



UPDATED MEETING POSTING

Original Posting Date Jan 3, 2024

Original Posting Number

TOWN OF NANTUCKET

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25

All meeting **notices and agenda** must be filed and time stamped with the Town Clerk's Office and posted at least 48 hours prior to the meeting (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays)

RECEIVED

2024 JAN 05 AM 10:06
NANTUCKET TOWN CLERK
Posting Number:T 019

Committee/Board/s

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Day, Date, and Time

Monday, January 8, 2024 @ 4:00PM

Location / Address

131 PLEASANT STREET, TRAILER ROOM A AND REMOTE PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM

The meeting will be aired at a later time on the Town's Government TV YouTube Channel

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-sgxAlfdoxteLNzRAUH1xA>

Signature of Chair or Authorized Person

Susan Carmel

WARNING:

IF THERE IS NO QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT, OR IF MEETING POSTING IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OML STATUTE, NO MEETING MAY BE HELD!

UPDATED AGENDA

Please list below the topics the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82470891407?pwd=Gwu8S0ngVJiYMY0IEuY0rVL1grJdCf.1>

Meeting ID: 824 7089 1407

Passcode: 655555

1. Call to Order
2. Audio/Video Announcement
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Public Comment
5. Potential Adoption of Meeting Minutes from January 31, 2023
6. Discussion of Citizen Warrant Article G: Bylaw Amendment – Ch. 58 Equal Access to Vehicle Rental Medallions
7. Discussion of Citizen Warrant Article I: Madaket Landfill Committee
8. Discussion of Citizen Warrant Article J: Request for Town Assistance with Evictions

9. Discussion of Citizen Warrant Articles
10. Assign Department Liaisons for the January 27, 2024 Budget Review Meeting
11. Date of Next Meeting – Thursday, January 11, 2024 @ 4:00 PM
12. Committee Reports
13. Other Business
14. Adjournment



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, January 31, 2023

Zoom – 4:00 p.m.

Called to order at 4:02 pm. by Ms. Kronau.

Staff in attendance: Libby Gibson, Town Manager; Gregg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager; Rick Sears, Assistant Town Manager; Brian Turbitt, Director of Finance; Susan Carmel, Assistant Director of Finance; Mariya Basheva, Financial Analyst; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

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

Absent Members: McEachern

Documents used: Departmental budget projections for FY2024s; Capital Program Committee Report

Adoption of Agenda

Motion **Motion to Approve.** (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded)

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

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Kronau called for public comments. (None)

II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

1. January 26, 2023

Motion **Motion to Approve minutes of the January 26, 2023, meeting.** (made by: Grause) (seconded)

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

1.

III. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF MOTION OF CITIZEN WARRANT ARTICLE #1 TOWN COUNCIL FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Discussion: **Kronau** – Stated that the committee extensively discussed Curtis Barnes article several weeks ago. Now, committee members are invited to share any additional comments or questions related to the article.

Vieth – Asked the question, If the focus shifts to studying, does that imply adherence to specific parameters preferred by the speaker, or is there flexibility for exploring a wide range of subjects?

Barnes – Responded by stating that in the discussion with non-resident taxpayers, he conveyed that, based on John Giorgio's guidance, the suggested approach is to form a committee for in-depth study. From Barnes' perspective, this committee is granted considerable flexibility to assess aspects like the viability of the idea, the optimal number of commissioners, distribution strategies, and various procedural steps. The study committee would be entrusted with the responsibility to analyze and recommend the direction it deems most appropriate.

Grause - Recalled from the last meeting, the Town Council outlined the expected process, emphasizing the formation of a study committee. The understanding is that this committee should consist of individuals selected for their relevance to the task and aligned with the goals of the study. The idea is to ensure that the committee comprises the right people who support the concept.

Barnes - Anticipating the Select Board's role in appointing the committee, Barnes acknowledges that applicants may have varying perspectives. Mentioned viewpoints include Brooke Moore's preference for an all-at-large approach. Notes discussions with Tucker Holland, who is developing a matrix to explore geographically representative options for the island. The parameters for committee composition, whether geographically specific or at-large, are expected to be determined by the committee itself.

Glowaki - Posed a question, expressing some uncertainty but indicating that he watched or listened to the relevant information. The question pertains to the current voting requirements, specifically in the context of a Town Council model. The speaker seeks clarification on whether the existing two-thirds majority for zoning and overrides would seamlessly transfer to a Town Council system, where a two-thirds majority of counselors would be needed for actions like overriding a two-and-a-half percent limit.

Barnes - Admits not having an answer to a previous question but emphasizes the importance of avoiding external consultants. Instead, he highlighted Mass Municipal as a free service with the capability to assist in the creation of a charter, which is anticipated to emerge from the process. Barnes expresses a desire for an efficient timeline, stating the belief that once the proper parameters are identified, actions like overrides, planning, and zoning would remain, but citizens could approach the Town Council more promptly with ideas or proposals. This streamlined process is seen as a way to avoid delays and frustrations experienced in the current system, allowing for quicker approvals and preventing the loss of opportunities, such as airport financing or affordable housing projects.

Maury - In the context of real estate, the speaker notes that the common challenge is not obtaining funds from reserves but rather seeking authorization to borrow. They raise a question about how this process would function in the proposed scenario, especially considering that, traditionally, an election is required after obtaining authorization to borrow.

Barnes - In the case of the water company, the speaker explains that they possess retained earnings, which could potentially be utilized for housing initiatives. However, despite having these retained earnings, the speaker clarifies that they still need to seek authorization from Town meeting to utilize these funds. Barnes stated that his intent is to streamline government and make it more efficient.

Maury - (Same as above) The speaker acknowledges the merit in the mentioned approach but raises a concern. If they are constrained by an annual balance and still require a mechanism to authorize borrowings, he expressed uncertainty about effectively addressing some of the larger issues at hand.

Kronau - Recalled a discussion at the Select Board several weeks ago. Initially, the Board considered initiating the process, but later they opted for a more prudent approach, suggesting that the decision to move forward with the study should be left to the voters at Town meeting. Asked Libby Gibson, Town Manager, if she had any additional input or comments on this matter. Ms. Gibson had no further comments.

Committee discussion ensued during which they sought clarification on the current status of the process. They explain that the current motion involves determining whether to form a study committee, which would subsequently work on sorting out the details. This motion is in the form of an article. Questions were asked about how this process differs from asking the voters directly at town meetings.

It is explained that the current motion is essentially a recommendation to create a study group, which will undergo a vote.

Barnes - Clarifies that the current committee's purpose is distinct from the government study committee. The ongoing committee is specifically tasked with delineating the parameters for transitioning to a Town Council form of government. This includes the creation of a charter that outlines and implements the necessary changes. In essence, the committee's charge is unique and focuses on the specific aspects related to the shift in the form of government.

Schaeffer - Questioned whether, after the committee makes a recommendation and puts it forward, the outcome might still face challenges and delays in the legislative process. Raised a timeline concern, questioning how long it might take before any action resulting from the town meeting could be implemented. They suggest that the process might extend to at least a year.

Kronau – Called for public comment.

Rick Atherton offered a general comment on the importance of the motion's language. Expressed concern about the phrase "to study converting to a Town Council form of government" and suggest that the committee's charge should encompass reviewing various forms of town government, including the current one. The emphasis is on allowing the committee to explore and evaluate different forms without pre-judging that a Town Council is the only possible alternative.

Barnes - Provided context about the article he authored, stating that it is based on the four forms of government options available in Massachusetts. He clarified that, in his view, a Town Council is the most appropriate choice. Barnes also shared his involvement in meetings with Barnstable and Falmouth, explaining that a mayor-based system is not feasible due to size constraints. The four options mentioned are open town meeting, open representative Town Council, mayor-council, and Town Council.

Motion

Motion to close the public hearing. (made by: Maury) (seconded)

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

Discussion:

Schaeffer – Stated he has spoken to a number of people about this since the article was written and noted that the feedback has been unanimous in favor of a change to a council situation, with not a single person expressing a desire to maintain the current system.

Kronau - Addressed the complexity of the situation, mentioning that the current article is in front of them and requires a motion. She highlighted that the next article is deemed unimplementable due to legal issues. Despite the interest in hearing about it, even a positive motion for the next article may not be feasible, according to Town Council, due to its deficiencies.

By consensus, the Committee wanted to hear from both articles before making a recommendation on the current one. The discussion moved to the next item.

Discussion resumed following the discussion and vote to Item IV listed below.

Motion to adopt. (made by: Grause (seconded by: Schaeffer)

There was a motion made, but the subsequent discussion led to deferring the vote to the following Monday's meeting.

Discussion: Committee discussion ensued during which they stressed the importance of including specificity in the comment, highlighting the intention for the motion to lead to definitive action rather than merely resulting in a study that sits on a shelf. They express the need to discuss this aspect further in subsequent conversations when revisiting the minutes, underscoring the desire for a clear and impactful outcome, with a target date no later than the Town meeting 2024.

Glowacki - Expressed confusion about the details in the article related to what the charter would include. He inquired whether the action described, possibly in the form of a motion, has to encompass the specific points listed from one through six in the article to be considered successful.

Maury - Expressed a lack of concern about this particular detail but emphasized the importance of the warrant being inclusive of the article that includes a Town Council. He clarified that their focus is on ensuring the article is specifically targeted towards studying the potential implementation of a Town Council rather than being a broad study of all potential forms of government.

Committee discussion ensued during which they suggested clarifying the motion to include only the first bullet point about the Town Council serving as the legislative body and then proceeding with the motion to adopt with this edited content. However, they considered waiting until Monday to finalize the article's wording with input from John Giorgio. They aim to gather specific text for everyone to review before the vote, ensuring clarity on what is being discussed. They plan to forward the text to the committee members, Town Manager, and John Giorgio before the next meeting on Monday. The decision to wait until Monday is made to ensure alignment with Robert's Rules of Order.

IV. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CITIZEN WARRANT ARTICLE #6 CHARTER CHANGE – TOWN COUNCIL – TOWN MANAGER FORM OF GOVERNMENT; POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF MOTION

Discussion: Jeff Carlson and Beau Barber

Carlson - Emphasizes alignment with the preceding discussion and expresses a collective interest in creating a more efficient form of government that better serves the citizens. They aim to incentivize officials to enhance their capabilities and drive progress. Carlson notes a concern about the current structure, where five volunteers are tasked with substantial responsibilities. He expressed the need to provide these volunteers with sufficient time and resources to contribute effectively. Carlson references the challenge of avoiding a scenario where a government study committee's recommendations end up shelved, emphasizing the importance of bringing informed conversations to voters. He acknowledged the intricacies involved and sees the value in the previously discussed article, which he views as a crucial step in committing to decisions and fostering substantive discussions about the proposed form of government for Nantucket.

Barber - Noted that the ongoing discussions primarily focus on Charter questions. He mentioned that, according to John Giorgio, a charter commission would be instrumental in navigating and finalizing these detailed decisions.

Carlson - Acknowledges the legal deficiencies highlighted by Town Council's review but emphasizes the importance of being at the table to initiate the conversation. He expressed a commitment to presenting the proposal to the public, enabling informed decision-making about the best direction for Nantucket's evolving landscape.

Bloomer - Inquired about the efforts made to address and resolve those issues. He highlighted the importance of addressing any deficiencies to ensure that the proposal aligns with legal requirements and can proceed smoothly through the approval process. Bloomer sought clarity on the committee's stance and actions regarding the identified issues that need correction before moving forward.

Carlson - Addressed the legal deficiencies, explaining that the issue lies in the filing method. He clarified that the typical Charter amendment process at town meetings allows for small changes, but in this case, where a significant replacement of the charter is sought, specific state law procedures come into play. According to Carlson, there are two options to address this: either collect signatures from 15% of registered voters to form a charter commission or pursue

the special legislation path discussed earlier. He stressed that even with the amended language, the current process won't meet the required legal standards under state law.

Carlson recognizes that the proposed change represents one of the most substantial alterations to government business since the town's incorporation in 1672. He stressed the importance of making these changes known to the public, ensuring people understand the implications and potential alterations to their interactions with the government. Carlson acknowledges that the transition won't be as straightforward as attending a town meeting or approaching the Select Board, anticipating a shift in interaction dynamics.

Maury - Recognizing the extended nature of the process, asks if the co-sponsors, including Roberto Santamaria and Barber, are supportive of Barnes's efforts as a means to initiate the necessary discussions. The goal is to pave the way for a future town meeting or potentially navigate the special legislation route. Maury sought confirmation of support for Barnes's approach, aiming to facilitate a discussion that could lead to an actionable outcome in the future.

Carlson - Affirms their support, stating that anything that promotes and advances the conversation, providing people with more information, is something they are genuinely interested in.

Schaeffer - Expresses concern about potential confusion among voters due to the presence of both articles on the warrant. He acknowledges the challenge of conveying to voters that both articles essentially aim to achieve the same objective. Schaeffer suggests considering options, such as joining forces or finding a way to communicate effectively to avoid potential complications. Stated that the current situation as a problem needs thoughtful consideration and a strategic approach to address it.

Roche - Expresses support for the ideas presented but raises a concern about potential confusion among people. She suggested a course of action, proposing the removal of the article since it cannot be enacted in its current form. The idea is to avoid adding unnecessary complexity to the situation and provide clarity to the voters.

Carlson - Acknowledges the opportunity to make a final decision between now and town meeting. He highlighted the chance to seek answers to questions and explore possible improvements to the proposal. Carlson emphasized the importance of avoiding confusion among voters and expressed a desire to ensure that there isn't a situation where essentially the same thing is presented twice, signaling a commitment to clarity and understanding.

Bloomer – Questioned what it would take for Carlson to go back to his constituents and withdraw his article.

Carlson – Explained that there is a procedure to withdraw but they are still exploring what options may be available for the article that would not cause confusion to voters.

Barnes - Shared his perspective, aligning with the idea that the ultimate objective of the study group should be to present a charter as part of their report. He expressed hope that the study group, with assistance from Mass Municipal, will go through the details and preferences, ultimately providing a draft charter. Barnes envisions that this draft charter could then be presented as part of the final report. He emphasized a comprehensive approach that integrates the charter into the final outcomes of the study group.

Roberto Santamaria - Noted that the charter being referenced is based on Franklin, which is the most recent one with input from the advisor who spoke at the Select Board meeting.

Kronau - Outlined two paths, as explained by John Giorgio. Path A involves electing a charter commission to draft a new charter, which is then approved through a ballot question at the annual election. Path B requires town meeting votes to petition the legislature through a home rule petition for a new form of government. She suggests that the study group's objective should be to propose a proactive path, either A or B.

Kronau proposed the option of postponing the motion until Monday's public hearing with John Giorgio, seeking his assistance in formulating concrete comments on the motion. While

Proposed FinCom Minutes for January 31, 2023
acknowledging the desire for a single article in town meeting discussions, she believes that voters can discern the differences between the two proposals.

Motion **Motion to close the public hearing.** (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded)

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

Motion **Motion to take no action.** (made by: Bloomer) (seconded)

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

The committee moved their discussion back to the previous item.

V. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CITIZEN WARRANT ARTICLE #11 HOME RULE PETITION - NPEDC; POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF MOTION

Discussion: **Hillary Hedges Rayport** presented her proposed warrant.

Article 83 aims to support and facilitate long-range planning and achieve strategic investment for Nantucket. The important aspect to understand is that regional planning law is designed to attract state and federal funding, technical expertise, and coordinated long-range planning to regions. This is achieved by designating Regional Planning Agencies (RPAs).

The objective of Article 83 is to support and facilitate long-range planning and achieve strategic investment for Nantucket. This will be accomplished by:

Differentiating Nantucket's long-range Regional Planning Agency (RPA) from its short-term land-use function.

Increasing interdepartmental collaboration.

Maximizing federal and state grant writing and administration within the RPA, benefiting the Town and County of Nantucket.

The purpose is to enhance the RPA's focus on long-term planning issues and to attract funding and expertise for strategic investments. The article aims to clarify the name and mission of the RPA, reconfigure its composition for more diverse input, and ensure that the powers of the Commission remain advisory without adding any regulatory authority. The proposed changes include renaming the RPA to the Nantucket Planning Commission and expanding its mission to encompass not only physical and economic resources but also environmental, cultural, and historical preservation, affordable housing, and other natural resources.

The proposed changes reconfigure the composition of the RPA. The current structure involves five Planning Board members, one Select Board member, three at-large members appointed by the NP&EDC, one Conservation Commission member, and one Housing Authority member. The proposed structure includes one Select Board member, one Conservation Commission member, one Housing Authority member, one Planning Board member, one Land Bank member, and one Historical Commission member. This change aims to provide more diverse input from the community, with equal representation from different boards and a 10-year term limit.

The article emphasizes the need to differentiate between short-term land-use functions and long-range planning tasks. The current overlap of NP&EDC and Planning Board functions is seen as limiting the effective pursuit of long-range goals. The proposed changes aim to create a dedicated Regional Planning Agency focused on long-range planning without adding regulatory authority.

The new governance structure involves a core of five people elected specifically for regional planning and six equally represented boards. These boards include the County Commissioners,

Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Housing Authority, Land Bank, and Historical Commission. The goal is to ensure more efficient coordination and collaboration among different entities overseeing various functions important for the town and county.

The creation of PLUS and the appointment of its director and employees remain the sole decision of the Town manager, and Article 83 does not make any comments or changes to the PLUS management structure. Article 83 and PLUS are distinct entities with different purposes.

Article 83 does not add any regulatory authority to the Commission. The primary goal is to update and enhance the RPA's role in long-range planning without introducing new regulatory responsibilities.

Bloomer – Questioned if the aim was to optimize grant writing and federal funding acquisition, aligning with a comprehensive long-term strategic plan, all within the framework of integrating it into the construct of PLUS.

Rayport – Stated the proposed change, akin to altering the form of government to a Town Council, doesn't guarantee specific outcomes. Instead, Article 83 introduces a different governance structure, fostering discussions on long-range planning, expanding inclusivity, and providing equal representation for various boards and commissions. She believes this change is positive and increases the likelihood of establishing a regional planning agency capable of achieving goals similar to other regional planning agencies.

Vieth – Questioned the use of the title “agency,” which comes with the indication of “authority.”

Rayport - Concurs with the mentioned perspective and acknowledges referring to it as "Authority" in the past. However, the official designation is determined by Massachusetts 40B, a general law. The proposal involves renaming it to the "Nantucket Planning Commission," emphasizing its classification as a regional planning agency by state law.

Grause - The central point being conveyed is that the primary alteration proposed involves modifying the composition of the governing body, while still being affiliated with PLUS.

Rayport - The overarching idea is to enhance the capabilities of the RPA by expanding its support system, such as having a grant writer, and encouraging collaboration with other entities to contribute to more effective long-term planning.

Libby Gibson, Town Manager - Raised a concern about the practicalities of incorporating grant writers, noting that securing grants is one aspect, but managing the subsequent projects and grants poses another challenge.

Glowacki – Sought clarification on how adjusting governance would alleviate staff from short-term pressures. Additionally, there's a question about the potential introduction of additional staff, particularly in planning functions, and whether this indicates a growth in the overall staff base.

Rayport - Clarified that the proposed article does not introduce additional staff or make a definitive decision on staff growth. However, the key point being communicated is the opportunity presented by having a state agency. She emphasized the potential to apply for grants through this agency to facilitate long-range planning. The current challenge, as expressed, is that the town has been hindered in its efforts due to complexities and entanglements with the planning board and various ongoing activities, suggesting that restructuring could unlock more effective utilization of available resources and opportunities for grants.

In response to the question of funding, the speaker suggests disentangling the two groups (presumably referring to the town and the Regional Planning Agency) and allowing a properly scoped Regional Planning Agency the freedom to decide its course of action.

Rayport provided an example involving receiving annual local technical assistance funds from the state, typically around fifty thousand dollars. However, this year, they received over eighty

thousand dollars, with the additional funds allocated to assist Regional Planning Agencies in securing federal grants.

Vieth - Highlighted a perceived inconsistency in the proposed structure. On one hand, there's an expectation of an independent group bringing in substantial funds and contributing positively to the town. However, the staff intended to work for this group would still be contracted with the town.

Bloomer - Questioned the decision to position the proposed endeavor next to PLUS instead of establishing it as a completely new initiative. There's a concern raised about the potential challenges that might arise in dealing with governance, organizational structures, and the combination of two distinct aspirational goals.

Maury - Expressed confusion about how the proposed changes to the governing body would impact the issue at hand, perceiving it as more of a staffing concern. He suggests that historical progress on planning issues has been achieved by creating specific positions, such as an energy coordinator or housing coordinator, and securing private funding initially before transitioning to public funding. There's a belief that this method is a more practical way to achieve the goal of dedicating more staff time and resources to long-range planning, which the speaker sees as not effectively addressed by the proposed structural changes.

Roche - Reflected on past instances of reorganizing town departments and emphasized that systemic improvements are needed, which is widely recognized. However, she expressed hesitation about legislating such changes outside of a process where those responsible for the work can architect the improvements. The sentiment is similar to recent discussions with the Historic District Commission (HDC). Additionally, Roche raised a practical concern regarding the acceptance of grant money by an outside commission. She emphasized that, in this case, it may not be feasible for an external commission to receive a grant directly, as such funds typically need to be received by the town through its finances.

Mary Longacre, NP&EDC, Chair - Clarifies that the NP & EDC has been actively engaged in discussions and planning for several months, considering potential changes to its Charter. Longacre asserts that there have been initiatives, such as proposing a land bank member, originating from within the NP & EDC. Additionally, Longacre refutes certain statements made by Hillary, highlighting that the open space plan is provisionally accepted by the state, and work on the master plan has indeed begun under the jurisdiction of the planning board.

Longacre challenges the accuracy of the presented organizational chart, expressing that the NP & EDC is not involved in daily activities like permit reviews and distinguishes between the functions of the planning board and the NP & EDC. There's an emphasis on the complex funding structure, with most funding coming from the town. Longacre contends that the proposed changes in the article may not guarantee the desired outcomes and underscores that ongoing discussions within the NP & EDC are broader in scope.

Finally, Longacre indicates that the NP & EDC recommended not adopting the proposed article to allow uninterrupted discussions about the organization's structure and approach.

Kronau - Questions the rationale behind changing the composition, particularly concerning the assumption that the five at-large, elected members would be more effective than the existing highly qualified and talented individuals. Kronau expresses difficulty in understanding how altering the composition would lead to achieving the goals Hillary has outlined. Kronau seeks clarification on how the proposed changes would address the identified challenges and enhance the effectiveness of the NP and EDC.

Rayport - Emphasizes the need to launch a conversation, pointing out that the Planning Board, responsible for subdivision control and various town-related tasks, doesn't necessarily have to be the same group as the Regional Planning Agency. Rayport suggests the possibility of having a distinct commission that doesn't completely overlap with the Planning Board, which could potentially attract a different set of individuals.

The suggestion is to attract a core group of five people dedicated specifically to long-range planning.

Veith - Expresses a perspective that town staff are knowledgeable about grants relevant to their areas of expertise. Vieth questions the effectiveness of elected individuals in understanding the intricacies of different grants and suggests that town staff, with their specialized knowledge, are better suited for this task. The implication is that town staff are well equipped to assess which grants are suitable for various purposes based on their existing expertise and experience.

Maury - Agrees that having more people involved could be beneficial. However, he points out that the proposed changes alter the composition of the commission without necessarily increasing the number of individuals actively engaged in the work, such as a grant writer or administrator. The concern is raised that the proposed changes don't address the need for additional personnel to handle the workload effectively.

Bloomer - acknowledges the complexity of navigating grant processes, emphasizing that it is challenging even for those familiar with the field. He recognizes the substantial opportunity presented by the outlined new funding but expresses skepticism about directly addressing governance, structure, and process issues.

Bloomer suggests that while there is a great need for outside expertise to tap into these new funding opportunities, confronting governance and structural challenges head-on might not be the most effective approach. He proposes exploring alternative avenues to bring in additional resources, likening it to finding a different method to access a valuable resource. Bloomer highlights the potential difficulties in navigating entrenched interests and busy schedules, emphasizing the need for a strategic and nuanced approach to unlock the identified opportunity.

Grause - Inquired about the additional functions and tasks they perform beyond grant writing.

Rayport - Explained that such entities are supposed to conduct careful studies of resources, problems, possibilities, and needs within the district. Additionally, they are tasked with preparing a comprehensive plan of development, recommending plans for societal governance, and ensuring the protection of the environment.

Motion: **Motion to close the public hearing.** (made by: Maury) (seconded)

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

Kronau re-opened the public comment period so that Rayport can respond to additional questions:

Bloomer - Suggested the possibility of creating something aspirational that avoids the identified problems. He expresses concerns about the current construction, noting that it leads to the inclusion of individuals who may not share a common vision or commitment. Bloomer implies a need for a different approach that fosters a more cohesive and aligned group of individuals.

Rayport - Explained the process for changing the form of government, highlighting that it involves establishing a study committee. She clarifies that this committee must be independent and distinct from the current government, requiring a separate process to form and appoint members to it.

Anne Dewez - Expressed support for Hillary's initiative, agreeing that changing from within in this circumstance is almost impossible. Dewez notes the absence of a debate on the town floor last year and emphasizes the need for one. They highlight the lack of significant study until October of the current year, pointing out that change from within has not occurred voluntarily and constructively.

Dewez shares their opinion that a different structure is needed, acknowledging that opinions have been expressed forcefully but reminding others that these are individual perspectives. She commends Hillary for her extensive work and careful consideration, advocating for a reasonable motion to enable proper debate and let the voters have a say on this critical aspect

of town government related to long-range planning. Dewez emphasizes the importance of giving voters the opportunity to have a say in the decision-making process for the benefit of the community.

Longacre - Explains that the delay in discussing a certain topic was intentional, waiting until a stable board with consistent members was in place, which occurred in August. This decision aimed to ensure that new voices on the board could contribute to the full conversation. Longacre acknowledges that the public may not always perceive the workings of government, emphasizing that even if not visible, the wheels of government are indeed in motion.

Kronau - Expresses that there is considerable energy and enthusiasm regarding the topic at hand, with everyone's intentions focused on doing what is right for the island. Kronau emphasizes that she has no doubt about the genuine intentions of those presenting citizens' Warrant Articles. As a member of the Finance Committee, Kronau explains their role in making recommendations on Articles not led by the Planning Board or Sewer Commission, basing judgments on what they believe is in the best interest of Nantucket. She underscores that while everyone has opinions, these are formed through diligent homework and are part of the process.

D Anne Atherton - Addresses their question to Mary through the Chair, inquiring whether Mary believes that the NP & EDC might have some recommendations by the upcoming special Town meeting in the fall.

Longacre - Responded that she does not have a specific timeline for the recommendations. She explains that the effort is aimed at a comprehensive approach, and as a result, she cannot provide a definite answer regarding whether the NP & EDC will have recommendations by the upcoming special Town meeting in the fall.

Motion: **Motion to close the public hearing.** (made by: Glowacki) (seconded)

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

Committee Deliberation:

Grause - Expresses admiration for the work done by Hillary, acknowledging her extensive knowledge and kindness. However, Grause expresses reservations about citizens proposing solutions without a deep understanding of the internal workings of the planning function. Drawing on a recent Historic District Commission discussion, Grause voices concern about the effectiveness of "parachuting" solutions and suggests that change is more likely to be successful when initiated from within the organization rather than imposed from outside.

Maury - Expresses sympathy for the idea of needing more assistance and expertise to delve into long-range plans and ensure their execution. However, he doubts that the proposed article achieves this goal, as it may not create more work but rather involve a different set of voices directing an already overburdened planning process. Maury suggests the need for additional staff, particularly advocating for filling the senior planner position and possibly adding more staff, similar to the approach taken with roles like Energy Coordinator and Housing Director.

Veith - Expresses agreement with the sentiments stated by Grause and Maury. She highlights that the focus shifted towards arguments on grant writing, raising concerns about who will handle these tasks. Veith mentions existing staff responsible for grants but questions the need for more elected individuals without technical expertise on the planning board, especially if they have been in their positions for a while. She sees the issues of grant writing and the composition of the Planning Board as separate matters, noting that the emphasis on grant-related discussions has complicated the situation. Despite this, Veith commends the efforts and work put into the issue.

Bloomer - Emphasizes his extensive experience in change management, asserting that their perspective differs from Hillary's. He suggests that successful change often originates from external factors rather than attempting to transform an existing structure. Bloomer applauds

Proposed FinCom Minutes for January 31, 2023

Hillary's aspirations but questions the feasibility of achieving them within the current organizational framework. He proposes considering alternative structures and cultural approaches to realize the desired changes.

Motion: **Motion to not adopt the proposed Article 83 .** (made by: **Grause**) (seconded)

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

VI. REVIEW OF 2022 ANNUAL TOWN MEETING WARRANT BY TOWN ADMIN

Kronau deferred the review of the 2023 Annual Town Meeting Warrant until the next meeting.

VII. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Next meeting: Thursday, February 2, 2023; 4:00 pm.

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Kronau differed the review of the 2023 Annual Town Meeting Warrant until the next meeting.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Kronau differed the review of the 2023 Annual Town Meeting Warrant until the next meeting.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 6:04 pm.**

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Bloomer, Glowacki, Grause, Roche, and Kronau-aye

Submitted by:
Elaina Cano

Raymond P. Conlon
66 Skyline Drive
Nantucket, MA 02554

December 11, 2023

Finance Committee
Town of Nantucket
Proposed Article G

Re: Opposing Article to Alter Rental vehicle Laws

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Citizen article pertaining to rental vehicle licensing and medallion distribution. In full disclosure, I own and operate Nantucket Windmill Auto Rental.

The current bylaw has been in place since 1988 and has worked well to control the number of rental cars on Nantucket up to 2021. In 2021 the number of rental vehicles on the island increased dramatically due to unlicensed entities renting vehicles which do not have medallions. In 2022 as well as 2023 this number continued to grow. Our streets are in gridlock much of the year – this worsening condition can be directly attributed to this large number of unsanctioned vehicles. Our ability to drive and park anywhere on the island is problematic and our quality of life has suffered. This proposed bylaw would increase the number of medallions – an action which will make a bad situation only worse.

The number of medallions owned by each of the existing rental car companies in 1988 was set by historical usage in prior years and was capped at 700 to prevent problematic growth.

In the thirty-nine years I have owned Nantucket Windmill Auto Rental I have built a business around full utilization of allocated medallions with a loyal following of travelers, citizens of Nantucket and state agencies such as the Department of Children and Families. Under the proposed article my number may be substantially reduced causing great financial harm. I have always done business within the laws of Nantucket, trying my best to be a good citizen. To impose a reduction of my number is not equitable or justified. Especially because the proposed article would reallocate current medallions and allocate those in excess of 700 to currently unlicensed entities who in fact have blatantly and knowingly violated our laws. I have a lease with the Nantucket Memorial Airport for counter space and parking and maintain a support facility directly across the street at 21 Airport Road for vehicle storage and operation of our business. Entities who do not own commercially zoned property or lease the same should not be allowed to conduct this commercial activity.

To reward such entities who have violated our laws with business licenses and medallions is just plain wrong. Please give the article a negative recommendation.

Sincerely,

Raymond P. Conlon
66 Skyline Drive

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

	Lead Petitioner	Article Description	Comment
A.	Mimi Huber	Zoning Map Change – R-40 to CN – 1 Evergreen Way and 21 Airport Road	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
B.	Susan Ottison	Zoning Map Change – R-10 to CN – 3 Cobble Court	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
C.	Patricia Halsted	Real Estate Acquisition: Unnamed Way (Surfside)	This article is not in proper form but may be cured by motion. The petition did not provide a sufficient description of the parcel or a plan. The Assessors Map provided is not sufficient, but NP&EDC located a plan that may be used in the motion. This article is the acquisition portion of a Yard Sale transaction.
D.	Patricia Halsted	Real Estate Conveyance: Unnamed Way (Surfside)	Approved as to form, subject to comments on Article C. This article is the conveyance portion of a Yard Sale transaction.
E.	Meghan Glowacki	No Town funds to be used re: Surfside Crossing development	A majority vote in favor would be nonbinding. If the Affordable Housing Trust already has funds available for a proper purpose, no Town Meeting vote is required. If the AHT is approved for additional bonding authority, that vote would be

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

			effective even if this article receives a majority vote in favor.
F.	Meghan Glowacki	Charter Change – Department Heads report to Town Manager	This article is in proper legal form. It seeks to <u>authorize</u> the Select Board to request a special act of the General Court to amend Sections 4.2, 4.4 and 4.5 of the Town Charter.
G.	Rebecca McCrensky	Amend Chapter 58 of Town Code – Car Rental Agencies	The subject matter of this proposed bylaw is generally valid, but not presented in proper form for insertion into Chapter 58 (changes are presented in outline form); this could be remedied by motion. Recommend deleting reference to “unpurchased” medallions and replace with “unissued.” Recommend making licenses inactive for two years subject to cancellation after hearing, not “automatically returned.” Provision reserving certain licenses to residents would be analyzed by Attorney General on “equal protection” basis but appears valid.
H.	Anne Kuszpa	Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Middle Income Inclusionary Housing	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
I.	Cliff Williams	Authorize Select Board to appoint Madaket Landfill Committee	Approved as to legal form. This article would be nonbinding if approved; expression of voter support for an advisory committee on landfill issues.

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

J.	Cliff Williams	Request for Town Assistance with Evictions	This proposes a nonbinding vote. Any dispute between an owner of residential property and a tenant is a private legal matter. Providing Town funds or resources to benefit an individual in such circumstances would likely violate the Anti-Aid Amendment (MA Constitution, Articles of Amendment, Art. CIII).
K.	Leah Hill	Adopt M.G.L. 175M – State Family and Medical Leave Statute	This article is in proper legal form; adopting c.175M would require a majority vote. Even if adopted, however, implementing the benefits pursuant to the statute would require negotiation with unions and with nonunion employees. An appropriation of funds would be required to implement the benefits if the statute is adopted.
L.	Emily Molden	Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Chapter 139-13(C), prohibit pools/hot tubs in Moorland Management District	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
M.	Michael Kopko	General Bylaw Amendment – Chapter 123, Short-Term Rentals	This article is in proper legal form, adding text to Chapter 123. Approval will require a majority vote.
N.	Robert Sarkisian	Bylaw Amendment – Sewer District Map Change – 62 and 64 Sankaty Road	This would add two parcels on Sankaty Road to the sewer district. The article is approved as to form. Unless the Select Board recommends this article, a two-thirds vote will be required for passage.

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

O.	John Fones	Amend Bylaw - Rescind Chapter 141, Stretch Energy Code	This article is in proper legal form. General rule for rescission of previously accepted statutes or similar state requirements is that at least three years have passed since acceptance (Stretch Energy Code accepted in 2019). If approved, this may impact the Town's designation as a "Green Community."
P.	Steven Cohen	General Bylaw Amendment – Revisions to Chapter 123 of Town Code, Short-Term Rentals	This article is in proper legal form, making revisions to Chapter 123. Approval will require a majority vote.
Q.	Steven Cohen	Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Revisions to Chapter 139 of Town Code to add regulation of Short- and Long-Term Rentals	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
R.	Irean Shreiber	Zoning Map Change – LUG-2 to R-20 – 25 Rugged Road	This article is not in proper form. It seeks to rezone a "portion" of a lot, but there is no metes and bounds description, no plan provided and no definite description ("not to exceed 30,000 sf"). Nonetheless, because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation; petitioner may be able to work with the Planning Board to resolve these issues. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
S.	Anne Kuszpa	Zoning Map Change – R-5 to CN – 75B Old South Road	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

			public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
T.	Gail Holdgate	Independent Investigation re: 2018 Historic African Meeting House Incident	This article is approved as to form. It would be a nonbinding vote, as Town Meeting cannot compel Town officials to take certain action or expend funds. In addition, the article states that the “article sponsors” would oversee the requested independent investigation funded by town public funds; this would violate the Anti-Aid Amendment to the MA Constitution.
U.	Arthur Reade	Bylaw Amendment – Sewer District Map Change – 16 Rabbit Run Road	This would add a parcel on Rabbit Run Road to the sewer district. The article is approved as to form. Unless the Select Board recommends this article, a two-thirds vote will be required for passage.
V.	Arthur Reade	Real Estate Acquisition: Bank Avenue	Approved as to form, except (1) motion should refer to “Select Board” rather than “Board of Selectmen,” and (2) copy of recorded plan should be filed with Town Clerk [recorded plan was viewed online and is in proper form]. This article is the acquisition portion of a Yard Sale transaction.
W.	Arthur Reade	Real Estate Conveyance: Bank Avenue	Approved as to form. This article is the conveyance portion of a Yard Sale program transaction, same comments as Article V.
X.	Vallorie Oliver	Withdraw Town from “Good Neighbor Agreement” with Vineyard Wind, LLC	This article is approved as to form. It would be a nonbinding vote, as Town Meeting cannot compel Town Administration or Select Board to take certain actions within their jurisdiction.

TOWN OF NANTUCKET
2024 Annual Town Meeting
Citizen Warrant Article Submissions
Town Counsel Comments
December 1, 2023

Y.	Vallorie Oliver	Offshore Wind Power – Require Town Meeting Vote	This article is approved as to form. It would be a nonbinding vote, as Town Meeting cannot compel Town Administration or Select Board to take certain actions within their jurisdiction, or mandate a prior Town Meeting vote if not legally required.
Z.	Kenneth Gullicksen	Real Estate Acquisition: Portion of Hamblin Road	Approved as to form, except (1) motion should refer to “Select Board” rather than “Board of Selectmen,” and (2) copy of recorded plan should be filed with Town Clerk [recorded plan was viewed online and is in proper form). This article is the acquisition portion of a Yard Sale transaction.
AA.	Kenneth Gullickson	Real Estate Conveyance: Portion of Hamblin Road	Approved as to form. This article is the conveyance portion of a Yard Sale program transaction, same comments as Article Z.
BB.	Beth Jekanowski	Zoning Bylaw Change – Add “Greenhouse” to Definition of “Ground Cover in Chapter 139	This article is approved as to form; “greenhouse” already appears in definition of “outbuilding.” Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.
CC.	David Buckley	Zoning Map Change – LUG-2 to R-40 – 71 Hummock Pond Road	This article is approved as to form. Because this is a zoning amendment, the article should be referred to the Planning Board for the required public hearing, and a report and recommendation. Passage of this article by Town Meeting will require a two-thirds vote.