NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission DRAFT Minutes
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
May 22, 2023 @ 5:00PM

Commissioners: Chair Mary Longacre, Vice-Chair Barry Rector, Nat Lowell, Bert Johnson, Seth Engelbourg, Dave Iverson, Kristie Ferrantella, Wendy Hudson, and Dawn Hill Holdgate

Staff: Andrew Vorce, Director of Planning, Leslie Snell, Deputy Director of Planning, Megan Trudel, Land Use Specialist, Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager, Raissah Koume, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT and Gary Roberts, NRTA

NP&EDC
Draft Minutes
05-22-2023

TO REGISTER FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE MEETING USE LINK BELOW:
https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_5OsltDhqTXaZaNUVKsBX6A#/registration

TO VIEW MEETING ONLY USE LINK BELOW:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NtO7lIBnl8A

PLEASE LIST BELOW THE TOPICS THE CHAIR REASONABLY ANTICIPATES WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING.

I. **Call to Order:**
Chair Longacre called the meeting to order at 5:00PM.

II. **Establishment of Quorum:**

In Attendance:

Commissioners:
Chair Mary Longacre
Vice-Chair Barry Rector
Nat Lowell
Bert Johnson
Seth Engelbourg
Dave Iverson
Kristie Ferrantella
Wendy Hudson
Dawn Hill Holdgate

Staff:
Andrew Vorce, Director of Planning
Leslie Snell, Deputy Director of Planning
Megan Trudel, Land Use Specialist Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager
Raissah Koume, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT
Gary Roberts, NRTA

III. Approval of Agenda:

Chair Longacre mentioned that there is a change in the agenda and that the April 24th minutes will not be reviewed and discussed. Chair Longacre asked if there were any other changes to the agenda. There were no further changes.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the agenda and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

IV. Public Comments:

Hillary Hedges Rayport introduced herself as the lead petitioner for Article 83 which was passed during Town Meeting. She expressed for increase of public participation in the commission's discussions leading up to the Town Meeting and expressed her willingness to maintain communication. Ms. Rayport briefly discussed the main goal of Article 83 which was to change the composition of the commission to promote comprehensive community planning and the need for assistance from the state. She stated that this message resonated with many people. Ms. Rayport stated that the changes proposed in Article 83 had a gradual transition, affecting the Planning Board. The bill allowed the current members to finish their terms and then run for re-election. Ms. Rayport stated that she knew that there was opposition to the change and assumed that the structure would now be in place. Ms. Rayport expressed how happy she was that the community believed it was a positive change and hoped that everyone could begin focusing on comprehensive community planning. Ms. Rayport expressed the need to embrace change, assistance, and community involvement. There were no other public comments.

V. Minutes:

- **March 20, 2023**
  Chair Longacre expressed her concern about the clarity of the written document and the use of the word "you". Chair Longacre stated that the paragraph had been edited slightly to address this issue and provided a condensed version.
- **April 24, 2023**

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Rector moved to approve the two sets of minutes with minor changes per discussion. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Johnson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

VI. Action / Discussion Items:

A. Transportation Program Manager Update:

- **FFY 2023 – 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – close 21-day public review and approve TIP Amendment.**

  Mr. Burns listed the changes proposed for the fiscal year 23 Transit program which included the additional funding for maintenance activities and bus replacements. The public review of this amendment began on April 28th with the help of the Town's communication staff as described in the public participation plan. The notice and signature sheets for the amendment were included in the packet for review. The May 22nd meeting was to take any final public comments. However there have been no public comments received so far. Staff are requesting the action of closing the public review period and approving Amendment Number One to the federal fiscal year 2023-2027 Transportation Improvement Program. The NRTA Administrator is present to answer any questions that they may have. Chair Longacre asked the public for comments for this agenda item and there were no public comments. Chair Longacre suggested that at this point close the public hearing and take a motion. Mr. Burns stated that the two separate motions, closing the public review period and approving the amendment, could be combined into one motion if there were no public comments.

  Motion/Vote: Mr. Johnson moved to close the public review period and approve Amendment Number One. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

  Vote taken by Roll Call:
  Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
  Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
  Wendy Hudson *Aye*
  Dave Iverson *Aye*
  Bert Johnson *Aye*
  Nat Lowell *Aye*
  Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
  Joseph Topham *Aye*
  John Trudel *Aye*
  Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

- **FFY 2024 – 2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – close 21-day public review and approve the TIP:**

  Mr. Burns stated that this TIP had been available for public review since last month's meeting. Mr. Burns briefly discussed the two projects for the highway program in the fiscal year 24. The first project proposed improvements at the intersection of Milestone Road and Polpis Road. The second project is an extension of the Sturgis Path to Monomoy Road intersection. The current cost allocated for these projects was $1.2 million which includes over $1 million in federal funding and $120,000 in state matching funds from both Statewide and regionally prioritized highway programs. There were no local funds programmed for these projects, however Regional Transportation Planning funding had been used for previous studies in the area. Identified issues included high speeds, insufficient sight distances, multiple conflict points due to the intersection's Y configuration and inadequate and unsafe access and crossings for active transportation users. The purpose of these projects was to improve intersection operations and safety through the design and construction of a new intersection configuration. Included in this project is the construction of a shared-use-path on the North side of Milestone Road between Monomoy Road and the existing Polis Bike Path, approximately 1600 feet, to improve safety and accessibility for all users. MassDot would assume the design responsibilities and advance the project development process. MassDot will coordinate with the Town to determine priorities and potential phasing based on available funding. The following Fiscal Year 25 a shared path is proposed along Wauwinet Road. This project would be funded through a combination of a federal land access program and local funding. For this fiscal year this marks the third grant awarded to this project. This project is to address safety, connectivity and support active transportation and sustainable mobility. The path will be around two miles long and will connect the Polpis Road path to the Gatehouse at the end of Wauwinet Road. Both the U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife recommended these projects. Both are identified in the region's Long-Range Transportation Plan. The Transit program for the fiscal year includes various projects for federal fiscal year 2024 totaling over $1.6 million dollars. They include operational costs maintenance of vehicles, farebox equipment and traveler information systems. Also, anticipated expenses for propane fueling equipment to accommodate new propane fueled vehicles. The bus replacement strategy would be clarified after running through the budgets for the four subsequent years. For 2025 similar expenses for operation and maintenance of vehicles and facilities were included totaling $1.2 million dollars. 2026 similar projects for operation and maintenance with a total budget of $900,000 dollars, however maintenance of support vehicles was not included in this year. 2027 the budget did not include operation expenses. Other typical asset management projects were included, totaling $270,000 dollars. 2028 includes similar items as 2027 totaling #295,000 dollars. Mr. Burns reiterated the TIP public review period. Chair Longacre asked the public for comments for this agenda item and there were no public comments.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Johnson moved to close the public review period and approve the TIP. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

- **FFY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – approve 21-day public review period for UPWP:**

This agenda item is related to next year's transportation work program. The Unified Planning Work Program is a fiscally constrained listing of federal and state funded regional transportation planning activities for the upcoming year. This document is updated annually and includes administrative data collection, analytical, planning and implementation activities that align with federal state and local vision goals and priorities. The 3C grants for fiscal year 24, a budget of over $324,000 for salaries, overhead, and direct costs. An itemized budget was provided in a table management activity. Task 1 includes the 3C grant administration writing of the TIP in the UPWP documents and other coordination tasks. Task 1.3 was highlighted. Mr. Burns stated that additional time would be allocated this year for public participation activities, including coordination with the Town's communication staff for a more robust and dynamic outreach. Task 2.3 there was a budget increase in time for data collection and analysis for the evaluation of systems performance and conditions. The safe livable and complete streets planning task involved developing the safe streets for all action plan and conducting other recommended studies from the current long-range transportation plan. This includes a multimodal traffic model and time necessary for intermodal transportation center and harbor place development. Long range and strategic planning time was allocated for scoping out what is necessary to limit single occupancy vehicle usage which aligns with the Town's strategic plan and this task has an additional budget of $25,000 for any necessary consulting services. Task 4 consists of implementation activities, grant management and other local assistance, the total budget for the program is approximately 20%. It was requested that the public review of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) begin after this month's meeting on Friday, May 26th with approval authorized by NP&EDC at this meeting. Notice will be communicated through the Town's Communication staff. Hard copies of the draft will be provided at the Atheneum, Town Building and Planning Office. Staff is requesting the following action to be authorized a public review period for the Unified Planning Work Program from May 26th through June 26th, 2023, with a public meeting for discussion and action on June 26th, 2023, at 5pm. Chair Longacre asked for comments from the Commissioners. No comments were made.

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Rector moved to authorize a public review period for the FFY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program from May 26th to June 26th, 2023, with a public meeting for discussion and action on June 26, 2023, at 5PM. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

- **Update of Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) – review vision, goals, existing and projected conditions, and public outreach strategy:**

Mr. Burns gave an update on the long-range transportation plan. The first step of the LRTP Update process will be a visioning phase to review vision, goals, and existing conditions. May 22nd meeting was scheduled to continue the discussion on the vision and goals. Staff has launched a vision survey to help inform the process. The survey results will be presented at the June 26th meeting and at that meeting the NP&EDC will be asked to approve the Vision and Goals before beginning to prioritize strategies and projects. NP&EDC will be using an online public outreach platform called ZenCity to gather input from the public. The platform is being used to collect responses to a Visioning survey and gives a timeline and recorded presentation of the LRTP. Soon a commenting map that collects information on congestion, safety concerns and other current issues in specific locations will be featured. The current NP&EDC vision for transportation was approved in June 2019 which equitably and legally limits vehicles on Nantucket while providing a transportation system that is safe, accessible, economical, and sensitive to the island's character. Mr. Burns stated that the vision for 2050 shown in red emphasizes safety, accessibility, economy, and vehicle limitations that are sensitive to the island's character. This is open for public input through the visionary survey. Staff provided two options for organizing goals and objectives. The option shown includes nine modified goals that align with federal planning factors. Two sets of suggested goals were presented. Mr. Burns briefly discussed the transportation-related goals and priorities. The second option aligns with the vision and planning priorities which are not currently in the long-range transportation plan. Mr. Burns requested feedback from the commission on framing of the vision, goals, and priorities. Chair Longacre expressed concern if there is any impact in the federal funds. Mr. Burns stated that it would require more effort in describing how the regional transportation plan aligns with federal planning factors. He said that removing them and making them explicit in the goals would not impact eligibility for federal funds. Strengthening regional economic competitiveness is a federal planning factor that could be included if adopted as a goal. Mr. Burns stated that it's an effort to write the plan and describe the plan for review by the State Department of Transportation (SDOT). Raissah Koume, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT clarified that the selected visions and goals serve as guidance but do not directly impact federal funding for the projects. The project that the commission selected will be the one receiving federal funding if they are in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as they set precedent. Mr. Trudel raised a question about the inclusion of alternative vehicles such as mopeds and motorized vehicles factor into the statistics for zero fatalities by 2020. Mr. Trudel questioned if only looking at conventional vehicles like buses, trucks and cars or are they factoring all alternative vehicles as well. Mr. Burns stated that the goal of zero fatalities by 2050 under the vision zero initiative includes all pedestrian and motor vehicles related fatalities. Seth Engelbourg expressed interest in discussing some of the goals and feels that there are some things that need to be added. Mr. Burns stated that this is absolutely the time to discuss and wrap things up as the goal is to finalize the plan in the following month. Mr. Engelbourg highlighted two goals he believes should be included in the vision zero plan. The first goal is to improve micro-mobility, pedestrian, and bicycle transportation need to be included. Wendy Hudson commented about attending a board meeting of Retailers Association of Massachusetts where there was a presentation from National Grid. She said that there was a great deal of discussion of electric going carbon by 2050 being decarbonized. Electric charging stations and the challenges involved in decarbonizing. Mr. Engelbourg stated that suggested including goals related to climate change and resiliency. He stated that opting total decarbonization or change a certain percentage or just a general. Mr. Engelbourg expressed the importance of considering the impact on the natural environment and the need to take further steps. He suggested adding a commitment and goal to prioritize non-carbon transportation systems in the plan. Mr. Lowell brought up the issue of colony housing that was voted back in 2019. Mr. Lowell expressed the need to prioritize roundabouts and include them in the plan. Dawn Holdgate raided the issue of safety regarding e-bikes. She suggested having a second path on Milestone Road either as a separate lane on the bike path or on the road. Mr. Burns suggested utilizing shoulders on Milestone Road. Mr. Burns mentioned the need for different speed zones. Chair Longacre mentioned that there needs to be three different speed zones for safety on the roads. She compares the risk of mopeds next to baby strollers and e-bikes next to large trucks. Chair Longacre suggested speed zones that include pedestrian zone, a middle range zone possibly around 10-15 miles per hour and a third zone for Milestone Road with a speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Mr. Trudel there is potential to be utilized for accommodating designated type of other modes of transportation. Vice-Chair Rector questioned if there were input or thoughts from the Department of Transportation (DOT) regarding micro mobility issues and how to address them in relation to sidewalks and roadway systems. Mr. Burns stated that the state law has recently changed regarding e-bikes. He briefly went over the class system of e-bikes, class one and two are pedal assist bikes and class three is throttle. He also discussed the different speed for each class system for e-bikes. There was a lengthy discussion of the different types of usage and speed of e-bikes. The Vice-Chair Rector expressed concern that there should be a viable alternative offered particularly during quieter winter months regarding long-term on-street parking. He mentions that the current downtown core allows on-street parking until June 1st but suggests that narrowing down the timeframe and providing disincentives requires serious thought about resolving the parking issue. Chair Longacre stated that many transportation problems are behavioral rather than structural. Chair Longacre suggested that the inclusion of public outreach and education in transportation as a priority and potentially fundable at the state or federal level. The Town's communication director is currently working on creating public informational videos and seeking assistance from various committees, including the accommodation advisory committee to inform and develop message for transportation issues including potential public service announcements relying on the town's communication staff for support and contribution. Chair Longacre stated that they haven't forgotten about the existing bus pull-outs on Milestone Road and that they should be considered when modifying the layout. Chair Longacre expressed concern about the wording change in the 2019 vision, where the original wording specifically called for equitable and legally limited vehicles. She said that the term "legally" can be taken for granted as it is not feasible to illegally limit vehicles. The new alternative wording which states "with vehicle limitations" raises concern about how the phrase may be perceived by the public. Mr. Trudel raised the point of including motorized vehicles in the discussion, specifically mentioning the inclusion of a certain class of e-bikes which are considered motorized regardless of whether they are electric or gas-powered. He also suggested exploring the possibility of permits and licensing for all motorized bikes that are not solely pedal powered. He acknowledged that such a proposal might generate mixed responses with some opposing it while others supporting the idea. Mr. Burns noted that class e-bikes are not considered bicycles under Massachusetts General law. Mr. Burns also clarified that the new state law requires bikes to be labeled based on their class and maximum speed with the requirement being effective from January 1st of the current year. Mr. Topham mentioned that during a previous discussion with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) there was talk of implementing a $5 registration fee and finding a way to determine the class of each bike. One suggestion was to use a visible indicator such as an orange or yellow stem on the seat post to quickly identify whether a bike belongs on the bike path or not. Mr. Topham also emphasized the need for riders traveling at high speeds to wear helmets for safety reasons. Mr. Topham stated that this topic has been on BPAC's radar for a few months and expressed to bring it up again now that Mr. Burns is back on the scene. Mr. Topham suggested implementing a $5 registration fee for riders and he said that someone proposed using license plates or color-coded indicators on the stem of the seat post to determine if a bike belongs on the bike path. Additionally, it was mentioned that riders on the bike path should be required to wear helmets, especially when traveling at speeds over 20-25 miles per hour. Mr. Topham stated that this topic will be revisited with the input of Mr. Burns, who has recently joined the discussion, to find a way to regulate access to the bike path and address safety concerns. There was discussion raised regarding the need for regulation, licensing, and safety guidelines for micro-mobility transportation. Mr. Engelbourg expressed hope that the organization BPAC would address these concerns. Mr. Iverson expressed concern about the enforcement of these regulations, especially if the Police Department is unwilling to participate. Chair Longacre stated that she didn't see enforcement as a goal and suggested the possibility of hiring additional enforcement resources. Mr. Burns stated that the enforcement aspect was intentionally not included as a goal in the plan because the enforcement should already be inherent in the mission of the Police Department. If there were specific changes needed for enforcement they could address through objectives or new rules, laws, or ordinances. Mr. Topham suggested that if the Police Department implemented the regulations, word would spread, and people would start following the rules. He also proposed doing informative videos to educate people about bike path rules and etiquette. Mr. Johnson suggested the idea of placing small signs at the beginning of a major bike path with the rules of the road, like how road rules apply to bicycles and pedestrians. Mr. Burns provided a brief overview of the current conditions in various areas including roadways, and public transportation, active transportation, freight, aviation facilities, ferry operations, parking, population forecast, job forecast, travel and tourism, Land Use, Project Selection. Mr. Burns mentioned that the next meeting is scheduled for June 26th with the reviewing of the survey results. Also, in the next month the finalization of goals and vision for the plan will be discussed along with the ongoing discussion on conditions and priorities.

B. Presentation, NRTA Administrator, Gary Roberts:

Gary Roberts, the new administrator for NRTA was introduced and welcomed. Chair Longacre mentioned that he had been in the position for a few months and had accomplished a lot. Chair Longacre stated that the presentation that he gave to the Select Board on May 3rd was positively received and his work was acknowledged and appreciated. Mr. Roberts stated that an RFP (Request for Proposal) had been put out for a low emissions grant for propane powered vehicles, but no one had bid on it causing a delay in the process of acquiring new equipment. This delay could potentially postpone the purchase of new vehicles for up to two years. Currently the NRTA fleet consists of 19 buses with two of them retired and no longer in operation, leaving 17 vehicles in service. Thirteen of these vehicles are overdue for replacement with the need for replacements dating back to 2017. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) does not include funding for vehicle purchases until 2018 making it challenging to continue operating without the grant funds. A TIP amendment was made to allocate more maintenance work for the vehicles. Mr. Roberts mentioned an electric bus demonstration during the Daffodil event which received positive feedback from attendees. The electric bus was praised for its quietness, small size, and maneuverability, making it suitable for congested areas. It measured 20 feet long and could accommodate up to 18 people including standees without requiring a commercial driver's license (CDL) to operate. Mr. Roberts provided more details about the electric bus and the cost associated with it. Mr. Johnson asked about the cost of the 20-foot electric bus that was being tested. Mr. Roberts explained that the cost of the test demo vehicle was approximately $250,000.00. He also mentioned that full-sized transit electric buses, measuring 35 feet were priced around $1.1 to $1.2 million. The charging equipment for these buses was more expensive with the 20-foot bus requiring a 240-volt charger with three times the capacity of the current charging systems on the island. Charging the bus would take about four hours, however fast chargers could reduce the charging time to as little as an hour. Chair Longacre mentioned the ridership report specifically the low number of passengers on the Surfside route. Chair Longacre expressed surprise at this finding considering that Surfside is known as a popular beach destination. Chair Longacre acknowledged that Mr. Roberts hadn't experienced the area in the summer months. She asked if he planned to analyze ridership numbers and bus capacity utilization to recommend any necessary changes. Mr. Roberts responded by stating that his plan is to examine every aspect of the transit authority's functioning. Mr. Roberts stated that some of the report numbers might be misleading due to routes not being operated the previous year and a high rate of mechanical failures. Mr. Roberts stated that there is a need for a comprehensive analysis of the transit operation. The replacement of vehicles should take priority over rout changes or other improvements. The discussion emphasized the importance of securing funding and grants to bring in the new equipment. Also, the discussion emphasized the need for fine-tuning and other improvements. The goal is to ensure the routes are operational by acquiring at least four small vehicles. The principle of prioritizing basic operations first and focusing on planning later was discussed and agreed upon. Mr. Trudel stated that with 17 vehicles priced at approximately $250,000 each, purchasing the entire fleet at once would amount to $4.25 million. Mr. Trudel, however, proposed the option of leasing vehicles instead. By leasing vehicles for a period of 10 years with an estimated cost of $25,000 per year the same budget could be used to update the fleet continuously. Mr. Trudel inquired whether there had been any discussion regarding leasing vehicles. Mr. Roberts explained that federal funding typically does not support vehicle leasing, particularly electric vehicles. Mr. Roberts explained that the challenge with wholesale fleet changes or leasing the entire fleet is that it creates a similar issue when it reaches the end of its lifespan all at once. Mr. Roberts stated that a better approach to vehicle replacement would be to gradually swap out the fleet overtime, suggesting replacing 14 vehicles every year by purchasing two buses. By doing this, this will allow for a continuous rotation of vehicles, avoiding the problem of all vehicles reaching the end of their lifespan simultaneously. Mr. Roberts mentioned the minimum lifespan requirements for vehicles noting that they would likely be disposed of before reaching the maximum mileage. He also mentioned that while leasing batteries for electric buses is common, leasing buses themselves is less typical with manufacturers usually focusing on selling new vehicles. Regarding servicing the vehicles, the question was raised about the availability of mechanics or service providers. Mr. Roberts acknowledged the need for regular maintenance including lubrication and other necessary tasks for vehicle parts. Mr. Trudel questioned if there is an existing service provider or dedicated mechanics for the electric buses or do they need to be sent off island for servicing. Mr. Roberts stated that there is a preventative maintenance plan for all vehicles including electric buses. This plan involves maintaining various components such as the power plant, brakes, tires, suspensions, and interior components. While there is less work involved in maintaining an electric bus compared to a diesel engine, there is still a need to stay on top of regular tasks. The transition to electric buses is seen as a slow process, potentially starting with two to three buses, with training and warranties in place. Mr. Engelbourg expressed support for electric buses. He asked about the passenger capacity of the current buses being used, specifically mentioning two different sizes, 29-foot buses and 25-foot buses. Mr. Roberts stated that the 29-foot buses can only operate on certain routes such as the airport route while the smaller buses are used for other routes. There was a brief discussion regarding the challenges associated with the size and width of the buses with most modern buses being on a low floor and 102 inches wide but needing to be 96 inches wide to accommodate the narrow roads in the area. There was a brief discussion about the need for charging stations or vehicle swap-outs at locations like Greenhound to accommodate the longer routes. Mr. Engelbourg expresses support for moving forward with electric buses for shorter routes and suggests holding off on implementing them for longer routes at the moment. Mr. Engelbourg expresses a desire to see electric buses implemented throughout the entire island. Questions were raised about funding if the grant for the buses is not awarded. Mr. Engelbourg stated that in the past funding for Nantucket's transportation has come from appropriations made by the RTA cap (Reginal Transit Authority) through the Town budget or Town meeting. Mr. Engelbourg asked about the course of action if additional expenditure is needed. Mr. Roberts explained that buses are generally purchased through state funding, and there was a line item in the budget for the purchase of equipment buses. The money from the grant was allocated for the state match to cover the entire grant. Vice-Chair Rector made a comment about considering reverse routes. The ideas is to have to buses do reverse loops, allowing passengers to reach their destinations without having to return to Town and wait for the bus to reload. Mr. Rector stated that this is similar to what is seen in larger Towns and cities. There was a lengthy discussion on the consideration of implementing reverse routes.

C. <u>Area Plan Guidelines:</u>

At the previous meeting there were initial guidelines discussed for development of area plans, both new plans and updates. Chair Longacre stated that based on her experience with the Town area plan, additional comments have been suggested for the guidelines. Chair Longacre acknowledged that other participants may have different opinions on the suggested guidelines, and she is open to adaptation and editing. Mr. Vorce expressed support for the development guidelines and suggested that they could be amended to suit their purposes. Vice-Chair Rector prefers to wait one more month before suggesting any changes. Vice-Chair Rector acknowledged Mrs. Longacre's comments and he would like to add additional ideas. Vice-Chair would like the plan to defer action for one more month while continuing to work on the goals and getting them finalized in the near future. No further comments or questions are mentioned in the discussion.

D. <u>Open Space and Recreation Plan Follow Up:</u>

Mr. Vorce is expected to provide an update on this matter, however there are technical difficulties and Mr. Vorce's audio is not coming through. Wendy Hudson also shares that she is unable to use her camera on her new desktop computer. Mr. Engelbourg offers technical advice and assistance. Finally, Mr. Vorce rejoins the discussion and provides an update on the Open Space and Recreation Plan follow-up. He mentions that the item was discussed during a Select Board meeting on March 10th and has been rescheduled for June 28th. A staff level workshop is planned for June 15th with stakeholders of the open space plan. Mr. Vorce informs the group that adjustments will be made to include references to the indoor recreational facility based on public comments received. Mr. Vorce expects a final vote from the Select Board to close the project on June 28th.

E. 2023 Annual Town Meeting Follow Up and May 23rd Ballot Questions

The accomplishments of this year's Town Meeting are briefly reviewed with Articles 11, 14 and 17 related to the ballot passing as recommended by the Commission except for one article, Article 36 which did not pass. Article 18 which pertains to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund will be before the voters. It was mentioned that out of the 33 Zoning Articles handled by the Planning Board 32 were voted in accordance with the Board's recommendation and 19 of those articles were not even called for debate indicating the smooth progress of the Zoning process. Article 39 which resolved a pool related lawsuit and saved resources. Articles 41, 43, 44 and Citizen Article 58 focused on supporting affordable housing initiatives including expanding the area where duplexes are allowed. Article 58 and Article 41 were highlighted as initiatives that track affordable housing and expanded the allowance of duplexes in certain areas. Mr. Vorce referred to a Planning magazine that discusses the missing middle type of housing which has been prohibited in favor of single-family homes in many communities. Article 44 addresses parking regulations and Mr. Vorce stated that eliminating parking minimums has become a prevalent topic in Planning magazines. He said that the trend is to replace parking requirements with articles that promote more housing options and prioritize people over vehicles. Mr. Vorce briefly mentioned Articles 87 to 97, which involve real estate and are important for coastal resiliency and ongoing work with the Land Bank. Article 101 which pertains to Stone Alley the importance of supporting a historic pathway and its long-term maintenance. Articles 102 and 103 were also mentioned of the long-term planning articles that solidify the positive working relationship between the Town, Land Bank and Steamship Authority for specific projects. Mr. Engelbourg expressed a change in opinion regarding Article RFO86 which pertained to fertilizer after conversations with community members and stakeholders. Mr. Engelbourg mentioned that there had been discussions about tabling the article, but it was not done, and he was glad that it went through. He stated that since it is a home rule petition, they would have to wait for the State to ratify it and raised the question of whether the Planning Department had considered the potential ramifications if the State accepts it. He emphasized the need to be proactive and start planning if the State moves forward because there would be a two-year period to get everything done. Mr. Vorce from the Planning Department responded by stating that they had received draft articles from the Health Department which they would share for review. Also, he mentioned that there is still time before the adoption of the articles and that the Board of Health chair did not see a major role for the Planning Department as their approval would primarily be required unless there were substantial differences of opinion. Vice-Chair Rector expressed to circle back to a previous topic after discussing the May 23rd ballot questions. Chair Longacre agreed and suggested sticking to the discussion of articles for the time being. Vice-Chair Rector took the opportunity to thank Mr. Vorce and the Planning Department staff for their excellent work in preparing for the Town Meeting and acknowledging the significant amount of effort involved. Vice-

Chair. Rector requested some latitude to introduce a motion and asked for a point of privilege to set up his argument. The Vice-Chair Rector mentioned having concerns about Article 83 and believed that some of his peers on the Board might share similar issues. Vice-Chair Rector explained that the previous Town Meeting allowed them to study the NP&EDC and they are still in the process of completing it. He said that they did not have the opportunity to analyze the new article introduced at the current Town Meeting, Article 83, and he mentioned that the Commission did not receive any information or changes regarding the article prior to the Town Meeting. He also stated that the last-minute changes presented within 36 hours and even during the Town Meeting itself did not allow the Commission to address them properly. it within the given timeframe of 36 hours. Vice-Chair Rector expressed three areas of concern. The first concern was bout term limits as the Planning Board had been singled out and treated differently from other Boards and Commission on the island. The second concern was related to the complete removal of the Planning Board leaving one person thereafter. Vice-Chair Rector stated that when he joined as a commissioner, he had the intention to serve his complete term. The third concern was that the article being discussed did not address significant items such as administration, government structure and financing.

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Rector made a motion to authorize the Chair to convey in writing concerns of the Commission in regard to Article 83 to the Select Board and recommend that this Article be deferred until 2024 Annual Town Meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson.

Discussion: Chair Longacre suggested opening the discussion to other commissioners before proceeding with the motion. Vice-Chair Rector mentioned that were additional topics that needed to be addressed beyond the three already discussed. He encourages that this Board adopt the concept that he proposed which is authorizing the Chair to draft a letter and allow the Board time to identify the areas that require attention. Mr. Engelbourg acknowledged Vice-Chair Rector's intent but expressed his understanding that at this point it is out of the Select Boards hands and the matter was now in the hands of the State and that contacting the Massachusetts legislature might be more appropriate at this stage. Mr. Vorce responded stating that the Select Board can make a decision on the petitions based on their own judgment, even if the Town meeting authorizes action. Mr. Vorce stated that the State legislature ultimately has the final say and that the Select Board would likely take a vote on the matter in early June. Mr. Engelbourg expressed his agreement with Vice-Chair Rector's concerns about Article 83 and mentioned that there are some flaws to Article 83, which he spoke about that effect on the Town Meeting floor. Mr. Engelbourg suggested proceeding with the process of sending a letter to address the concerns but also, he mentioned the importance of not interfering with the democratic process. Mr. Engelbourg suggested inviting the article's sponsor to the table to discuss the current initiatives and how they would lead to improved long-range planning and sustainability for the commission. Mr. Engelbourg emphasized the need to try to engage in dialogue in attempt to convince the sponsor of the value of the ongoing efforts. He said by denying the article sponsor a seat at the table would be considered bad governance. Mr. Trudel opposed Article 83 and expressed agreement with the Vice-Chair Rector's concerns. He acknowledged that the vote on the article was close, and there was even a request for a recount. Mr. Trudel emphasized the importance of respecting the process and indicated that he would oppose Vice-Chair Rector's motion. Vice-Chair Rector stated that the issue at hand is time sensitive as the Select Board will need to take action by the beginning of June. Vice-Chair Rector believed that silence could be interpreted as complacency and highlighted the problematic areas that would need to be addressed if no action was taken. There was a brief discussion on the challenges of getting people to participate and run for positions in Nantucket, particularly in committees. Mr. Lowell expressed support for Vice-Chair Rector's article but anticipates a larger process and potential involvement of other agencies and the state government. Mr. Lowell mentions the difficulty of changing entities like the Land Bank and the Steamship, requiring community support. Mr. Topham mentions his upcoming candidacy and expresses a desire for others to step up and run as well. He suggests having a workshop to discuss the details and implications of Article 83 including its pros and cons. Mr. Topham agree with Vice-Chair Rector's suggestion of writing a letter to the Select Board to further understand the reasons behind the decision. Mr. Topham emphasized the need to move forward in the best interest of Nantucket and suggested that the letter to the Select Board should convey a positive message. Mr. Engelbourg stated that he supports the idea of the letter and emphasizes the importance of including and informing all citizens, regardless of their stance on the matter. Mr. Iverson expresses agreement with Mr. Engelbourg's viewpoint and sees the cautious approach as a necessary part of the process. Mr. Iverson emphasized the need for thorough understanding and ensuring that the article works for the community. Mr. Topham supports the diversity of opinions within the Board and appreciates the differences and opposing perspectives. He stated that he values the ability to challenge each other 's ideas and make inform decisions. The Board acknowledges the need to give sufficient time to work through the issues and move forward in a constructive manner. Chair Longacre stated that the conflict arising from the coexistence of Article 83 and the previously passed Article 81 from the previous year is recognized as a problem that needs to be resolved. Ms. Longacre stated that the need for a process to address this conflict is identified although specific steps are not determined at this time. Mr. Engelbourg suggested if there is a history of the Select Board not sending certain articles to the State in the past then the same approach can be taken with Article 83. Chair Longacre asked Mr. Vorce if he wanted to respond to Mr. Engelbourg. Mr. Vorce stated that he would need to conduct extensive research because he doesn't have any immediate knowledge or examples regarding the question. Mr. Vorce expresses uncertainty about whether specific action has been taken in the past and mentions that the Select Board has made changes to articles before they were sent back.

Vice-Chair Rector read the motion out loud.

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Rector made a motion to authorize the Chair to convey in writing the Commission's concerns regarding Article 83 to the Select Board and recommend that the article be deferred until 2024 Annual Town Meeting (ATM).

Discussion: Mr. Trudel expresses his concern about the wording of the motion. He feels that recommending a deferral until 2024 might give the impression that the Board is trying to obstruct or delay the process, which might not be well-received by the general population and could be perceived negatively. Mr. Trudel is opposed to the article. He emphasized the need to better understand it and have more conversations without forcefully deferring it for a year as there will still be opportunities to address it after the Annual Town Meeting (ATM). Mr. Iverson acknowledges Mr. Trudel's concerns and suggests an alternative. Mr. Iverson proposes deferring the article to the November Town Meeting even though it's a short timeframe. Mr. Iverson emphasized the importance of discussion of the matter among the Boards and ensuring that everyone understands it before sending it to the State. Dawn Holdgate from the Select Board is invited to offer any perspective on past history or how the proposal might be received. Dawn Holdgate has technical difficulties with the audio. Mrs. Holdgate stated that they will not vote on the matter because she feels that they will be discussing it in her other role. She expressed uncertainty about the history of waiting to send things to the State but suggested that there may be reasons for doing so. She mentions the possibility of having two new Board members after Wednesday, which could influence how the Board receives the proposal. Mrs. Holdgate stated that she was opposed to this article, particularly regarding the term limits and the limited number of candidates in the upcoming elections. She believes the process should be collaborative and agrees that the proponent of the article should be brought in for discussion. She expresses regret that the proponent of the article had to leave early. Mrs. Holdgate stated that sending a letter with concerns would be appropriate regardless of the outcome and it might be more acceptable to prepare something for the November Town Meeting rather than waiting for a full year. Mrs. Holdgate stated that the public doesn't generally react well to long timelines. Mr. Vorce reminds the Board about upcoming timelines. The warrant articles for the Special Town Meeting will be open in June and the warrant article for the Annual Town Meeting will come around December. Mr. Vorce suggests that since time is limited and they don't have much of it, he suggests deferring the matter without tying it to a specific Town Meeting in order to allow for a process. This would give the Commission time for analysis and a better understanding of their future regarding elections and Board approaches. Instead of deciding now they can defer it and decide later whether to continue pursuing it or make adjustments and send it back to the Town Meeting. Chair Longacre stated that she identified three issues that are possibly interconnected but might require separate consideration. The first is related to Article 81 from last year which instructed them to study the makeup of the NP&EDC and present their own recommendation. Mrs. Longacre believes that the process initiated by Article 81 should continue as it is valuable. The second issue is Article 83, which is being discussed may have flaws or uncertainties that have not been thoroughly examined yet. It is important to understand that the potential impact of these flaws on the structure of various Boards or organizations involved. The third issue arises from the fact that Article 81 and Article 83 both passed by the Town Meeting appear to be compatible. Therefore, there needs to be a resolution or clarification regarding this inconsistency. Kristie Ferrantella asked about the deadline for submitting a letter to the State and the urgency of having a meeting to discuss it. She was curious about whether there was enough time to send the letter to the Select Board, have a meeting, and still meet the deadline. Mr. Vorce stated that the deadline for submitting comments on the current petitions is May 31st, and the Select Board will discuss them on June 7th. If the home rule petitions are not acted upon during the legislative session, they will need to be voted on again.

Chair Longacre stated that there is a motion on the table. After no further discussion, a vote was taken on the Vice-Chair Rector's motion. The motion included authorizing the Chair to send a letter to the Select Board expressing concerns about Article 83 and recommending deferring its progress until the Annual Town Meeting in 2024.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristie Ferrantella *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Abstain*
Wendy Hudson, *Nay*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Abstain*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

F. Director of Planning Updates and Contract Ratification:

Andrew Vorce, the Director of Planning announced his retirement and the end of his service as Director. He mentioned that his contract would end on June 20th and expressed his appreciation for the team he has worked with. Mr. Vorce assured everyone that he would still be available to assist in the future. The Commissioners expressed their gratitude and appreciation for Mr. Vorce's service and leadership. They acknowledged the significant impact he has had on the Planning Department and the Town of Nantucket. They praised his fairness, honesty, and the growth of the department under his guidance. Several Commissioners mentioned that Mr. Vorce's contributions would be remembered for a long time, that he would be missed, and that his departure would leave a big shoe to fill. They thanked him for his dedication and wished him luck in his retirement. Mr. Rector recognized Mr. Vorce as the longest-serving employee at NP&EDC. He was also acknowledged as the longest-serving member of the Planning Board. Mr. Vorce thanked everyone. He announced that he will be taking the summer off but plans to return around September, He mentions that there are unfinished projects and expresses his willingness to work with the Town Manager and others to continue contributing in the future. Mr. Vorce views this as a new chapter and expresses his happiness for his team including Leslie, Mike Burns and Megan.

Leslie Snell provided an update. Mrs. Snell stated that in March there was an executive session where her promotion to the Director of Planning was discussed. She informs the Commission that there is a contract that was voted on during the executive session which needs to be ratified in the open session. Mrs. Snell states that she has a formal acceptance letter to provide to the Commission.

Motion/Vote: Mrs. Farrentella made a motion to approve the contract. The motion was duly seconded by Mrs. Holdgate and the motion carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristie Ferrantella *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
Wendy Hudson, *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

Mrs. Snell expresses her gratitude to everyone and states that she is excited to start her new position and work with all of them in a different capacity. Mrs. Snell's role will be effective from July 1st. Vice-Chair Rector thanked Mrs. Snell and expresses his enthusiasm for her involvement. Vice-Chair. Rector congratulates Mrs. Snell on being part of the team and expresses his confidence in her ability to carry on Mr. Vorce's legacy. Mrs. Snell thanked Vice-Chair Rector for his kind words. Mr. Vorce congratulates Mrs. Snell and Mrs. Trudel.

G. Other Committee updates/reports:

Ms. Hudson from the Rural Policy Advisory Commission announces that the State has finally filled the position of the Director of Rural Affairs with Senator Ann Goby. Senator Goby will be leaving her job as a Senator from Spencer, Massachusetts, to take on this newly created position with the Executive Office of Economic Development, which has been separated from housing. Ms. Hudson expresses that this is good news and mentions that they have been advocating for someone in this position for a long time. Ms. Hudson is unsure if Senator Goby will be available to speak to them in the future but suggests reaching out to Linda Dunleavy who has been helpful in the past.

Mr. Topham provided an update on the Medicaid Area Workgroup. He mentions that they have sent out 625 postcards to the first batch of recipients, heading west. The purpose of these postcards is to invite recipients to go online and fill out surveys. Mr. Topham expresses hope that they will receive information back soon. He mentions that his family has received the postcard, and he believes that most of the recipients have filled it out. Mr. Topham stated that he is hoping to speak with Diane or Bill Grieder to see the progress of the survey.

VII. **Other Business:**

a. **Letters of interest for At-Large Membership position due June 16, 2023, at 4pm**
Mr. Lowell mentioned that the situation he experienced was an example of succession planning that had occurred naturally without the need for outside consultants or special individuals. Mr. Lowell believed that this was significant and something to be grateful for.

b. **Next Meeting Monday, Monday, June 26, 2023, at 5pm***, via Zoom*

VIII. **Adjournment:**

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was duly seconded by Mrs. Ferrantella and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristie Ferrantella *Aye*
Dawn Holdgate *Aye*
Wendy Hudson, *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

Submitted by: *Catherine Ancero*