
None.

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.
Second by Mr. Marks and **Passed** unanimously, by the following roll-call vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Reuss, Recorder

Master List of Documents Used:

03/24/26 Agenda
Agenda Protocol
Exhibit 1
TSA Lease Agreement
McFarland-Johnson Contract Amendment
TRAC Builders Contract
Nantucket Island Rent-a-Car Landlord Waiver & Agreement
ACK Housing Production Plan Presentation