



NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION



**Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission APPROVED  
Minutes  
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar  
November 27, 2023 @ 5:00PM**

---

**Commissioners:** Chair Mary Longacre, Vice-Chair Barry Rector, Nat Lowell, Bert Johnson, Seth Engelbourg, Joseph 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 Nicky Sheriff, Land Use Specialist

---

**I. Call to order:**

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

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  
Joseph Topham Aye  
Seth Engelbourg Aye  
Kristie Ferrantella Aye  
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye  
Chair Mary Longacre Aye  
Bert Johnson Aye

**Staff:**

Leslie Snell, Director of Planning Aye  
Megan Trudel, Senior Planner Aye  
Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager Aye  
Nicky Sheriff, Land Use Specialist Aye  
Raissah Kouame, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT Aye

**III. Approval of Agenda:**

**Motion/Vote:** Nat Lowell made a motion to approve the agenda and the motion was duly seconded by Barry Rector and the motion was carried unanimously.

**Vote taken by Roll Call:**

Wendy Hudson Aye  
Dave Iverson Aye  
Nat Lowell Aye  
Joseph Topham Aye  
Seth Engelbourg Aye  
Kristie Ferrantella Aye  
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye  
Chair Mary Longacre Aye  
Bert Johnson Aye

**IV. Minutes:**

**A. September 18, 2023**

**Motion/Vote:** Barry Rector moved to approve the September 18, 2023, minutes as drafted, and it was duly seconded by Nat Lowell.

**Vote taken by Roll Call:**

Wendy Hudson Aye  
Dave Iverson Aye  
Nat Lowell Aye  
Joseph Topham Aye  
Kristie Ferrantella Aye  
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye  
Chair Mary Longacre Aye  
Bert Johnson Aye  
Seth Engelbourg Aye

#### **A. Transportation Program Manager Update**

- **FFY 2024 – 2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – authorize public review period for Amendment Number 1.**

Mike Burns presented a request for an amendment to the 2024-28 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The amendment involves replacing a \$600,000 purchase of a new fare collection system with a \$600,000 purchase of two new electric buses under 30 feet in length. The new electric buses are part of the plan to transition the fleet from diesel to electric. The buses have a low floor for easy accessibility, and a public review of this TIP Amendment is required since it involves removing one project and replacing it with another. The proposed public review period is from December 1st to December 18th, with a public meeting scheduled for December 18th at 5:00 p.m. The staff will use the Zen City platform for public input, and although the usual public review period is 21 days, an 18-day period is deemed acceptable. Mr. Burns requested authorization from the Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission (NPEDC) for the public review period and the subsequent meeting on December 18th to discuss and take action on the proposed TIP amendment.

*Dawn Hill Holdgate joined the meeting during the discussion of this item.*

**Motion/Vote:** Bert Johnson moved to authorize public review period for FFY 2024-2028 TIP Amendment Number 1, and it was duly seconded by Barry Rector.

#### **Vote taken by Roll Call:**

Wendy Hudson Aye  
Dave Iverson Aye  
Nat Lowell Aye  
Joseph Topham Aye  
Seth Engelbourg Aye  
Kristie Ferrantella Aye  
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye  
Chair Mary Longacre Aye  
Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye  
Bert Johnson Aye  
John Trudel (*joined meeting later*)

- **Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) – authorize Chair to sign agreement for Comprehensive Safety Action Plan consulting services.**

Mike Burns mentioned that there is an item on the agenda related to the approval of a consulting contract for the "Safe Streets and Roads for All" project. However, due to a request for additional follow-up from another region, they would like to postpone the approval of this consulting contract for one month until the December 18th meeting.

- **Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) vacancy advertisement – authorize advertisement of notice to fill vacancy.**

Mike Burns explained the need to fill a seat on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. He requested approval for advertising the notice from December 1st through January 1st, 2024, with the public meeting to fill the seat scheduled for the January 22nd, 2024, NP&EDC meeting. Mike Burns also mentioned that there is correspondence from Jason Bridges in the packet, and he acknowledged Bridges' commitment to bicycle and pedestrian activity on Nantucket. He added that Jason Bridges was instrumental in the genesis of the committee and did a lot of work to get it started.

Joseph Topham expressed gratitude and recognition for Jason Bridges' outstanding contributions as the chair of BPAC. He commended Mr. Bridges for his effective leadership, active participation, and significant role in supporting various projects, highlighting Jason's crucial role in the committee's success. Mary Longacre requested that the Commission send a letter of thanks to Jason Bridges.

*John Trudel joined the meeting during the discussion of this item.*

**Motion/Vote:** Joseph Topham moved to advertise the notice to fill the seat for BPAC, and it was duly seconded by Bert Johnson.

**Vote taken by Roll Call:**

Wendy Hudson Aye  
 Dave Iverson Aye  
 Nat Lowell Aye  
 Joseph 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 Aye

**B. Cape Cod Bridges Project Letter of Support**

Leslie Snell mentioned a letter in the packet regarding the Department of Transportation's request for the Planning Department's support in funding for the Sagamore Bridge and the Bourne Bridge. She explains that due to time constraints, it wasn't possible to include the NP&EDC's endorsement of the letter, but she felt comfortable signing the letter as the director and sending it to the Federal Department of Transportation.

### **C. Special Town Meeting 2023 Report**

Leslie Snell provided a summary of the Planning and Economic Development Commission's positions on various town meeting articles. The Commission voted to support articles 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 20 and oppose Article 18. However, articles 1 and 2, related to short-term rentals, were not adopted, contrary to the Commission's recommendation to the finance committee. The other articles, except for Article 13 (appropriation to construct airport housing), were adopted in line with the Commission's recommendations. Article 13 was given a "take no action" status.

### **D. Ongoing Discussion – Enabling Legislation**

#### **1. Finance**

Leslie Snell explained that the proposed changes to the enabling legislation, specifically in section three, are not significant in nature. The funding mechanism for the Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission (NP&EDC) remains through the general fund of the town of Nantucket. The proposed changes focus on modernizing administrative processes related to payroll, billing, contracts, and similar matters. These adjustments aim to eliminate obsolete practices and align with current procedures.

#### **2. Membership- discussion of suggestions received from public poll and questions regarding alternate forms of participation**

Chair Longacre discussed the membership topic, thanking the public for their poll responses and emphasizing that the poll was conducted as a blind survey to gather input from the commissioners. The purpose was to identify areas of interest and not a formal voting process. Chair Longacre invited questions on the methodology and outlined the plan for the discussion on the suggestions received from the public poll.

Chair Longacre emphasized that the process is not a vote, and participants were not directed on how to prioritize or include names. The number of votes received by a particular name is not indicative of whether or not it should be included, and all suggestions are still equally in

contention. There was notable interest in the Chamber of Commerce and the Nantucket Islands Land Bank ('Land Bank'), along with some existing entities represented on the NP&EDC. Chair Longacre provided an update on the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee, clarifying that it is a committee of town employees, and town employees are not recommended as candidates for participation on boards due to the potential for confusing authority. This applies to other town employees, such as the DPW Director, who has been on the commission in the past but was removed for similar reasons.

Nat Lowell expressed that the suggestion that stood out to him was the Airport Commission. He mentioned that in the past, when the airport was a more significant topic, having a representative might have been more necessary. However, at present, the airport shares information with the NP&EDC, and he sees it blending in without the need for a dedicated member. He emphasized that the Land Bank would be his top choice if there were to be two additional seats. He is torn between a representative from either the Historic District Commission (HDC) or the Nantucket Historical Commission (NHC) and the Chamber of Commerce. While he acknowledges the economic development aspect of the Chamber of Commerce, he is still deciding between the two options.

Seth Engelbourg expressed gratitude to both the public and commission members who participated in the survey. After reflecting on the suggestions, he proposed reserving seats for specific sectors rather than designating exact agencies. Seth highlighted that governmental commissions and non-profit/business agencies can evolve over time, and certain entities may not exist in the future. He suggested having seats designated for broader sectors, such as conservation, historic preservation, business, and planning, without specifying particular agencies. Seth emphasized the need for community-centered representation, allowing individuals to serve as community organizers within their sectors, collaborating with relevant groups and bringing ideas back to the commission.

Wendy Hudson expressed agreement with Seth Engelbourg's proposal and appreciated the flexibility it provided. She mentioned tying the suggestions to the updated objectives and praised the list as excellent. Wendy acknowledged Chair Longacre's role in compiling the list of suggestions and emphasized the importance of finding a structure, like BPAC, that allows for flexibility and benefits the commission's goals. Ms. Hudson also mentioned past conversations regarding limitations due to open meeting laws but expressed optimism about finding effective structures to achieve the desired outcomes.

Chair Longacre agreed with the flexibility proposed by Seth Engelbourg and Wendy Hudson. She mentioned that in the event not everyone wanted to chime in at once, she prepared a proposal to provoke additional conversation. She suggested prioritizing seats with a wide perspective to cover a broad range of activities and focus on regional issues.

Dave Iverson expressed appreciation for Seth Engelbourg's and Wendy Hudson's suggestions. He shared his concern about potentially trying to pack too many things into two additional seats and emphasized the importance of community engagement. Iverson suggested that while adding two seats is essential, there might be a more efficient way to address the issue of diverse voices by looking at community engagement strategies.

Barry Rector noted the need to consider the regional aspect of the commission and the importance of individuals being able to look at issues on both local and regional scales. He

emphasized the need to identify individuals who can contribute to regional planning effectively. Rector also highlighted the possibility of engaging consultants, either paid or unpaid, for short-term projects or to provide insider information. He suggested a two-fold approach, involving commissioners in determining an appropriate number of individuals to work with and considering both the commission's perspective and individual perspectives. Rector stressed the importance of finding the right individuals who can contribute meaningfully to regional planning.

Chair Longacre introduced several suggestions for the consideration of the commissioners regarding the structure and membership of the commission. These included the possibility of establishing more subcommittees aligned with specific objectives and forming work groups for purposes that could be disbanded after addressing specific topics. The idea of more flexible membership, avoiding strict specifications for seats, was proposed, along with the option of inviting representatives from different community segments to attend meetings as liaisons or consultants. Another suggestion involved having an NP&EDC representative on other organizations or commissions to broaden collaboration. Lastly, there was mention of assigning seats based on specific objectives or sectors for a targeted focus. Chair Longacre sought additional input from commissioners on these suggestions, emphasizing a collaborative approach to membership considerations.

Chair Longacre went on to present a visual representation illustrating various options for including representatives on the NP&EDC. The options discussed included representatives from the Land Bank, Chamber of Commerce, Nantucket Resource Partnership, Nantucket Historical Association, At-Large Seats for Transportation, Elected At-Large Seat, Appointed At-Large Seat, Housing Authority, Conservation Commission, and representatives from other commissions or organizations not directly affiliated with the town. The intention was to stimulate conversation and consider the merits of each representation option.

Joseph Topham expressed agreement with Seth and Wendy's comments but had reservations about including the Nantucket Historic Commission, suggesting they might be "a little too early to the party." However, he supported the idea of having a representative from the Nantucket Historical Association and non-voting taxpayers, emphasizing their valuable perspectives. Topham acknowledged the list as a good starting point and suggested further exploration and development of the ideas.

Seth Engelbourg suggested reconsidering the representation of all five members of the Planning Board on the NP&EDC, proposing that having fewer representatives might be more efficient and still allow for coordination. Secondly, he emphasized the need for a more flexible approach to sector representation, advocating for self-identification within sectors rather than prescribing specific entities. Finally, he expressed concern about the potential confusion arising from a mix of appointed and elected seats and suggested a clearer approach by having either all appointed or all elected seats.

Kristie Ferrentella added to the discussion by suggesting a focus on sector-based representation rather than specifying particular organizations. She emphasized the importance of inviting a diverse range of individuals to participate in the commission without limiting their capacity to specific organizations. Additionally, she echoed Seth Engelbourg's point about having a consistent approach to members at large, either all elected, or all appointed, for clarity and simplicity.

Bert Johnson felt that the Housing sector needed to be represented by either the Housing Authority or the Housing Nantucket due to their contributions to creating affordable housing.

Seth Engelbourg acknowledged the challenges and commitments required from representatives on the NP&EDC, emphasizing the importance of sector-based representation rather than designating specific organizations. Mr. Engelbourg also highlighted the potential changes in leadership and focus within organizations over time, making a broad sector-based approach more resilient. Chair Longacre expressed agreement with this perspective and noted that adding seats can help distribute the workload and responsibilities more effectively among members.

Wendy Hudson reiterated the value of inviting key individuals, such as executive directors or representatives from relevant organizations, to provide reports or updates. She emphasized that hearing directly from those responsible for running specific entities could offer valuable insights to the NP&EDC without necessarily requiring them to become regular members. Wendy expressed support for standing invitations as a valuable structural improvement.

Joseph Topham highlighted the diversity of his involvement with several committees. He suggested flexibility in the number of members on the NP&EDC, possibly ranging from 11 to 13, to accommodate changes, such as bringing in individuals with specific strengths or facilitating rotations to maintain dynamism within the commission. Mr. Topham also endorsed the idea of inviting speakers periodically to provide valuable perspectives.

Nat Lowell highlighted the value of periodic reports from key organizations, referencing past informative discussions with officials like Mark Willett from Wannacomet Water Co. He suggested inviting representatives from entities like the airport and having them provide occasional reports rather than becoming formal members, which would reduce their meeting commitments. Nat also addressed the question of the ideal number of members, expressing uncertainty about whether to stick with 13 or consider expanding to 15. He acknowledged the importance of having housing representation on the NP&EDC, acknowledging the differences between organizations like Housing Nantucket, Affordable Housing Trust (AFT), and the Housing Authority.

Chair Longacre emphasized the importance of flexibility in the commission's membership, including considerations about the number of members and the specificity of seat allocations. She highlighted the potential challenge of changing the enabling legislation, which could be a lengthy process. Chair Longacre encouraged exploring options that provide flexibility without being overly specific, acknowledging that the current needs of the commission should be addressed efficiently.

Barry Rector asked Commissioners if they felt ready to specify the number of members and composition of the Commission and members responded by favoring continued discussion of alternatives.

Wendy Hudson added to the discussion by emphasizing the importance of considering the Massachusetts Clean Energy Climate Plan for 2050 and how the island would work towards meeting those goals. She suggested the inclusion of entities like National Grid or other energy producers in the commission's considerations. Wendy stressed the significance of addressing environmental concerns and ensuring that the commission's composition aligns with the broader goals related to clean energy and climate planning.



Hillary Hedges Rayport shared her thoughts, expressing appreciation for the exciting ideas discussed during the meeting. She mentioned the proposal at the State House, which includes a board of five directly elected at-large members and six appointed members from different boards. Ms. Rayport emphasized the importance of having a well-functioning governing board and raised concerns about the potential challenges associated with flexibility in determining the number of members. She highlighted the need for representation and the public's ability to participate in the decision-making process. Ms. Rayport acknowledged the various perspectives and ideas presented, recognizing the value in both the proposals discussed during the meeting and the legislation passed at town meeting.

Joseph Topham responded to a comment about the Planning Board's membership, expressing his perspective on the importance of having multiple members with diverse backgrounds on the Planning Board. He highlighted the varied expertise and professional backgrounds of the Planning Board members, emphasizing the value they bring to the commission. Joseph refuted a comment in the paper suggesting an "iron fist" on the board, clarifying that he has never experienced any coercion or influence on voting decisions. He stressed the openness of the commission to communication and public participation, asserting that the goal is to increase representation and not restrict it.

Seth Engelbourg responded to Joseph Topham, clarifying that his suggestion to reduce the number of Planning Board seats on the commission was not about disrespect or criticism of the Planning Board. Instead, Seth explained that he believes having fewer Planning Board seats and more diverse voices from various sectors could enhance the effectiveness of the commission as a regional planning authority. He emphasized that his perspective is based on logistical considerations and the goal of achieving a more representative and diverse board.

Chair Longacre emphasized that the inclusion of all five planning board members in the Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission (NP&EDC) is rooted in a decision made by the town 15 or 20 years ago. The town decided to invest in the master plan process led by the Planning Board, which is required by Massachusetts General Law to produce the master plan. As a result, the NP&EDC's comprehensive planning role was not conducted in parallel. The inclusion of all Planning Board members in the NP&EDC ensures that the perspectives of the commission can be easily incorporated into the master planning process, as all Planning Board members are aware of them. Chair Longacre presented this as a historical context for the current structure.

John Trudel suggested the idea of introducing an alternate position for the Planning Board members on the Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission (NP&EDC). He proposed having two members of the Planning Board serve as voting members on the NP&EDC, while the other three Planning Board members serve in an alternate capacity. This would allow them to attend meetings, participate in discussions, and relay information but not have a voting position. Mr. Trudel acknowledged that this idea might introduce a new discussion and welcomed feedback and discussion on the concept. Chair Longacre expressed openness to the idea and encouraged further comments and discussion on this proposal.

Joseph Topham suggested that if the number were to change, it should be a minimum of three Planning Board members, including the chair, vice chair, and a former chair. He also expressed support for the idea of having two members as alternates. Joseph emphasized the importance of

staying connected and proposed considering flexibility in the number, allowing for adjustments based on needs.

Seth Engelbourg expressed gratitude for John's idea about alternates but raised a concern about whether alternate membership is typically associated with regulatory boards. He suggested consulting town government or regional municipal resources to explore how that concept would work for an advisory committee like the NP&EDC.

Nat Lowell also expressed his willingness to consider reducing the number of planning board members to three if it helps create the right mix and representation on the NP&EDC. He emphasized the importance of finding the right balance without having too many members that may lead to a less effective commission.

Barry Rector suggested a structured approach to the discussion by starting with the question of how many people members see being on the board as a functional board. He proposed that each member goes down a list and shares their thoughts on who should be included. The idea is to create a spreadsheet to capture and visualize the responses, allowing for a clearer understanding of commonalities and differences in perspectives. This approach aims to streamline the conversation, providing a systematic way to address the key questions about the Commission's size and composition. Members would express their preferences on various aspects, such as the inclusion of specific organizations or sectors. The spreadsheet would serve as a tool to tally votes and track the consensus on different elements.

Dave Iverson expressed his support for Mr. Rector's idea, emphasizing the need to move towards the finish line and create forward momentum in the discussion. While acknowledging that some tweaking may be necessary, he sees the proposed approach as a productive way to structure the conversation and make progress.

Overall, the commissioners expressed agreement with Barry's proposal to streamline the discussion and move towards finalizing the document. They appreciated the value of the conversation, recognizing the challenges and differing perspectives, particularly regarding the number of planning board members on the commission. The suggestion to consider three planning board members was well-received, along with the idea of exploring an alternate structure. Wendy Hudson noted the importance of not losing the sector representation aspect in the discussion, with a preference for broad representation rather than specific organizations. Overall, there was a call for forward momentum and a commitment to finding common ground.

Barry Rector suggested using a spreadsheet to streamline the discussion on the number of members and their representation on the commission. He emphasized the need to decide between individual entities or sectors before determining the membership structure.

Seth Engelbourg expressed the importance of clarifying the sector concept and understanding how it would work in practice before voting on the number of members and gave his proposed list of sectors as an example of how the NP&EDC membership could use the concept.

There was also a suggestion to either continue the discussion on Zoom or allow commissioners to submit their individual preferences to staff for collation. The decision would depend on whether the group wanted to reach an end result during the meeting or take some time for reflection. Commissioners expressed the need to hash out the sector portion and fully understand its implications before moving forward. Questions were raised about how sectors would

function, including how representatives would be selected and the duration of their terms. The discussion highlighted the complexity of the sector concept, and further clarification and discussion were deemed necessary before finalizing the membership structure.

Hillary Hedges Rayport proposed a mechanism inspired by Massachusetts historic district commissions, where a right of appointment is given to organizations rather than panels. This ensures independent representation of a sector's perspective. She emphasized the value of having a mix of elected and appointed members, pointing to the success of such arrangements in boards like the Community Preservation Committee. Ms. Rayport also cautioned against excessive atomization, suggesting that the NP&EDC should be a broad, visionary committee, acknowledging the expertise of staff members covering various areas to prevent becoming overly granular.

Kristie Ferrentella left the meeting during the preceding discussion

#### **F. Other Committee Reports (if any)**

- Rural Policy Advisory Committee – Wendy Hudson

Wendy Hudson reported on the Rural Policy Advisory Commission meeting held on November 9th via Zoom. The discussion primarily revolved around various draft bills and articles related to rural areas. Key topics included housing, the HERO Act, local food systems, rural roads, schools, public health, and municipal buildings. The meeting delved into issues concerning shared resources in rural parts of the state. Wendy mentioned that there were insightful speakers, and she highlighted an act aimed at establishing a rural policy office, emphasizing the need for staff in this regard.

- Community Preservation Committee – Joseph Topham

Joseph Topham provided an update on the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) activities, mentioning that they have progressed by moving one emergency application forward, specifically for the Summer Church. The committee is currently focused on reviewing contracts and cost estimates. Mr. Topham expressed optimism that by the next meeting, they will have a clearer understanding of which organizations will receive funding. However, he noted that there is a current shortage of funds. Despite the financial challenge, the committee is actively engaged in discussions and moving forward with their responsibilities.

- Affordable Housing Trust – Dave Iverson

Dave Iverson provided an update on the Affordable Housing Trust's activities, stating that the trust is busy, particularly with the enthusiasm for assembling a year-round buy-down restriction

program. They are currently engaged in public outreach for this program through Judy Barrett. Additionally, the trust is excited about initiating activities in Wauwinet in the first quarter of the upcoming year. Mr. Iverson mentioned that they recently went through a land swap at GW Village with the hospital, resulting in acquiring more land for building additional housing units. Overall, there is a lot of progress and activity within the Affordable Housing Trust.

Nat Lowell also chimed in briefly and provided a couple of updates related to the Steamship Authority. He mentioned that the Eagle will be going off for about a month, but the Woods Hole will remain as a freight boat until the Eagle comes back, ensuring a similar level of service. Additionally, there might be a demonstration of an electric baggage cat in High over the next few weeks, offering a potentially better-looking alternative to the old tugs currently used. Mr. Lowell expressed hope for finding the right mix and mentioned plans to replace the 26-foot baggage cart that has been in use for a long time.

- Harbor Plan Update Committee – Seth Engelbourg

Seth Engelbourg provided an update on the Harbor Plan Update Committee. The committee has completed its initial round of community input, including three in-person community meetings, one Zoom-based meeting, and an extensive survey. The survey response was reported to be the highest ever recorded in Massachusetts history. The consultant, Urban Harbors Institute, is currently compiling the data and drafting the first look at the harbor plan update, which will be reviewed by the committee. The timeline is crucial, as there is a two-year period to complete the plan once the notice of proceed has been submitted to the state. The committee aims to finish the Harbor Plan by next summer or fall.

- Capital Program Committee – Barry Rector

Barry Rector provided an update on the Capital Program Committee, stating that they have received testimony from most department heads regarding their capital requests for the upcoming Annual Town Meeting (ATM) in 2024. The committee is now in the process of reviewing the various requests and prioritizing them. Mr. Rector anticipates that their workload will be completed by the beginning or mid-January.

## **VII. Other Business**

- A. Next regularly scheduled Meeting Monday, December 18, 2023 at 5pm, via Zoom
- B. Special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 5<sup>th</sup> at 4 pm on Zoom.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

Nat Lowell moved to adjourn the meeting and the motion was duly seconded by Bert Johnson and the motion was carried unanimously.

**Vote taken by Roll Call:**

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

**Links to the documents included in the Meeting Packet:**

1. [NPEDC AGENDA 11.27.23 \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
2. [PUBLIC COMMENTS 11.27.23 \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
3. [NPEDC 9.18.23 DRAFT MINUTES \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
4. [TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER UPDATE 11.27.23 \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
5. [CAPE COD BRIDGES PROJECT LETTER OF SUPPORT \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
6. [SECTION 3 FINANCE MEMO FROM ANDREW VORCE \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
7. [EDGARTOWN MULLS MVC EXIT ARTICLE \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
8. [11.9.23 EMAIL FROM LESLIE TO COMMISSIONERS NPEDC MEMBER SURVEY \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
9. [NPEDC Membership survey.xlsx \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
10. [Memberships Responses from Commission Data.pdf \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
11. [NPEDC DRAFT VISION MISSION OBJECTIVES 09.12.23 \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)
12. [THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN MASSACHUSETTS \(nantucket-ma.gov\)](#)