NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission DRAFT Minutes
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
September 18, 2023 @ 5:00PM

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

Staff: Leslie Snell, Director of Planning, Megan Trudel, Senior Planner, Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager and Holly Backus, Preservation Planner

---

I. Call to order:

Chair Longacre called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

Chair Longacre read a prepared statement in accordance with Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2023 regarding open meeting law, which outlines how the meeting is conducted via remote participation and states the ground rules for any discussion.

II. Establishment of quorum:

In Attendance:

Commissioners:

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

Staff:
Leslie Snell, Director of Planning *Aye*
Megan Trudel, Senior Planner *Aye*
Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager *Aye*
Holly Backus, Preservation Planner *Aye*
Raissah Kouame, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT *Aye*

III. Approval of Amended Agenda:

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

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

IV. Minutes:

A. July 17, 2023

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson moved to approve the minutes as drafted. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

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

Transportation Planner Update

1. FY 2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Budget Amendment

Transportation Planner Mike Burns stated that this item pertains to an amendment in the current year's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), involving the reallocation of budget among planning tasks. The rationale behind this amendment is the need for more budget allocation towards management and public participation activities towards the end of the fiscal year 2023. Burns noted that this adjustment is possible due to unused funds originally allocated for analysis and fieldwork support. Historically, management activities have typically accounted for about 15% of the budget, and 8% was budgeted in the FY 2023 UPWP. Furthermore, staff is dedicating more time to coordinate with communication staff for public outreach, necessitating adjustments in the budget for both tasks in the FY 24 UPWP. Importantly, Mr. Burns noted that this amendment does not affect the overall budget or detract from task three items. As such, staff recommended the approval of this amendment as presented for the FY 2023 UPWP.

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell moved to approve the budget amendment for the FY 2023 UPWP. The motion was duly seconded by Kristie Ferrantella and the motion was unanimously approved.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

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

2. FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Review upcoming annual tasks

Mike Burns provided an overview and look ahead to fiscal year 24 planning activities. He highlighted various tasks to be discussed at upcoming NP&EDC meetings. These include updates to the public participation plan, as well as changes recommended by MassDOT staff to the Title VI program. Mike emphasized that task one items fall under management activities. He noted that task two items encompass data collection, with a new requirement for Complete Street support. Task three items involve specific planning tasks and account for a substantial portion of the FY 24 UPWP budget. This includes efforts to limit single-occupant vehicle usage, focus on the potential Intermodal Transportation Center, and significant time for the development of the Regional Safety Action Plan. Bicycle and pedestrian planning activities, parking, freight, and other planning activities, as well as task four items, mainly relate to implementation-related tasks. Mike underlined that these planning priorities are aligned with the long-range transportation plan, and the goal is to synchronize various planning documents. While most planning priorities are addressed in the FY 24 UPWP, affordability and resident access to the vehicle ferry might require further discussion. Mike also mentioned the possibility of grant opportunities to address affordability. Finally, he noted that certain topics like free fare for transit and vehicle capacity studies could be included in future UPWPs, pending approval. Raissah Kouame from MassDOT expressed appreciation for the comprehensive overview presented by Mike Burns. She noted the upcoming start of the new fiscal year in October and highlighted the anticipation of implementing the SS4A program. Raissah expressed her readiness to address any questions or provide further information as needed.

Nat Lowell inquired about Mike's assessment of the work done by the WPI (Worcester Polytechnic Institute) team during their recent cycle, which took place around late fall of the previous year. Nat expressed interest in whether Mike had reviewed their findings, as he believed there was valuable content within their work. Mike Burns acknowledged Nat Lowell's inquiry and confirmed that he had considered the work conducted by the WPI students, particularly under task 3.4, related to parking, freight, and other planning activities. While he had specifically mentioned the parking management program, Mike highlighted that the WPI students had indeed assessed loading zones and made recommendations. He assured Nat that these recommendations would be thoroughly evaluated and coordinated with the Traffic Safety Committee, and that there was room within the work program to address these matters. Mike also expressed his willingness to collaborate with Mr. Lowell outside of the scheduled meetings to further discuss these findings and recommendations. Mike Burns went on to express his gratitude to Nat Lowell for organizing a meeting with Steamship Authority staff the previous week. During the meeting, they discussed the planning priorities recently approved in the long-range Transportation plan and explored various ideas related to ensuring access to the boats and affordability, among other operational matters. Mike credited Nat for his role on the Port Council, which enabled valuable contacts and conversations with Steamship Authority staff. He shared this information with the commission to keep them informed of the productive discussions that took place.

Seth Engelbourg brought up the topic of free fares for public transportation, citing a recent experience with NRTA implementing free fares during the winter through a grant. Seth observed a positive response from people, including himself, though he acknowledged that this was based on anecdotal information. He expressed interest in whether there was any data available to assess the impact of the free fares initiative. Commissioner Engelbourg pointed out that various municipalities across the state have had a history of successful free public transit fare programs and advocated for prioritizing this concept in future planning. While acknowledging that it's not a standalone solution, Seth believed it could significantly contribute to increased bus usage, provided that other factors such as additional routes, stops, and schedules are also considered. He suggested incorporating free fares into the plan if feasible.

Mike Burns offered a follow-up on the discussion of free fares for public transportation, stating that he had conversations with the NRTA administrator about the benefits of such a system. He highlighted that free fares can incentivize ridership by removing the barrier of needing to purchase tickets or cards, thus streamlining the operation and saving costs. Additionally, Mike mentioned that there are performance measures related to fares, such as revenue per mile, which would need to be addressed to implement free fares. He noted that there is considerable support for affordable transit and making stops more accessible. Mike also brought up the efforts, possibly at the statewide or federal level, to provide funding for regions to improve stop accessibility, with a focus on priority stops located within crash clusters and other areas that would lead to a prioritization of stop improvements. Chair Longacre mentioned that the Commission plans to invite Gary Roberts, the administrator for the NRTA, to the October meeting. The purpose of this invitation is to have him provide an update on how the summer season went.

3. Update on 3C Program Activities (informational only)

Mike Burns provided an update on the third item, indicating that it was related to all the planning tasks. He mentioned the inclusion of a narrative report for informational purposes and expressed readiness to answer any questions members might have regarding the content of that report.

B. Area Plans Status Update

1. Town Area Plan

Henry Terry provided an update on the town area plan, acknowledging that progress has been somewhat slow. He mentioned that Amy Baxter would be attending their next meeting to provide clarification on certain aspects of the plan. Mr. Terry expressed his hope that they would complete the plan toward the end of the year or possibly in the early part of the next year, depending on how the holidays unfold. He welcomed any questions from the members. Chair Longacre provided additional context on the town area plan, mentioning that it has been meeting twice a month for approximately the past two years. Mr. Terry initiated a survey, and the results have been returned. They have been focusing on various aspects of the master plan relevant to the town area plan. At present, there is no draft available. Chair Longacre also clarified her role as the NP&PDC representative to the Town Area Plan work group. When a draft of the plan becomes available, it will be presented to the NP&EDC for review.

2. Madaket Area Plan

Joe Topham discussed the need for improved communication and sharing of meeting minutes within The Madaket Area plan group. He expressed appreciation for Diana Brown's proactive role in facilitating communication between the Town and Madaket. However, he expressed sadness about her departure. He also mentioned the resignation of Bob Kucharavy. and the resulting changes in leadership within the group. Bruce Mandel is set to become the temporary chair, and Kathy Slattery will assist for a few months. Mr. Topham noted that they are currently facing challenges in getting up to speed, and Bruce Mendel has personal matters to deal with. The group, while offering some valuable suggestions, raised concerns about certain guidelines. Mr. Topham then discussed the group's request to sit down with Chair Longacre and Vice Chair Rector, but there was a scheduling conflict as their next two meetings coincided with NP&EDC meetings. While there was a suggestion to change the date, the decision was already made to keep the original schedule. Mr. Topham expressed uncertainty about how to address this issue.

Chair Longacre acknowledged the scheduling conflict and the need to find a resolution. She particularly focused on a statement from March 2021, which mentioned that the MAP Work Group was waiting for NP&EDC approval for the expanded area plan boundary. Chair Longacre sought clarification on whether this issue had been resolved or if it was still pending. The Chair went on to emphasize the complexity of the situation due to resignations, the need to advertise for replacements, and the scheduling of area plan guidelines for discussion with the public at the October 23rd meeting. She suggested that the work group should consider sending a representative to the NP&EDC meeting on October 23rd instead of holding their own meeting at the same time, at least for that specific date.

Joe Topham agreed with the suggestion to have a representative from the Madaket Area Plan Work Group attend the NP&EDC meeting on October 23rd. He also highlighted a concern related to the group's desire to promote from within rather than advertise for new members, emphasizing the need to follow rules and regulations. Joe noted that he had reached out to the town administration to provide the group with information on open meeting laws and sharing public documents. He shared his experience from a seminar led by Lauren Goldberg and planned to share helpful links with the group. Joe aimed to educate them on effective participation in workgroups, as they had questions regarding their interactions at various meetings. He expressed his willingness to sit down with Michael Maynard and potentially Bruce Mandel or Kathy to offer guidance on how things work and progress. Joe requested assistance from Vice Chair Barry Rector and Chair Mary Longacre in this regard. Chair Longacre and Vice Chair Rector expressed their willingness to schedule a meeting with Joe Topham to offer guidance to the Madaket Area Plan Group. Chair Longacre then raised a concern about the references to attachments in the second page of the letter but the absence of actual attachments. The Chair specifically mentioned that the letter referred to summary results from a survey but he had not seen the survey questions or data. Chair Longacre expressed the need to see both the results and the actual survey questions and data if the group is at a point where they are ready to share them. Joe Topham indicated that he had seen the survey questions and data and expressed his surprise that Diana didn't share them earlier, attributing it to a potential oversight. He noted that 97 respondents had provided comments, which were not shared by the person who analyzed the data. Joe emphasized the importance of sharing all relevant information, including the minutes and identifying who made specific comments, to maintain transparency and provide access to public records. He reiterated the need for a meeting with the Madaket Area Plan Group to address these issues.

Director of Planning Leslie Snell clarified that the survey questions and responses were indeed provided, but the 97 open-ended comments were not. She mentioned that they have those comments internally and felt that the work group might need more time to review them and decide how to present them to the NP&EDC. Leslie suggested that it's important for the work group to have an opportunity to discuss the comments internally before they are made public to ensure they are presented with appropriate context and discussion.

3. Acceptance of Resignations of Madaket Area Plan Workgroup

- Diana Brown
- Robert Kucharavy

Chair Longacre addressed the acceptance of resignations from Madaket Area Plan Work Group members Diana Brown and Bob Kucharavy. She expressed gratitude for their participation and acknowledged the need to consider the next steps, including advertising for replacements. Chair Longacre also emphasized that the current work group members would have an opportunity to provide input on the preferred appointees, ensuring that the process is collaborative and prioritizes Madaket residency.

Motion/Vote: Barry Rector moved to accept the resignations from the Madaket Area Plan Work Group. The motion was duly seconded by Joe Topham and the motion was unanimously approved.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

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

C. Section 106 Status Update (Wind Farm)

Preservation Planner Holly Backus provided an update regarding her role as the representative under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the NP&EDC. She noted the initial difficulty in having federal agencies recognize Nantucket's multiple representatives. With the assistance of Cultural Heritage Partners, they have navigated through various Section 106 reviews, with Vineyard Wind being the only one approved by the Department of the Interior. Holly emphasized Nantucket's special status as a National Historic Landmark and the requirement for developers to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any adverse effects on the landmark. Backus also mentioned the Town's efforts to hold developers accountable and highlighted the significance of wind farms being developed off the Nantucket Coast. Holly encouraged the commission to review the Oppa (Ocean Projects Protection Act) and offered to answer any questions they might have related to the Section 106 reviews. Joe Topham wanted to clarify that Holly Backus is the NP&EDC representative for this matter as there had been several comments made that there was no NP&EDC representative. John Trudel sought the opinion of Holly Backus regarding recent statistics on the impact of wind farms on tourism in Nantucket. According to an article, a study by a major wind corporation suggested that at least 15 percent of tourists are unlikely to return once the wind farms are installed. Mr. Trudel is concerned about the substantial loss in tourism revenue for Nantucket, given that 15 to 30 percent represents a significant portion of the income derived from tourism. Holly acknowledged CHP as the foremost law firm in cultural heritage and historic preservation law, praising their expertise and commitment to presenting accurate information. She expresses concerns about the potential negative financial impacts on the National Historic Landmark posed by wind farms. While acknowledging the difficulty in predicting exact outcomes, Holly highlights contrasting statistics, some suggesting increased tourism due to wind farms, a claim she disputes. Ultimately, she aligns with CHP's stance, emphasizing the fluctuating nature of the situation and supporting the firm's insights. Bert Johnson recounted his recent fishing trip around the West End of Muskegon, expressing surprise at the visibility of the large black transformer platform from sea level. He mentions previous information suggesting that it wouldn't be visible from Nantucket, indicating a contradiction with his recent observation. In agreement with Bert Johnson's comments, Holly emphasizes the significance of understanding the impacts of the transformer platform's visibility, especially through the Section 106 review process. She notes that developers are obligated to provide photo simulations showcasing the visual aspects of the Wind Farm.

Wendy Hudson commended the article, acknowledging numerous valid points but expresses skepticism about the projected 30% cut in tourism due to wind farms. Drawing a comparison with Montecito, California, where the presence of oil rigs hasn't deterred high-profile visitors, Wendy finds the tourism argument less convincing. She emphasized the importance of collaboration and criticizes obstructionism, citing the need for appropriate action. Wendy also went on to highlight positive precedents set by the Vineyard Conversation and urges against alarmism, suggesting a balanced perspective on the issues raised in the article.

Chair Longacre appreciates Holly's acknowledgment that the impact of wind farms is uncertain. Personally supportive of wind energy since a young age, she notes that her vacation plans wouldn't be swayed by the presence of a wind farm, expressing a potential for increased interest in such locations. Chair Longacre aligns with Wendy's skepticism about a 30% tourism decrease, emphasizing the need to differentiate between various projects. She highlights the importance of distinguishing Vineyard wind, which has a good neighbor agreement and has made concessions for Nantucket, from other projects still in negotiations. Chair Longacre urges a nuanced approach, recognizing Vineyard Wind's cooperation compared to other companies still in early planning stages. Holly went on to emphasize the importance of regularly checking the town's Work Group website for updates on wind farm developments, with assistance from expert Council CHP. She highlights the complexity of managing multiple projects at different stages and the challenges faced by town staff in keeping up with federal processes and state procurement. Holly notes the uncertainty surrounding each developer's approach and the evolving technology, stressing the need to understand the cumulative effects. Acknowledging potential technical issues, she encourages the community to monitor the website for reliable information and updates, assuring efforts to address questions as they arise.

Vice Chair Rector urges caution when interpreting news media reports, emphasizing the potential for sensationalism and the need for solid data. He questions predictions like a 30 percent reduction in tourism, suggesting that the news may not accurately reflect the complex reality. Barry highlights the positive aspect of potential increases in tourism due to artificial reefs created by wind farms for fishermen. He echoes Holly's point about the evolving nature of technology, citing a recent example of experimental one-blade wind generators being tested on the ocean. Barry underscores the dynamic nature of developments and the importance of staying informed as new technologies emerge.

Seth Engelbourg discussed the financial challenges faced by wind energy projects off the Southwest Shore of Nantucket, noting that several are actively seeking to exit their permits, some even willing to pay up to $60 million to break contracts. He emphasizes the financial strain in the wind energy business, regardless of individual opinions on the matter. Seth suggests that the NP&EDC, as the Regional Planning Authority, should take a more active role in these discussions. While acknowledging Holly's role as a staff representative, he advocates for a more engaged commissioner role in the ongoing conversations. Holly responded to Seth's point about developers seeking to exit permits, citing the example of Mayflower Wind changing its name to South Coast. She acknowledged the challenges in keeping up with the changes and expressed gratitude for the expertise of their legal counsel. Holly confirms Seth's observation that developers have indeed paid fees to cancel contracts, highlighting the volatile and political nature of the process at the federal level. She stresses the complexity of the situation, with technological changes and different phases adding to the uncertainty. Holly went on to emphasize the unprecedented nature of cumulative effects as each individual development goes through review processes, and the need to understand the overall impact. Chair Longacre expressed gratitude to Holly for the report and indicates an intention to follow up with her and Lauren Sinatra for more information. She notes the emerging impact of wind farm developments on Nantucket, citing both construction and the significance of The Good Neighbor agreement with associated funding. Chair Longacre mentioned that the first installment of the funding is now with the Community Foundation, expressing anticipation to learn more about how it will benefit the community.

D. Special Town Meeting 2023, Articles of Planning Concern

John Trudel announced his intention to maintain consistency by recusing himself from discussions on the General Bylaw and Short-term Rental Regulations. Director of Planning Leslie Snell provides an overview of the 20 articles on the special town meeting warrant for November 7th, highlighting those that may be of planning concern. She begins with the first two articles related to short-term rentals, explaining that they are closely tied together. She mentions article 6, which addresses the conveyance of land around the Surfside wastewater treatment plant to the land bank. Articles 7 and 8 involve easements in the Surfside area for utility and road work and a home rule petition for a bike path easement, respectively. Leslie then discusses article 10, focusing on the Nobadeer playing field site enhancements, and suggests it may be related to the recently endorsed open space and recreation plan. Articles 12 and 13 involve appropriations for town employee housing at the airport. Article 15 proposes amending the description for a new Public Works facility location, and Leslie notes that the commission supported a similar amendment last year. She highlights article 18, a sewer district amendment for Codfish Park, which may warrant the commission's recommendation against FinCom support due to environmental concerns. Lastly, Leslie mentions article 20, a sewer district for Burnt Swamp Lane, emphasizing its environmentally sensitive nature in the Hummock Pond Watershed. Chair Longacre raised a question about article 19, a sewer district map change, wondering why it was not included as a potential planning concern. Leslie Snell responds, explaining that the work group did not see any compelling reason to either support or oppose article 19. Snell suggested letting the voters decide without the need for a specific position from the commission. Chair Longacre asked for input from the commissioners, she specifically inquired whether the commissioners felt inclined to support the staff recommendation for certain articles, such as article 18, or if there are opposing views that warrant not supporting the staff recommendation. Nat Lowell expressed agreement with all the recommendations, including the "no" on Codfish Park. He mentioned having done some research on the matter and believes it is premature, suggesting that more work needs to be done before any decisions are made. Mr. Lowell emphasized that further assessment is necessary to fully understand the implications of the proposal for Codfish Park.

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson moved to approve the determination that Articles 1 & 2 are of planning concern and to support the staff recommendations for those articles. Motion was duly seconded by Joe Topham.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joe Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristie Ferrantella *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*

Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Recused*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Recused*
John Trudel *Recused*

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson moved to approve the determination that Articles 6,7,8,10,12,13,15 & 20 on this list are of planning concern and to support the staff recommendations for those articles. Motion was duly seconded by Barry Rector.

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

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson moved to approve the determination that Article 18 is of planning concern and to support the staff recommendations for that article. Motion was duly seconded by Joe Topham.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joe Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristie Ferrantella *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Recused*

E. Ongoing Discussion – Enabling Legislation.

1. Vision Mission Objectives

During the discussion on the ongoing review of the enabling legislation, vision, mission, and objectives, there was a focus on the inclusion of language related to historic preservation. Wendy Hudson suggested adding language that reflects the consideration of the island's National Historic Landmark status in the mission statement. Barry Rector expressed concerns about the specificity of the language, emphasizing the need to avoid overstepping boundaries and be cautious about the scope of the document. Other commissioners, such as John Trudell and Joe Topham, supported the idea of including historic preservation, considering it integral to the regional planning concern. Wendy Hudson proposed the language "balance consideration of Our National Historic Landmark status with planning." Barry Rector expressed caution about using the term "balance" in conjunction with planning. Chair Longacre suggested using the term "recognizing" instead. Ultimately, Wendy Hudson and Barry Rector agreed on the term "recognizing," and Commissioner Dave Iverson expressed satisfaction with the overall document.

F. Discussion of Text Changes by Massachusetts Senate Counsel to Article 83 (ATM 2023)

Director of Planning Leslie Snell informed the Commission about a home rule petition, Article 83, which is set to be discussed at the upcoming Select Board Meeting. The certified copy of Article 83, as approved at town meeting, was sent to Senate council for review. The Senate council made suggested changes, visible in the red-lined version. These changes are described as non-substantive, involving reordering sections without altering the overall scope or intent of the article. Leslie emphasized that this was an informational update, with no immediate action required from the Commission. The decision-making authority lies with the Select Board. The article has not yet advanced due to the pending changes. Chair Longacre clarified that the purpose of providing this information was not to engage in a discussion about the merits or details of the article. Instead, it was intended to inform the commission about the article's position in the process, the changes made at the state level, and its upcoming appearance before the select board on Wednesday. Vice Chair Rector expressed the desire to have a rough estimate of the upcoming time frames and next steps in the process. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that the matter does not inadvertently fall off the Commission's radar and is adequately addressed between the current meeting and the subsequent ones. Leslie Snell explained that the first step was the Select Board's action on Wednesday. Afterward, the process will continue through the normal legislative channels. The bill will be assigned a number, and Snell has been in contact with legislators and local liaison Charity Grace. She assured the Commission that they are aware of the impacts and that the commission will have an opportunity to comment at the appropriate time. Currently, they are at the text level of the process.

G. Other Committee Reports

1. **Rural Policy Advisory Committee – Wendy Hudson**
   Wendy Hudson provided an update on the Rural Policy Advisory Commission meeting held on September 8, 2023. The meeting discussed a letter of support for a housing bond bill, with emphasis on including the transfer tax for the Cape and Islands. The discussion revolved around the challenges of housing and the higher costs of building in rural areas. Additionally, there was a presentation on a bill concerning safe drinking water in the state, revealing variations in standards across the Commonwealth. The next meeting is scheduled for two months after the last meeting.

2. **Capital Program Committee – Barry Rector**
   Barry Rector provided a brief update on the Capital Program Committee's weekly meetings. They have received requests from the fire department, police department, and natural resources. The committee is in the process of ranking these requests, considering input from the seven members on the board. The discussions are ongoing, and the committee has more work ahead in the evaluation process.

3. **Affordable Housing Trust – Dave Iverson**
   Dave Iverson provided an update on the Affordable Housing Trust's activities. The trust continues to explore properties of interest, with an active Request for Proposals (RFP) for Orange Street. Additionally, they are engaged in discussions with the owner of Sparks Avenue regarding the potential purchase of some units. The trust remains busy and proactive in addressing affordable housing initiatives.

4. **Contract Review Committee of Human Services – Bert Johnson**
   Bert Johnson reported that the committee received a $175,000 grant from the town. They have issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) and are currently in the process of receiving proposals related to drug prevention and rehabilitation programs.

5. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee – Joseph Topham**
   Joe Topham mentioned that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will be discussing the Nantucket Pedicab pilot project and evaluating its performance. Additionally, they plan to address issues related to e-bikes and pedicabs, provide updates on the Tom Nevers Share Road project, discuss a Mid Island project involving the addition of a sidewalk and bike path, and receive updates on William Street. Chair Longacre inquired about whether the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) had plans to submit any articles for the Spring Town Meeting. Joe Topham mentioned that Jason Bridges has stepped down and so they need to elect new officers for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). They will decide on the committee's direction as part of this process, but he thinks they may have one article in the queue.

6. **Harbor Plan Update Committee -Seth Engelbourg**
   Commissioner Engelbourg provided an update on the Harbor Plan, mentioning that the state has officially accepted the notice to proceed. Public engagement activities have included a kickoff meeting in June with about 100 attendees, meetings at the Great Harbor Yacht Club and the Madaket Yacht Club in August, and an ongoing online public forum. He highlighted the high response rate of over 500 survey responses, the highest in the history of the consultant Urban Harbor Initiative. He encouraged participation in the ongoing public forum and survey for those interested in providing feedback on the Harbor Plan.

VII. Other Business

A. Next Meeting Monday, October 23, 2023 at 5pm, via Zoom

1. Review of 2024 calendar and opportunity to discuss Zoom meeting format.

   Chair Longacre sought feedback from the Commissioners regarding the meeting format, expressing the current intention to continue meeting via Zoom. She invited comments or preferences for any changes. If there were no objections or preferences stated, the plan was to maintain the Zoom format. There were no comments or preferences made by Commissioners.

VIII. Adjournment

Dawn Hill Holdgate made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the motion was duly seconded by Bert Johnson and the motion was carried unanimously.

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

List of documents from the packet (with links):

- 09.18.23 NPEDC Posting.pdf
- 07-17-2023 NPEDC minutes - DRAFT.pdf
- Transportation Program Manager Update.pdf
- Madaket Area Plan Update for NPEDC.pdf
- Madaket Area Plan - Resignations.pdf
- NPEDC - Wind Farm S106 Rep Update.pdf
- NPEDC Draft Vision Mission Objectives 09-12-23 with notes from 08-21-23 NPEDC meeting.pdf
- Articles of Planning Concern STM 2023.pdf
- 2023.08.31 - 3. ART. 83 - (HRP) ATM23 - SEN counsel edits.pdf