

NP&EDC
Approved Minutes
Thursday, February 23, 2023 at 5pm

To view a recording of the meeting, use the link below:
[Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission - February 23, 2023](#)

Call to Order:

Chair Longacre called the meeting to order at 5:01pm

Establishment of a Quorum:

In Attendance:

Commission:

Mary Longacre
Barry Rector
Nat Lowell
Joe Topham
Seth Engelbourg
Dave Iverson
Kristie Ferrantella
Wendy Hudson
Dawn Hill Holdgate
Bert Johnson

Staff:

Andrew Vorce, Director of Planning
Leslie Snell, Deputy Director of Planning
Megan Trudel, Land Use Specialist
Raissah Koume, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT

Approval of Minutes

- **January 23, 2023**

Dave Iverson moved to approve the minutes of the January 23, 2023 NP&EDC meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY.

December 19, 2023 are to be continued.

Public Comments:

None

Action/Discussion Items:

Jess Bell is the Director of the Nantucket Land Bank and is joining us today to go through a little bit of history about the land bank, 2023 NLB Projects Highlights:

- 19 East Creek Road
- Consue Springs

- Washington Street & Francis Street Beach

There are two aspects of the Land Bank that are different from and go beyond existing institutions. One is its origin. It began with the Planning Commission's draft proposal for "Goals and Objectives for Balanced Growth", in which Goal A was to establish an Island-wide open space system by expanding and linking up existing public and cooperating private conservation and recreation lands. An ISLAND-WIDE SYSTEM, we've never had that before, just a hodgepodge of separate land parcels. The Land Bank would be oriented to pull things together and make some sense out of the present patchwork so I find it interesting that I'm here in the front of the planning commission which was You Know instrumental in creating the Land Bank along with our Founder Father Bill Klein. Also, there is an emphasis on public access, particularly access to the water us being a publicly funded organization. The Land Bank act was passed 1983 with two state senators and one state Rep that had strong ties to Nantucket also Governor Dukakis that was married on Nantucket, it was passed at one distinction vote at the annual town meeting in 1983 and signed into law by Governor Dukakis at the end of 1983. Martha's Vineyard Land Bank quickly followed suit, the one distinction between Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard Land Bank is that Martha's Vineyard can only do passive recreation they can't do active recreation so we own golf course, playgrounds and bike park that they cannot pursue. So subsequently after Martha's Vineyard created a Land Bank there were a bunch of interest cropping up around the state there were dozens of Land Bank proposals coming up and basically that gave rise to the community preservation act which was ultimately passed in 1997.

2023 NLB Projects Highlights:

- 19 East Creek Road which is one acre parcel in front of our Island Home on the creeks, we also own 16 East Creek Road and it currently contains a private dwelling in docks which extends out into the marsh, we have been using scape landscape Architects to transform this residential property into an inclusive waterfront park that builds resiliency by restoring and enhancing coastal habitats so the existing dwelling will be replaced with a deck overlooking the marsh the elevated boardwalk paths will connect to the deck and refurbished dock. There is going to be a direct access connection to our island home or the future of the salt marsh center if that ends up coming to fruition and we recently wanted to thank the town publicly here for the license area that they granted to us to connect 16 East Creek with 19 East Creek and also a licensed area to continue with permitting and construction of this which is on the town meeting warrant for this year, we've asked for a permanent easement because we'll forever maintain that easement area. The Landscape Architects are phenomenal, they have been superimposing these designs.
- Consue Springs historically was a large marsh, a berm was added for the railway right here which basically bisected the marsh that we see today, Goose Pond and surrounding marsh receive and hold storm water from the surrounding watershed which then filters into the harbor the pond is currently compromised by excess nutrients and sediment buildup that causes algal blooms our plan are to enhance the public experience of the property with improved bike and pedestrian access and circulation throughout and a direct connection to Nantucket Harbor. Another thing on the town meeting warrant is a parcel which will connect all of this to the beach, we have done 2 years of eradicating the phragmites treatment so that will continue the long-term goal is to reduce the fragments cover to increase native species diversity within the marsh dredging excess sediment and nutrients that has built up in Goose Pond and we've also exploring how to improve title exchange through this existing culvert so in addition to enhancing the public experience we're looking for opportunities to incorporate resiliency in this design specifically exploring the role of the berm and culvert and reducing flooding to the surrounding upland areas given expected future impacts of climate change were looking to improve and maintain the health of the marsh system as salt marshes can act like sponges in that they have enormous capacity for flood storage and carbon sequestration making them key green infrastructure components of resilient coastlines and this one this project is a

little bit behind, so this is a little further behind in planning than the other two. There is an intense permitting road map that goes along with these projects. Washington and Francis Street given the significant public ownership on Washington Street town and Land Bank combined we've been working in collaboration with the town and remain on a long-term conceptual framework for the entire Washington Street corridor, this street as we all know is the island's main transportation arteries and exists as the only real stretch of beach in the core downtown other than Children's Beach. We have began exploring coastal resiliency design opportunities along the entire stretch with scape in the Woods Hole group in 2021 and while much of Washington Street experiences flooding during storms this corner of Washington and Francis streets represents not only a flood pathway from the waterside but also a storm water retention area during precipitation events the first phase of implementation in the broader framework plan has become the area we are now focused on this phase will include a beachfront viewing deck, storm water gardens and a permeable parking area we were asked to keep this as the program of the kayak rental as well as keep this parking, this parcel already experienced flooding and we'll be exacerbated over time by sea level rise and increased precipitation events, the main goal is to introduce the concept of combining hard engineering with green infrastructure to reach elevation 8 which will restrict high tide flooding through 2070 with predicted sea level rise so basically an elevated berm that will continue and the framework plan down Washington Street there is an element of hard structure in the berm of course with enhanced Coastal vegetation all of this accessible complies with ADA and the engineers have been calling this back elevated berm the last line of defense and this will protect it ultimately and then I just actually learned the elevation eight actually doesn't mean eight feet in the air it means that from the ground where you're when you're standing there it's four feet.

In other news as widely publicized the award of Fog Town Farm at Eat Fire Springs we're about to issue another request for responses at Mount Vernon Farm for agricultural use of some plots there. We have a community garden survey out at the moment and that we interested to see what neighborhoods would be interested as having this as an amenity in their neighborhoods we have an RFQ out tight now for a bike path design we have a few properties we've acquired in the last few years that have existing docks but will require planning and permitting to convert them to public use stocks so that needs to get started in terms of beach access, its always a constant priority and we have built several stairs in the last few years and just bought a whole bunch of adjustable stairs. Lily Pond an ecological restoration is in the works there planning is in planning Eastern Street Park that will be fully accessible and also will resolve some of the flooding issues in that area. We have recently agreed to partner with the town on the design and engineering for that project and presumably we will continue that partnership down the road when it comes time to construct, trail connectivity we are always looking to connect existing trails and make it easier to traverse the island with alternative modes of transportation and walking and biking and all of that accessibility is at the forefront of every new project for planning. We have new land bank representation on the community preservation committee and some staff members on that committee now. We also have staff members on the coastal resiliency advisory committee and recently joined the municipal Harbor Plan update committee. Awareness of NLB projects and inclusion of concepts in island planning documents to facilitate permitting include NLB in NP&EDC open space and recreation plan and working collaboratively on grant applications my understanding is that the state favors that.

Transportation Program Manager Update from Jack Moran on the PM1, PM2 and PM3 performance measures. Starting with PM2 one key point here is that these measures are for the national highway system facilities on island, the regulations are such that State DOTs use in this case MassDOT identified pockets for statewide usage and then the regions the planning commissions then either opt to adopt the targets or identify their own so I'm not sure if they ever envision a situation like this but here we are and obviously I think the support of every citizen in the commonwealth is important with these targets, NHS is a subset of our public roads and it first identified in 1995 which was the Clinton Administration I believe the roads themselves are the entirety of the interstate system and then there was a process to identify other major facilities primary arterials that serve airports, military bases and various other transportation hubs such as rail and truck terminals and ultimately just strategic transport facilities in Massachusetts, we MassDOT own the entirety of the national highway system in the case of interstates and then non-interstate national highway system is approximately split up two-thirds MassDOT one-third with the region, as far as what sort of infrastructure are we measuring at this moment we are focused exclusively on pavement and bridge in the federal performance management system at the DOT with look at other things as well obviously have a whole host of assets that are part of our transportation network, tunnels, lighting, traffic signals, pedestrian accommodations, bicycle accommodations all these things we measure internally as well but certainly pavement and bridge from a budgetary standpoint are command the long share of our investment due to their scale and the measure themselves basically as a top level measure a bottom level measure that's both for pavement and bridges. Pavement is measured using a federal indices much like most communities maintain or engage with a consultant to develop it's a measure that looks at various forms of distress in the pavement in many ways most notably through cracking but we look at the ride quality itself and then we look at running and we look at rattling and these are all just different forms of a way pavement material can deteriorate that gets compiled into a single measure and then the indices itself maps to these other categories of good fair and poor. The key factor that was introduced with the federal performance measurement system is the integration of the bridge size for a long time we had measured the number of bridges in a particular condition state and most notably when we embarked upon the accelerated bridge program about 10 years ago there were target set to maintain or get below a certain number of poor bridges. We could easily identify and track our progress towards a number of bridges the counter bridges but in reality the size of the bridge is important factor to consider both the performance management and budget planning we have 29 million square feet of national highway system bridges in Massachusetts the average bridge size is about 14,000 square feet but there are structures in the inventory well in excess of a hundred and even above 200,000 square feet so the size factor basically allows us to take into account that outside outsized impact that a large structure would have on performance and then as a result we can take that into account in our budget planning. First performance period which was based on data from calendar year 2019 and 2021 essentially we set a two-year target, it was 19 condition data but the target was for 2020 and similarly a target for 2022. It was a bit of phased implementation that was basically recognize that at least for the case of pavement there was a sophistication involved in the data that the federal government was asking us to collect not all DOTs had purchased that equipment or were using it regularly, we effectively must provide this data for bridge pavement on an annual basis so there's a little bit of a transition period. In 2019 actuals we did ok in 2021 was a bit better, effectively we're talking the difference of three bridges so it's not a big difference but certainly we make every effort to try to achieve these as close as possible. The interstates entirely owned by MassDOT a good amount of it within the Boston region but certainly the interstate system extend well out into Western Mass the I-90 being first and foremost and then north south facilities as well, non-interstates this chart's a little different because there is that shared ownership and that does vary widely in some cases it's entirely municipally entirely state-owned or majority state-owned and as you can see with the Boston region it's actually majority owned by municipalities so just on to the targets here we are presenting before you now what our future two and four year targets are for this second full performance period again each target set will have a high-end target and a low target we're starting with the base of 72 percent good on the interstates and we are essentially forecasting a bit of a conservative target for 23 and 25. We did recognize a slight drop in an interstate condition over the course of the previous performance period so we back building that into our targets that could be a trend

that we need to watch out for, second major part is one of the major initiatives that I think its certainly nothing new but we take a very hard look at how we spend our infrastructure state of good repair dollars and we try wherever possible to put the money into preservation it's a challenge because sometimes things reach their life cycle end and they do need to be rehabilitated and the difference between preservation rehabilitation and replacement is basically a lot of money and preservation allows us to extend that life cycle beyond that which at a lower cost than if we were just to let it fail we have been very successful in recent years with the interstate system putting money on preservation which would allow us to produce a lot of Lane miles preserved every year extending that life cycle in the coming years we do have some more expensive projects and for the interstate system that really means we are not only doing pavement we are adapting to our guardrail system in some cases we're adapting our drainage system to design criteria for storm events that are more current than when they were originally built or just dealing with infrastructure that other infrastructure non-payment infrastructure that has reached its useful life. Its all state of good repair work the net effect is more lean mile cost for that project to go out and then down downstream less lane miles cost per year. Bridges are owned by us being mascot and I think this will probably be my last side so I will give you the pitch on the bridge program we certainly have a big focus on bridges in Massachusetts the average age of our inventory is 16 years older than the national inventory and that's really a function most specifically of when the actual interstates on the national highway system roadways of today or the systems built though then we were a little bit ahead of many states that coupled with the environment factors of what usually has been pretty considerable winter and the de-icing salts that come along with operating the system in those sorts of circumstances have certainly created a pretty significant backlog of repair for us on the bridge side and within these measures the backlog can most readily be identified by the percentage of poor so the percent poor, minimum condition threshold for interstate on the bridge side it's essentially that no state should have over 10 percent poor so we're at 12 and we have been above that threshold for some time though made quite a bit of progress over the last 5 years we've come down from 17 percent to 12 percent so we're certainly headed in the right direction. The bipartisan infrastructure law as well as the 2021 Massachusetts transportation bond bill provided the dot and the commonwealth with additional funds to address this bridge need within the state and nationwide comparison we have about fourth largest percentage of backlog on the national highway system, overall so all the bridges in Nantucket we have the 16th worst in that same criteria so there certainly the need to do something here and this very much continuing the work that was started with the accelerated bridge program and effectively we are driving down the age if the inventory so that we have a sustainable system that can be maintained to get to that point the number 12 has to come down, these funds that came through with the state bond bill and now the bipartisan infrastructure law are making a very substantial down payment towards achieving that. There are two types of investment we make for bridges they are preservation investment that is meant to kind of freeze the clock on the bridge life cycle and there is the rehabilitation and replacement so that's a much more in-depth project that often requires traffic rerouting and real consideration for what the future bridge should look like, it's a much different endeavor. Preservation projects get out quick, capital projects of rehabilitation replacement take a little longer. The first year that we have been able actually invest the bill by privacy network structure law funding was 2023, those projects are preservation projects that are on the street now and will be continued to be led to the bidding community over the next six months well into the next federal fiscal year so figure two to three to four year construction period of time their effects will be seen beyond calendar year 25 and we will be looking to revise those targets in the next full performance period to reflect that investment.

Raissah Koume from MassDOT office of Transportation planning will be presenting on PM1 and PM3 performance measures so all state dots are required to develop and endorse these performance measures per Federal Regulation. Per Federal Highway Administration Guidance the calendar year 2023 target setting process began in April 2022 with a trendline projection based on the most recent available data due to higher rates of speeding caused by decreased vehicle miles traveled amid pandemic shutdown in 2020 and the lingering impacts in 2019, 2020 and 2021 fatalities increased relative to previous years fatalities are expected to decrease based on MassDOT efforts in the area of speed management and Safe System among other safety strategies as always Mass thoughts overarching goal is zero deaths and this goal will be pursued by

implementing strategic highway safety plan strategies the covid-19 pandemic greatly impacted VMT causing fatality rates to spike in 2020 with significant lower VMT and slightly higher fatalities along with lingering impacts in 2021 to 2023 projection is now a 0.59 fatalities per 100 million VMT so that's the five-year average of 2019-2023. The long-term goal is towards zero deaths, so the long-term fatality rate is zero fatalities per 100 million VMTS. Due to the higher rates of speeding caused by decreased PMT amid pandemic shutdown in 2020 and the lingering impacts in 2020 and 2021 serious injuries increased relative to previous years so therefore MassDOT developed targets by projecting the 2022 annual serious injuries to be equal to the lowest year in recent history and the 2023 annual serious injuries to continue downward at a roughly 10 annual decrease which reflects the average decreases in the years in which the state experience reductions in serious injuries this approach resulted in a five year average number of serious injuries dropping from 2626 to 2569 a reduction of 1.99 percent similar to the fatality rate serious injury rates were greatly impacted due to covid following the methods above. The protection is now 4.25 serious injuries per 100 million VMT down from 4.30 serious injuries per 100 million VMT a reduction of 1.57 percent, the long term goal is towards zero deaths and zero injuries per 100 million VMT. The fluctuation in the total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries made tracking the trend in this area difficult therefore non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries for 2022 were side to be equal three percent higher than our recent lower year, in 2023 were said to be three percent lower than the recent lowest year this results in a five year average of non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries going from 467 to 437 a reduction of 6.86 percent. The specific measures included in PM3 are reliability congestion of emissions reduction, reliability includes travel time reliability on both the interstate highway system and non-interstate roads as well as truck travel time reliability to evaluate the efficiency of freight movement, congestion includes two measures non-sov travel and peak our excessive delay within the whole urbanized area emissions reductions is a measure that captures reducing emissions specifically from CMAC funded projects our presentation today and the information that is relevant to Nantucket is that we will be focusing on the non-congestion measures so travel time reliability in interest rates and no-inter states truck travel time reliability and emissions reductions, the first measure is the level of travel time reliability which refers to the percentage of miles on roadways that are considered reliable, its important to note that reliability in this context does not necessarily mean uncongested it is more a measure related to the predictability of travel so if a roadway is consistently congested it would be considered reliable under this measure a highly congested leading to unpredictable travel times it would be considered unreliable for this purpose with regards to the reporting timeline MassDOT submitted statewide reliability targets to the Federal Highway Administration on December 16, 2022 and all mpos are required to either adopt these targets or establish their own within six months of the date, we are asking for the board to review these targets now so that the updated targets can be endorsed and included within the regional transportation plan both of which need to be endorsed over the next few months. To calculate the level of travel times the process involves measuring different travel times percentiles on different roadway segments at different times of the day comparing these travel times to see how variation there is and then aggregating the percentage of roadway miles considered reliable based on these calculations, an increase in percentage is considered moving in the right direction for this measure. Truck travel time reliability which measures the amount of time it takes for trucks to drive the length of a road segment the reporting timeline is the same for this one, MassDOT submitted its targets on December 16th, TTTR are calculated in similar ways to the level of travel time reliability but its reported as a index rather than percentage of travel times within a segment are compared to assess how much variation there is and the index is developed travel time reliability is reported at both the interstate and non-interstate level the data for interstates. The first year we started to collect data on this measure was in 2017 and the trend between 2017 and 2019 were heading in the wrong direction, in 2020 with fewer vehicles on the road with Covid travel time reliability shot up to 94.4 %, in 2021 reliability went down slightly but remained much higher than pre-pandemic levels. MassDOT chose to develop two- and four-year targets that represented improved reliability over the pre-pandemic levels while accounting for external factors such as continued work for home trends and other MassDOT initiatives that aim to improve travel time reliability. The 2024 target of 74 percent represents a five percent increase over 2019 levels, 2026 target of 76 percent represents an even greater increase to reflect MassDOT goal of improving reliability. Setting the non-interstate travel time reliability targets involved both aiming for improving over the prior chart target years while also assessing the accuracy of the current trend line. The trendline for non-interstate travel time

showed small improvements prior to the pandemic increasing from 80.1 percent in 2017 to 82.8 percent in 2019 as with other reliability data non-interstate reliability was high in 2020 and 2021 due to lower VMT. These target were set in fall 2022, the year to date 2022 figure showed 89 percent which was an improvement over the 2021 figure of 87.9 percent, however MassDOT felt that the year to date 2022 figure at the time of target settings may have been a little too optimistic since non-interstate reliability can be particularly unpredictable as such a conservation approach was used to set targets than were lower than the trendline but were still higher than the prior target of 80 percent this was logic behind the two year target of 85 and four year target of 87. The trend line for TTTR (truck travel time) unlike the previous two reliability metrics which show percentage of role models that are reliable TTTR is showing just as and index comparing 95th percentile travel time trucks carry freight to the 50th percentile travel time of trucks since a lower number indicates less variability in travel time, the direction we want the trend line for this measure to go is down. Regarding the trend line, you can see that there was a bit of variation prior to the pandemic between 2017 and 2019 with some improvements in TTTR between 2018 and 2019. Since the pandemic 2021 and 2022 data show that TTTR is worsening slightly going up to 1.61 in 2021 and 1.64 in 2022 as such to set targets in this area MassDOT sought to show improvements over the prior target of 1.85 and set a 2024 target of 1.80 and a 2026 target of 1.75 these targets still aim to improve upon the last target that while also being achievable given the current trend line.

Andrew Vorce makes the motion to endorse PI, P2 and P3 performance measures. The motion was duly seconded by Wendy Hudson and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Tip Readiness days results and scenarios for Nantucket:

Fiscal year 2024 we have \$66,939, for fiscal year 2025 we had \$657,575 for fiscal year 2026 we have \$641,487 and for fiscal year 2027 we have \$794,307 and for fiscal year 2028 we have \$809,258 so these are the different projects that are part of the Nantucket priority of projects, the first is the Tom Nevers Bike Path which the MPO recommended a 2027 project fiscal year, Sparks Williams Pleasant non-motorist improvement project with a MPO recommended year of 2028 and the Wauwinet Bike Path which I have more information regarding this project is in the process of receiving a flap Grant because an application was sent so our previous information indicated that flap is estimating that 2.2 million will be available for Massachusetts regions and communities through flap, please note that the final number will be determined, presented and announced soon a regular flap project decision committee meeting has been occurring. The next project is the Orange Street non-motors improvement project with a 2028 fiscal year and the others are the Milestone Road and Polpis Road Bike Path with a 2024 recommended year so this was a new development from the project Readiness days that this project with a proposed programmed amount of \$1,200,000.00 would be ready for 2024 delivery. The Milestone Road is State Highway the cost of the project expanded in part due to the work required at the intersection to better accommodate bikes and pedestrians and it is likely that the construction of this project will occur over two tip years, so I have a scenario one for the Milestone and Polpis Road Project, these are the three scenarios from fiscal year 2024. The first scenario could be that the regional target is used for this project however the regional target does not cover the entire cost of the project and there would be a \$531,061 gap in funding the second scenario would be that no regional target is used for the project and this project is entirely covered by statewide HSIP funding and the third scenario would be a combination of both, currently Massdot is seeking to get the information from the NPEDC in terms of the interest in using regional target at all to fund Milestone and Polpis Road and the decision will inform Statewide programming so the discussion would be on discussing the appropriate split needed if there is NPEDC and the board wants to use Regional Target and HSIP funds. For fiscal year 2025 is the Wauwinet Bike Path the regional target for that year \$657,575 so that the Wauwinet Bike Path could be programmed in fiscal year 2026 as well as the FLAP grant is in the process of being secured for the Wauwinet Bike Path and the PDC project decision committee is meeting this week to finalize awards, more information on award is anticipated in the next few weeks and for fiscal year 2027 the project that would be programmed based on the information that we have is the Tom Nevers Bike Path and finally in fiscal year 2028 the Sparks/Williams and Pleasant non-motorist improvements project and the Orange Street non-motors improvement products would be programmed for those years.

Transportation Program Manager:

First thing on the agenda the authorization of contract terms, we have Mr. Mike Burns returning to the commission and those terms were negotiated in their final form by the commission in executive session, we need a vote to authorize the contract terms as discussed earlier.

Bert Johnson makes the motion to approve the contract terms. The motion was duly seconded by Barry Rector and the motion was carried UNANIMOUSLY.

The next item the bylaw of the NPEDC authorizes me as the Director to appoint staff and Mr. Burns was provided with an offer letter earlier today so under the terms of our bylaws you have the ability to either consent to my offer of employment or you can adopt a resolution of disapproval, so I would ask you to make a motion to consent to that offer.

Dave Iverson makes the motion to consent to that offer. The motion was duly seconded by Bert Johnson and the motion was carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Burns has accepted with contingent upon the signature of both parties of the final contract so as we led in here, we didn't know what those final conditions were so now that you've finished your deliberation, we would ask that you make a motion to authorize you representing the full commission to authorized to sign the contract.

Bert Johnson makes the motion to sign the contract. The motion was duly seconded by Nate Lowell and the motion was carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Grant updates we've sort of touched on several of them in the earlier presentation, one that I'm not sure that you all know about was the safety plan among the three regions, it's a very interesting Grant to make us more competitive so it's a really a collaboration with the other two rural RPAS Franklin County and the Vineyard so we're very pleased to get that, we don't have the exact amount but it is in the neighborhood of a half million dollars as well, so again there's at least a million dollars in in these grants.

Update on articles of planning concern with the Fincom:

Fincom has voted consistently with our recommendations, I'd recommend that the commission members review the Fincom meeting especially on article 83 and article 36, I think that for people to understand some of the debate going on in those particular articles the lighting article I know was something that was still in flux and well I did get a late email about I think a possible emotion on that which is to adopt some portion of it, I think there's still some open-ended questions on the enforcement part of that but that meeting is happening at the same time as our meeting. Do we need to have anybody representing us for articles 11 and 14 that are on the Fincom's agenda they're not yet uh determined what their recommendation is, I don't know I mean we submitted our recommendations to them so I don't know the results of their meeting today but we will update this chart and then send it out once we get that, once we learn of what their actions were today.

Open Space and Recreation Plan:

Meet with our Wesson and Samson representative Brandon earlier this week just to go over on the status of their edits as you may recall the plan was circulated to the commission and various members in the community stakeholders in the community and staff members for input so they're working to incorporate those comments and suggestions that they've received so far and they also had some comments that needed some follow-up with Andrew and I from the state so we're working on getting them the information that they need on that to have that incorporated into the plan they assured me they would have it ready to disburse by

March 1st, we will need to have it approved at the NP&EDC level at the planning board level and then the public hearing will actually take place through the select board to approve the plan in that regard so this will be on your March agenda both for the NP&EDC and for those of you that also serve on the planning board it will be on that agenda as well it will also be posted publicly and then the select board would follow through with their advertising protocols for the public hearing so hopefully it'll start moving forward out of house your pace next month and that is where we're at with the open space plan.

We have been working on the open space and recreation plans, there has not been time for a heavy focus on the area plan but we are looking forward to returning to those we currently have three groups who are developing area plans an update from Madaket, a new plan from Monomoy and a new plan from the town area we have two other groups who have expressed an interest in plans and the groups are moving at different paces, so we thought that having a little bit more well-established procedure and some guidelines would be helpful for all groups now and in the future. I have reached out to Madequecham requesting that they let us know how they're doing, Monomoy has let us know how they're doing and the town area association is planning to come in March to our meeting and let us know how they're doing but I can say being on that committee that we have a survey out right now so we're pulling the responses in and we'll see what we get from that any comments or questions on area plans.

A few updates on MARPA:

We had our monthly meeting last week for some of those updates included legislative updates the key talking point there was what's happening with open meeting and zoom meetings and hybrid meetings and how is that all moving forward which they don't have an answer for as of yet so hopefully we'll have resolution to that before next month but as of right now things are still up in the air, we'll be attending DLTA day at the state house next month, I believe that's on March the 29th another update is MARPA's redesigning their website trying to interact with all of the RPA so we'll be working with them to provide them relevant information for Nantucket and those were kind of the highlights of that meeting.

Discussion of the NPN EDC Mission we were provided in the packet with copies of the mission statements from the other Massachusetts Regional planning authorities, we want to do is discuss changes to our mission whether inspired by the other organizations or for our own situation here on Nantucket if people had any ideas for what they would like to see. What we don't want to see is one of these longer drawn-out statements like Middlesex or Pioneer Valley, I think that's not helpful I also saw that in a lot of the mission statements that have been listed out here in this guide for us there are words that keep getting used that don't mean anything so let's make sure that we have a straightforward mission that directly stating what we're trying to do.

Mary likes the specificity of the central Massachusetts where they listed some very well-defined tasks I noticed that Middlesex and Pioneer Valley were the exact same mission statement and I thought that was not a good way to go, I saw words like Advocate Foster Cooperative effort in resolving common regional problems in Merrimack Valley, you know a lot of the language here says regional collaboration because they represent regions with different constituencies we don't but I think regional collaboration for us is important with Martha Vineyard in Cape Cod because what I see in our future are lot of bigger issues that are not specific to Nantucket or issues that require the cooperation of the cape or perhaps the inspiration of what might have already been done in Martha's Vineyard or vice versa with the two islands and those are opportunities that I think we should be thinking about and also the MOA should be mentioned, I think Martha's Vineyard has to assist our regions towns with planning expertise that should probably be listed in our mission statement that's some very big part of what we do so that was something that I thought was important as well.

Seth Engelbourg: I think the ACT there's actually potentially a copy paste error with the Middlesex Mission, I don't think that's actually their mission I think that Pioneer Valley Planning Commission pasted it twice but we can figure out what Middlesex is on their website. I think that in addition to figuring out how we refine our mission what we also need to do is to set a vision so we obviously have a history we have legislation that allowed for our commission to be created but lots of organizations they only focus on the what you know the mission is the what are we doing and then they focus on the how that's the objectives and the plans but they never focus on the why and that's the vision and a lot of these organizations become very skilled at doing something but they have no idea why they're doing that something so I think part of what we're having here at the NPDC is that is an identity crisis and before we dive too deep into what action are we doing we do need to step back a little bit and discuss the why as well.

Andrew Director Vorce presented a discussion regarding Seth's comments that those long mission statements are very ineffective, I do like your point about assistance I think where like the Berkshire example talks about leadership and assistance. I think those are good words to include, I do like old colony which talks about technical expertise and the focus on collaboration of regions with the Cape and Islands especially and connections to the state and federal resources so I'm glad to be around that sort of brief is better and I do think that the focus on assisting our existing organizations and the town is really the proper focus for us not planning for them which I think is something I've heard and what some of these other regions do plan for or come up with plans that may impact the community in the context of what's best for the entire region. I like those shorter ones and I think thank you for all the conversation because I think we're at least in more of a position to start bringing some draft examples at our next meeting, I do agree with Seth's comment about vision as well and you know that might be certainly a component that is either separate but I do think it's an important part to include in any amendment of the legislation I think that is a great idea . We've had a couple mentions about the climate action plan so one of the things that I didn't see in these examples probably because they were written some time ago was any focus on climate action or on environmental protection and I wasn't sure if that was necessary or appropriate here but I did want to bring that up, we do have the climate action plan and we do have support for the Costa Roseanne's efforts as part of the planning Department's charge right now. Andrew as you said I think bringing some draft statements to our next meeting would be the next step and again everybody please do think about you know what opportunities for language we want to have what statements we want to make whether it's the vision or the mission and please do send any ideas to Andrew so he can incorporate those and I'm going to say feel free to give Andrew a call too if that's easier

Other Committee Updates/Reports

The Harbor Plan update committee has began its meeting which you appointed me to the representative, due to unfortunate circumstance my email was left off all communications for that committee so I wasn't aware that the meeting happened or was even happening but I've been since filled in with the minutes and other relevant information and that process is up and going and expected in the planning phase to take about one year and then we'll move into implementation phase after that .

Other Business

The next meeting is Monday March 20th at 6 p.m. and this is a time change because there is a joints meeting with involving the planning board members earlier in the day so we'll be meeting at six we are not anticipating a speaker to help get some of the time back for that.

- Upcoming meeting date:
 - Monday, March 20th at 6pm via Zoom

Adjournment

Moved to adjourn the February 23rd, 2023 NP&EDC meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Nowell and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting adjourned at 6.56pm

Submitted by: Fiona Johnson

NP&EDC Executive Session #2
Minutes
Thursday, February 23, 2023 at 5:00pm

Adjournment of Open Session:

Barry Rector moved to adjourn the Open Session of the February 23, 2023 NP&EDC meeting, to convene in Executive Session, not to return to Open Session. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Open Session was adjourned at 6:57pm.

In Attendance:

Commission:

Mary Longacre
Seth Engelbourg
Dave Iverson
Dawn Hill Holdgate
Wendy Hudson
Nat Lowell
Barry Rector
Joseph Topham

Staff:

Andrew Vorce, Director of Planning
Leslie Snell, Deputy Director of Planning
Megan Trudel, Land Use Specialist

Executive Session: Reason 2: To conduct strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with nonunion personnel or to conduct collective bargaining sessions or contract negotiations with nonunion personnel:

Director Vorce informed the Commission that he intends to retire at the end of June, which will leave a vacancy for the Director of Planning. He went over with the Commission a succession planning presentation that the Town Manager presented to the Massachusetts Municipal Association and would hope that the Commission consider Deputy Director Snell for the position of Director of Planning effective July 1st.

Members of the Commission asked whether there was a succession plan in place for a then replacement of the Deputy Director when Ms. Snell moves to Director. Mr. Vorce informed the Commission that effective July 1, there will be a Senior Planner role available that can then transition into the Deputy Director within the following months/year, and that Ms. Trudel may be a candidate for that role. This will also allow for Mr. Vorce to stay on board with the Town part time to help transition and work on special projects under a separate contract that allows him to work up to 600 hours per calendar year (as allowed by Barnstable Retirement) and stay within the already submitted PLUS budget for FY24.

The Commission had only positive things to say about Ms. Snell becoming the future Director of Planning. The overall consensus was that Ms. Snell has a great deal of professional and institutional knowledge with many years of service to the Town of Nantucket and that this is a perfect example of successful implementation of succession planning.

It was noted that the terms of a formal contract will be discussed at a future Executive Session.

Adjournment

Barry Rector moved to adjourn the NP&EDC Executive Session. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting adjourned at 6:59pm