



Town of Nantucket Finance Committee

www.nantucket-ma.gov

Committee Members: Denice Kronau (Chair), Joseph T. Grause Jr. (Vice-chair), Jeremy Bloomer
Chris Glowacki, Steve Maury, Peter McEachern, Joanna Roche, Peter Schaeffer, Jill Vieth

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 16, 2023

In-Person & ZOOM – 4:00 p.m.

Called to order at 4:00 pm. by Ms. Kronau.

Staff in attendance: Libby Gibson, Town Manager; Brian Turbitt, Director of Finance; Susan Carmel, Assistant Director Finance; Mariya Basheva, Assistant Town Accountant, Leslie Woodson Snell, Planning Deputy Director

Attending Members: Kronau, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer, Vieth, Bloomer

Absent Members: McEachern

Documents used: Proposed ARTICLES for Review and Consideration

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion	Motion to Approve. (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded by: Maury)
Roll-call Vote	Carried 7-0// Kronau, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer, Vieth - aye

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Grause called for public comments. (None)

III. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF MOTION FOR THE FOLLOWING TOWN MEETING WARRANT ARTICLES:

1. Article 73	Campbell Sutton	Bylaw Amendment - Noise
Discussion:	Kronau - Stated that the deputy police chief has suggested that enforcing this is very difficult because you can't isolate just pool equipment noise at a distance of 30 or 40 feet due to other noises being measured simultaneously. - Noted that during the last discussion, a committee member asked about the feasibility of enforcement and measurement. Campbell Sutton - Acknowledged being glad that the deputy police chief got back since he didn't respond to a request for comment and wasn't at the last meeting discussing noise issues. - Stated that the deputy police chief has the equipment to measure sound, which includes air conditioning, air handling equipment, or fans, under the noise article at 40 feet. - Discerned that the 55-decibel level is a globally recognized reasonable level for outdoor noise, and 45 decibels for indoors, with local determination of these regulations. - Expressed difficulty understanding the argument against measuring sound at a specific distance and direction, rather than randomly. - Acknowledged the reluctance to enforce regulations due to the need for measurement and enforcement, but reminded that the request is for an adjustment of distance while keeping the globally accepted 55-decibel range. - Noted that sound attenuates over distance and that decibel readings can be made at the source and projected over distance using apps or computer programs. - Mentioned the variable speed pool pump example, where at 1,000 RPM (around 30 gallons per minute), the decibel reading is 57, with higher RPMs required for effective heating or	

	chlorination, resulting in higher decibel levels at the source, which can be calculated for distance. Kronau - Highlighted that one issue with the fertilizer article last year, as Roberto Santamaria clarified, is that the Board of Health cannot enter private property to enforce regulations without the owner's permission. - Noted that while it is possible to take a sound reading from a pool pump, the police department cannot do so without the owner's permission, adding a layer of complexity. - Acknowledged that while an equation could provide an answer, the practical ability to take that measurement on private property is relatively low. Sutton - Expressed confusion because the police department stated they have equipment to measure noise at a 40-foot distance and have used it for complaints, making it unclear why they couldn't measure at 30 feet. - Acknowledged that questioning this discrepancy might not be productive, and shifted focus to enforcement. - Suggested that the first step upon a complaint should be a verbal request to quiet the equipment, followed by a citation for repeat offenses, with a requirement to remediate the situation within six months. Kronau - Pointed out that any changes to the article, including enforcement measures, would need to be approved by the moderator as they are not currently included in the article. - Clarified that articles can be amended to be smaller or lesser but not bigger. - Noted that the enforcement piece being discussed is not currently in the article. Sutton - Acknowledged that the research conducted could be useful for future reference. - Noted that the situation appears to depend on what the deputy chief said regarding their ability to enforce the current system. Kronau - Confirmed that while they can measure the noise levels, they cannot isolate the measurements to specifically identify if the noise is coming from pool pumps, air handlers, or exhaust fans. - Clarified that they can measure the overall noise level at the property line, but cannot attribute it to those specific sources. Sutton - Clarified that the only amendment being made to Chapter 101-2 is the distance, changing it to 30 feet. - Noted that pool pumps are already included in the existing regulations, and nothing else is being added. - Suggested that if they can measure the noise level at 40 feet without identifying the specific source, they should be able to do the same at 30 feet, albeit still without identifying which specific equipment is causing the noise. Schaeffer - Suggested considering applying the new distance requirement to all new construction, as fixing existing issues might not be feasible for homeowners who would not want to replace their equipment unless absolutely necessary. - Acknowledged that this issue is difficult to correct, unlike easily resolved situations such as turning down a loud radio at a party. Sutton - Based on Peter's recommendation, proposed an enforcement approach that does not immediately require purchasing new equipment. - Suggested that the first step would be a verbal request to abate the noise, without specifying a method for doing so. - Noted that the current noise ordinance involves giving citations upon repeat offenses.
--	---

	Believed this approach would be effective and that was the basis for the suggestion.
Motion:	Motion not to Adopt. (00:13:55) (made by: Grause) (seconded by: Schaeffer)
Further Discussion:	Maury - Expressed concern that the proposed changes might lower the bar for complaints but leave enforcement equally untenable due to the difficulty in identifying the source of the sound from the specified distance. Grause - Highlighted that this is essentially a nuisance reporting situation and questioned the effectiveness of the enhancements proposed by Campbell. - Noted that enforcement would still rely on neighbors calling the police to complain, who then measure the noise as best they can. - Pointed out that even under the current bylaw, if a machine exceeds the noise limit at 40 feet and 55 decibels, a complaint could lead to a citation, but only if pursued by the neighbor. - Emphasized that police are unlikely to proactively measure noise levels due to other priorities, and therefore, the proposed changes may not significantly improve noise problem enforcement. Schaeffer - Suggested considering introducing a new article at the upcoming special town meeting that requires a sound barrier between noisy equipment and neighboring properties. - Noted that a sound barrier could substantially reduce noise and be an easy solution for homeowners, such as installing a fence in front of an air conditioner condenser. - Acknowledged uncertainty about whether existing installations would be grandfathered in, but emphasized that adding a sound barrier might be more feasible than requiring new equipment.
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6-0// Kronau, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer - aye // Vieth - recused

2. Article 76	Catherine Gail Walker	Bylaw Amendment – Outdoor Lighting
Discussion:	Gail Walker - Realized that another change needs to be made to the article regarding the effective date, currently set for the time of the vote at the town meeting. - Acknowledged that this does not provide the town enough time to set up the necessary processes. - Suggested changing the effective date to January 1, 2024, or a later date if more time is needed. - Apologized for the mistake and mentioned that this change is in addition to the two other changes previously notified to correct inconsistencies discovered after filing. - Responded to questions about the estimated cost of compliance and the number of houses needing changes, based on informal surveys. - Found that in surveyed neighborhoods, about 30 to 50 percent of houses have outdoor lighting violating existing or proposed bylaws. - Identified common problems: landscape uplighting, unshielded floodlights, and onion lights with high-lumen bulbs. - Estimated costs for compliance: - Replacing bulbs for uplighting: approximately \$14 per bulb. - Adding shields to floodlights or replacing fixtures: shields and bulbs cost around \$46, new fixtures and bulbs about the same. - Reducing bulb output for onion lights: \$2 to \$4 per bulb. - Presented cost scenarios: - Scenario 1: Only replacing bulbs for four onion lights: \$16. - Scenario 2: Adding replacement for four landscape uplights: \$72. - Scenario 3: Adding replacement or shielding for four floodlights: \$164.	

	○ Worst-case scenario: Large properties with multiple structures, eight onion lights, eight uplights, and ten floodlights: \$604. • Emphasized a five-year grace period for compliance, extendable to ten years in some cases, and possible rebates for LED replacements. • Mentioned potential financial assistance programs and bulb giveaways to help with compliance costs. Roche • Acknowledged that the compliance costs are much lower than anticipated, mostly involving replacing light bulbs and adding shields to floodlights. • Recognized that these requirements align with existing bylaws that are not being properly followed. • Noted that this effort is about encouraging behavior change and that the cost of using different light bulbs is reasonable. • Asked for clarification from Gail about a requirement mentioned regarding annual permit applications or registrations. Walker • Clarified that the permit proposal applies to projects involving renovations requiring a building permit or HDC (Historic District Commission) permission. • Explained that outdoor lighting plans would be reviewed during these project approvals and not on an annual basis. • Pointed out that people often think they need more light than necessary, and trying lower levels like 600 lumens might prove sufficient. • Mentioned that using other fully shielded fixtures could provide additional lighting without being subject to the 600-lumen cap. • Suggested that if more light is needed, one could add fully shielded fixtures or replace an onion light with a fully shielded fixture for better lighting. Vieth • Asked why the focus was on lumens and wattage rather than just shielding, and if it was due to up lights on trees or the prohibition of up lights. • Noted that the pictures were very helpful but expressed concern that fully lit houses with interior lights might obscure the impact of exterior lights on light pollution. • Questioned how much additional light pollution exterior lights contribute when interior lights are also on. Walker • Explained that there are four aspects of lighting that need to be addressed together: brightness, glare, shadows, and energy usage. Simply requiring shielding doesn't solve all issues because some lights are too bright, creating glare and affecting safety. • Highlighted that regulating lumens addresses total energy usage, which is an important aspect of light pollution. • Acknowledged the concern about the photo of the large, fully lit house, which was sourced from a real estate ad due to a lack of personal photos of large compounds. Explained that the house had multiple unshielded lights contributing significantly to light pollution. • Agreed that interior lights also contribute to light pollution but emphasized that addressing outdoor lighting is already complex and a necessary first step, with interior lighting potentially being addressed in the future. • Clarified that permitting is a significant part of the proposed changes to the enforcement provisions but not the only part. • Explained that currently, there is no compliance review for outdoor lighting prior to installation, leading to excessive lighting being installed without being caught. • Mentioned that complaints about lighting are not a top priority, and the person assigned to enforce lighting regulations is stretched thin with other duties. • Proposed that for projects requiring a building permit or HDC approval, outdoor lighting plans must be submitted for review to catch any violations.
--	--

- Stated that this process is common in towns where lighting regulations are part of the zoning bylaw, but it is not currently done in Nantucket.
- Highlighted the importance of compliance review to prevent inadvertent violations, as many people rely on agents like architects and builders who may not be aware of the regulations.
- Provided an example of the Miacomet Golf Course, where lighting installed without proper review violated existing bylaws and created unsafe situations. The property manager was unaware of the violations, having relied on the permit process.
- Emphasized that compliance review would educate and raise awareness, preventing violations and resistance to making changes later. Undertaking an educational campaign to inform architects, builders, electricians, and homeowners about the regulations would further support this effort.
- Clarified that the proposed changes would apply to new constructions and renovations from the effective date onward, whether it is January 1st or this fall.
- Mentioned that permit fees for outdoor lighting would start being collected from the effective date.
- Acknowledged that the fees collected up front would not cover immediate costs but would contribute over time as new permits are issued.
- Noted that the 12,000 homes on the island would not need permits for existing outdoor lighting unless they undertake major renovations requiring a building permit.
- Confirmed that only those undergoing significant renovations or new constructions would need to obtain permits and have their outdoor lighting plans reviewed.

Kronau

- Provided a hypothetical situation whereas the number of building permits issued annually, noting that out of 2,200 permits, approximately 200 are for new builds.
- Calculated that 200 new builds at \$100 per permit would generate \$20,000, insufficient to fully fund a lighting enforcement officer.
- Estimated that issuing permits for new builds alone would require the officer to issue one permit per day, considering 230 working days in a year.
- Noted that the bylaw also requires permits for renovations costing more than 50% of the assessed value of a house.
- Acknowledged that the assessed value of homes is often significantly less than market value, and construction costs on the island are high, making it likely to reach the 50% threshold quickly.
- Estimated that doubling the number of permits to include significant renovations could generate around \$40,000 annually, still requiring the officer to issue multiple permits a day alongside enforcement duties.

Glowacki

- Acknowledged that the scope of the task likely requires a three-person office, not just a single lighting enforcement officer.
- Noted that in addition to issuing permits, the office would need to handle waivers, appeals, and enforcement actions.
- Mentioned that with 30 to 50% of the island out of compliance, the workload for enforcement would be substantial.

Roche

- Noted that requiring a lighting plan for new construction and having it approved is reasonable.

Maury

- Acknowledged the importance of dark skies.
- Recognized that effective enforcement is the critical issue, as the current bylaw cannot be enforced, and the new bylaw lacks a fee structure to support the necessary personnel.
- Questioned the practicality of implementing the new bylaw without a sustainable enforcement mechanism.
- Suggested that unless private industry steps in to fund the enforcement, the town may not be able to manage it on its own.

	Bloomer • Acknowledged that the town has the authority to impose a fee reflecting the actual cost of enforcement. • Questioned why the fee should be set at \$100 if it needs to be higher to ensure proper enforcement. • Suggested that the fee should be adjusted to cover the necessary costs, proposing a fee of \$200 to \$250 for the approximately 400 houses that might need permits. • Recognized that concerns about enforcement largely stem from cost issues and proposed that setting an appropriate fee could address these concerns effectively. Glowacki • Acknowledged that creating a new enforcement department under the Town Manager involves organizational consideration. Kronau • Stressed the importance of getting all relevant parties together to find a way to implement the lighting regulations because it is the right thing to do. • Expressed frustration with good ideas that come to the Finance Committee but cannot be implemented due to a lack of thorough planning and consideration of practical details. • Highlighted past instances where initiatives were approved without fully understanding the implementation challenges, leading to outcomes different from what was originally envisioned. • Emphasized the need for clear and practical implementation plans to ensure that everyone understands the process and its feasibility before approval. Glowacki • Drew an analogy with recent noise issues, noting a recurring problem of increasing urbanization and the frustration with unenforced existing bylaws, leading to the creation of more complicated, unenforceable bylaws. • Expressed concern that the concept of the proposed lighting regulations is great, but the implementation has significant issues. • Preferred seeing the regulations integrated into a revised charter for the HDC or another regulatory authority capable of managing the complexity, rather than as a general bylaw. • Emphasized the need for a proper framework and mechanism for enforcement, beyond just addressing the expense. • Worried that the proposal, if passed, would present practical challenges, such as holding up building permits if the lighting enforcement process becomes overwhelmed. • Stressed the importance of considering the chief of police's input regarding law enforcement issues related to the proposal, which have not been fully explored. • Suggested careful consideration of the motion, acknowledging the intrinsic challenges and potential unworkable parts of the proposal, to avoid future problems and ensure effective implementation. Kronau • Clarified that if a neighbor makes a complaint, the person complained about has 30 days to change the light, despite the theoretical five-year compliance period. • Acknowledged that this effectively allows those who complain to get their neighbors to comply much sooner than five years. Walker • Confirmed that the 30-day compliance requirement addresses instances where lighting is causing significant light trespass or glare. • Clarified that the metric ensures the light is genuinely impacting a neighbor's property and isn't based solely on a complaint. • Explained that issues can often be resolved quickly by replacing a bulb, redirecting a floodlight, or adding shielding. • Emphasized that glare can be a public safety hazard, not just a nuisance, as it poses a risk of harm. This justifies the exceptions to the five-year compliance period.
--	---

	Charles Stott, Co-President of the Nantucket Civic League • Reported that last month, a letter of support for Article 76 was sent after the executive committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposed outdoor lighting bylaw. • Since then, six neighborhood associations have also endorsed this warrant article. • Noted that the reasons for supporting the bylaw have been extensively discussed previously, and will not be repeated. • Observed that there is likely much broader support beyond the Civic League and the six associations. • Mentioned that many of the other 19 Civic League member associations have constitutions or governing documents requiring a vote by their boards or membership at annual meetings before taking a policy position. • Stated that while some leaders wanted to support the article, they were restrained by their governing documents. • In summary, the Civic League encourages a favorable recommendation for Article 76 and thanks the committee for their consideration. Glowacki • Acknowledged that many feedback letters have been received, most of which cite specific examples already covered by the current bylaw. • Noted that egregious examples mentioned in the letters align with existing regulations, pointing out that many issues stem from lack of enforcement rather than the need for new rules. • Referenced supporters' previous statements emphasizing simple solutions like pointing lights down, which is already required by the current bylaw. • Expressed difficulty in reconciling the broad support for better protection of dark skies with the actual need for amendments to the bylaw, given that many cited problems could be addressed through proper enforcement of existing regulations. Walker • Clarified that the permit process for outdoor lighting wouldn't hold up the building permit or HDC approval process, as their approvals are not contingent on the Lighting Enforcement Officer's (LEO) review. • Explained that HDC approval focuses on the style of the lighting fixture and does not consider the technical aspects like color temperature or lumen output, so the process for these elements would be separate. • Addressed the misconception that enforcing the existing bylaw would resolve all complaints. Pointed out that the current bylaw lacks provisions for certain issues, such as lighting curfews, except for non-residential athletic lighting, indicating that some complaints are not covered by existing regulations. • Clarified that the current bylaw has lumen limits for security lighting but mainly addresses brightness for commercial properties through technical standards, not residences. • Noted that the proposed bylaw would regulate color temperature, which affects how light is perceived due to the interaction of blue light with the human eye. • Explained that the current bylaw does not set overall lumen limits for sites or fixtures, which the proposed bylaw aims to address. • Confirmed that enforcement of the current bylaw is lacking due to no dedicated lighting enforcement officer, as mentioned in Libby Gibson's email. • Highlighted that clearer metrics and definitions in the proposed bylaw are expected to encourage more voluntary compliance, especially with an educational campaign. • Stated that the proposed standards are clear and understandable for homeowners, making them enforceable with the right personnel. • Emphasized that the enforcement issue is primarily a resources problem, not the complexity of the rules. • Estimated that effective enforcement may require a three-person office. • Stressed the importance of preserving Nantucket's dark skies, suggesting that investing in enforcement personnel is necessary to maintain these unique qualities.
--	--

	• Since founding Nantucket Lights, I've led an educational campaign to encourage voluntary compliance with the existing bylaw, featuring a brochure and a comprehensive website. Despite these efforts, compliance remains an issue due to lack of awareness and enforcement. • Planning public forums, webinars, and in-person seminars to educate property owners, architects, builders, and landscapers about the proposed bylaw. Working with local lighting suppliers to stock dark sky-compliant products. • Clarified that the permit process for outdoor lighting wouldn't hold up the building permit or HDC approval process, as their approvals focus on style, not technical specs like color temperature or lumens. • Addressed concerns that existing bylaw enforcement could solve the issues. Explained that the current bylaw lacks provisions for lighting curfews and overall lumen limits, especially for residential properties. • Emphasized that the proposed bylaw includes clear metrics and definitions, expected to encourage voluntary compliance and ease enforcement. Acknowledged the need for a dedicated enforcement team, possibly a three-person office, to ensure effective implementation. • Highlighted the importance of regulating color temperature, as modern lighting, especially LED, can appear much brighter due to blue light interactions with the human eye. • Noted that the existing bylaw doesn't address all current light pollution issues and that an educational campaign alongside updated regulations would enhance compliance. • Addressed the urgency for immediate compliance in cases of significant light trespass or safety hazards, which can often be resolved quickly by changing bulbs, redirecting floodlights, or adding shielding. • Outlined that the current bylaw isn't enforced due to lack of personnel, as confirmed by Libby Gibson, necessitating a proper enforcement mechanism. • Discussed the potential costs for schools to comply, emphasizing the need for dimmers, motion detectors, and possibly replacing some fixtures, which shouldn't be prohibitively expensive. • Mentioned that the timeline for compliance, such as the 30-day period for addressing complaints, was based on Town Council's suggestions and can be adjusted if necessary. • Highlighted the need for an appeals process to ensure good governance and provide recourse for both homeowners and those affected by non-compliant lighting. Suggested the possibility of designating a separate body to handle appeals if the Town Manager's office becomes overburdened.
Maury	• Acknowledged that if the new bylaw is on the books, there will be a period where homeowners might be in violation if they don't get their permits approved. • Noted that they would then need to appeal to the town manager's office or another regulatory body, which hasn't been fully defined yet. • Recognized that even without active enforcement, the permitting process itself imposes real consequences and requirements for compliance.
Grause	• Expressed the belief that the article is likely to pass at the town meeting, as it will resonate positively with attendees. • Acknowledged that while the enforcement side of the proposal may be flawed, the article itself is very well-organized and justified. • Recognized the significant amount of work that has gone into the article and its thorough presentation. • Voiced concern that, despite its importance, the issue might become a lower priority for the town government, which already has many pressing matters. • Suggested that even if the article passes, it may only represent a small step in the right direction, given the challenges of enforcement and prioritization. • Conveyed a sense of being torn between the article's merits and the practical difficulties of implementation and enforcement.

Motion:	Motion to close public hearing. (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded by: Vieth) (01:20:20)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 8-0// Kronau, Bloomer, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer, Vieth -aye
Discussion:	Schaeffer • Unanimously agreed that light pollution is a problem. • Unanimously agreed that there is currently no effective way to enforce the existing or proposed bylaws. Maury • Agreed that the likelihood of the article passing is very high. • Proposed taking time to review the provisions that would make enforcement untenable for Town Administration. • Suggested stripping out or modifying those provisions to create a more manageable version of the article. • Recommended presenting a positive recommendation for a revised version of the article that could be more easily administered by the town. Glowacki • Suggested delaying the implementation of the bylaw until the beginning of the next fiscal year (FY 25) to ensure proper funding and resource allocation. • Highlighted the need to secure funding for enforcement personnel and resources in the next fiscal year's budget. Maury • Agreed with Gail's point that having guidelines on the books is valuable as a resource and guide for best practices. • Suggested keeping the guiding aspects of the article to provide direction on responsible outdoor lighting. • Proposed removing the requirements for permits and timelines, as there currently isn't anyone qualified or available to review applications. • Recommended setting a further effective date, like the beginning of the fiscal year two years from now (FY 25), to allow time for proper planning and resource allocation. • Mentioned that, similar to the Plastics ban which took a year and a half to implement, having the bylaw in place would give people time to prepare and understand the new restrictions. • Highlighted the importance of having a clear and reasonable timeline for implementation, providing ample time for education and preparation. Kronau • Suggested seeking Town Council's opinion on the proposed approach. • Proposed structuring the bylaw to start with best practices, including guidelines on light bulbs, lumen limits, correlated color temperature, and illumination of signs and flags. • Suggested retaining sections on sports lighting, street lights, and public lighting as guidelines. • Recommended dropping the sections on prohibitions, enforcement, permits, and appeals to focus initially on education and guidance. • Suggested the idea of getting the right practices on the books for people to understand what they should be doing, without the enforcement and penalty aspects initially. • Proposed revisiting the enforcement and penalties at a future town meeting if necessary. • Presented this as a compromise to achieve the goal of moving towards darker skies for the island while addressing concerns about enforcement feasibility. • Suggested that Gail take a first stab at drafting a compromise version of the article based on the feedback received during the meeting, ensuring the motion to adopt reflects the desired structure.. • Proposed that the revised draft be discussed at a future meeting to see if it aligns closely with the Finance Committee's concerns and recommendations. Walker • Noticed that the prohibitions in section 10.26 are already part of the existing bylaw, although slightly rephrased and with added metrics for defining light trespass.

	- Pointed out that enforcement was not clear before, and certain exemptions are necessary to avoid unintended consequences. - Suggested focusing on sections 10.28 (Enforcement), 10.29 (Permits), and 10.30 (Appeals) for removal or modification. - Agreed with the idea of changing the effective date to allow more time for implementation. Maury - Proposed collaborating with experts and stakeholders to strike a balance between practicality and effectiveness, preventing wasted efforts and ensuring meaningful progress. Bloomer - Agreed that addressing enforcement and resource issues beforehand would facilitate a more effective compromise. - Suggested establishing a process to ensure these issues are resolved prior to finalizing and voting on the article. Maury - Acknowledged that the bylaw can be brought back for review or modifications at any time if necessary. - Emphasized that enforcement provisions can be added or adjusted in the future as needed.
--	--

3. Article 80	Select Board	Home Rule Petition: An Act Amending the Charter of the Town of Nantucket To Increase the Terms of Office for Members of the Select Board to Five Years
Discussion:	Kronau - Reminded the committee that there was previous interest in passing over the article entirely and letting the voters decide. - Noted that "passing over" is an option but is generally frowned upon under town meeting procedures. - Clarified that the closest equivalent to "pass over" would be a motion to "take no action." Jason Bridges, Select Board Member - Discussed the pros and cons of staggering the terms of select board members to avoid having two new members at the same time. Advantages: - Helps avoid having two brand new members simultaneously, allowing for smoother transitions and continuity. - New members can get their feet wet over a year to a year and a half, similar to the planning board where one seat turns over each election year. Disadvantages: - Could potentially scare people away from running for office due to the perceived complexity or commitment involved. - Noted that this idea was considered alongside potential changes to the form of government, which could take several years to implement. The staggered terms could help smooth the transition if such changes were to happen. Glowacki - Given the recent prescriptive push for considering a Town Council form of government, including the specific request for a detailed plan from the government study committee, it's recognized that introducing staggered terms for the select board might confuse voters at this time. Schaeffer - Stated that introducing staggered terms for the select board might be perceived as an endorsement of the current government structure, which could complicate or conflict with the ongoing consideration of a Town Council form of government.	

	Maury - Indicated that staggered terms are an acknowledgment of issues with the current government structure. - Addressed the disruption of having two new members at once, which hinders getting things done effectively. - Recognized that the select board realizes this issue and sees staggered terms as a fix. - Agreed that things move slowly and that expecting a new form of government within two years is unrealistic. Roche - Concurred with Maury's statements. - Considered the availability of qualified candidates and the impact of a five-year commitment. - Acknowledged that a five-year commitment might limit the pool of candidates willing to serve on the select board. Kronau - Appreciated the five-year term for its structure, allowing for a rotating one-off each year, which provides continuity. - Liked the idea that a five-year term would encourage members to serve a full term and then step away, avoiding the need for frequent re-election. - Acknowledged that a three-year term might feel too short, while six years might seem too long, making five years an attractive middle ground. - Expressed doubts about the likelihood of a Town Council passing, given that many people who appreciate town meeting might resist the change. Vieth - Supported the idea of focusing on electing one person each year to reduce disruption on the board. Grause - Supported a three-year term. Bloomer - Acknowledged that a five-year term might limit the opportunity for members to serve multiple terms, potentially losing valuable institutional knowledge. - Recognized that if someone is good and chooses to do two terms, they would serve for ten years, which could still provide continuity and experience.
Motion:	Motion to close public hearing. (made by: Maury) (seconded by: Schaeffer) (01:47:12)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 8-0// Kronau, Bloomer, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer, Vieth -aye
Motion:	Motion to adopt. (made by: Maury) (seconded by: Vieth) (01:47:30)
Roll-Call Vote:	Failed 3-5// Maury, Vieth Kronau (aye) Bloomer, Glowacki, Grause, Roche, Schaeffer-(nay)
Motion:	Motion to take no action. (made by: Glowacki) (seconded by: Schaeffer) (01:48:13)
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 5-3// Bloomer, Glowacki, Grause, Roche, Schaeffer (aye) // Maury, Vieth Kronau (nay)

IV. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next meeting: Thursday, February 21, 2023; 4:00 pm. (Fully Remote)

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Schaeffer – Short Term Rental Committee

- Updated on the recent short-term rental committee meeting, which lasted three hours.
- Noted that the discussion focused on the same issues as previous meetings, leading to little progress.
- Mentioned that the committee is stuck in a cycle, with discussions going in circles.
- Highlighted that there is a significant divide in opinions, with a seven to two breakdown among the nine members.

Grause – Short Term Rental Committee

- Updated on two policy levers discussed by the moderator:
 1. **Commercial or Corporate-Owned Rentals:** Considered regulating, banning, or managing rentals owned by commercial or corporate entities.
 2. **Minimum Rental Duration:** Discussed creating a regulation that would forbid renting a property for less than one time a week. This means no short-term rentals of two days followed by another short rental period within the same week, ensuring rentals are only allowed once per week regardless of length.
- Noted that these topics have been discussed extensively in the meetings.

Roche – Coastal Resiliency Committee

- Christy Kickham from Capcom presented to the Coastal Resiliency Committee.
- Approximately \$1 million per year set aside for coastal resiliency projects in the capital budget.
- An additional \$1 million allocated in a different part of the budget for coastal resiliency this year.
- Coastal Resiliency Committee concerned that \$2 million will not be sufficient for necessary large-scale projects.
- Noted a lack of a definitive action plan with clear steps for moving forward on major projects.
- Highlighted the need for a concrete plan to address key actions.
- Sediment transport study is supposed to start soon.
- Discussions and agreements needed regarding the situation at Baxter Road.
- Consideration of breaking the committee into smaller groups to identify supporting steps and potential bylaw and zoning changes.
- Acknowledged the need to identify necessary changes and steps for effective implementation.
- Discussed that the Contract Review Committee meeting about the money from the Cannabis fund will be held next week.
- Noted that Libby mentioned needing all submissions by March 3rd.
- Expected Libby to attend a future meeting after the submissions are received.

Grause

- Had a meeting this past week on Solid Waste.
- Noted progress in writing an RFP for various vendors to propose operating the landfill.
- Mentioned ongoing technical decisions about waste streams and separation processes.
- Acknowledged the complexity of these details.
- Scheduled a meeting next week with a representative from Martha's Vineyard Solid Waste to discuss their methods for dealing with organics.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 6:06 pm.**

Roll-call Vote Carried 8-0// Kronau, Bloomer, Grause, Glowacki, Maury, Roche, Schaeffer, Vieth -aye

Submitted by:
Elaina Cano