NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission APPROVED
Minutes Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
January 22, 2024 @ 5:00PM

Commissioners: Chair Mary Longacre, Vice-Chair Barry Rector, Nat Lowell, Bert Johnson, Seth Engelbourg , Joseph Topham, Dave Iverson, 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 5:02pm.
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 (joined the meeting later)*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye (joined the meeting later)*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
John Trudel *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*
Barbara Lachance, District 5 Transportation Planner, MassDOT *Aye*

III. Approval of Agenda:

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

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Seth Engelbourg Aye
Dave Iverson Aye
Bert Johnson Aye
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell Aye
Joeseph Topham Aye
Chair Mary Longacre Aye

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell moved 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*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

IV. Public Comments:

Chair Longacre outlined the protocol for public comments during the meeting. She specified that members of the public would have the opportunity to comment on agenda items related to appointments, such as at-large membership to the NP&EDC or membership to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Comments on these agenda items would be welcomed when they are brought up for discussion. For items concerning the Town Meeting Warrant for the spring, public comments would be accepted when those specific articles are discussed. Additionally, comments on the recommendation from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee would be taken at the time of that particular agenda item, rather than in advance.

Dawn Hill Holgate and Wendy Hudson joined the meeting at this time.

V. Minutes

1. November 27, 2023

Adjust John Trudel's arrival time.

Motion/Vote: Bert Johnson made a motion to approve the November 27,2023 minutes as amended and the motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

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

2. December 18, 2023

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to approve the November 27,2023 minutes as drafted and the motion was duly seconded by Joseph Topham and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

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

VI. Action/Discussion Items:

1. Appointment of At-Large Member (see packet for letters of interest)

Chair Longacre provided information regarding the process for appointing a new member to the commission. They mentioned that the appointed member would officially join the commission at its next meeting after being sworn in by the town clerk. Due to the meeting being conducted via Zoom, commissioners would use email to vote, with their votes being sent to Megan Trudel. Any questions regarding this voting procedure were encouraged to be asked at that moment. She also addressed the possibility of multiple rounds of voting, considering there were 10 commissioners and three applicants, which could result in a tie or no applicant receiving a majority vote. Chair Longacre emphasized that the bylaws required a majority vote for the appointment. After all votes were received by Megan, she would announce the results and ask each member to confirm their vote as she read it off. Chair Longacre also noted that the at-large members should be presented in alphabetical order, as stated by the bylaws, and they were included in that order in the packet provided.

Abby De Molina, a year-round resident, expressed gratitude for the opportunity to apply for the At-large seat on the NP&EDC. She emphasized the importance of considering her character, highlighting qualities such as independence, respectfulness, open-mindedness, and commitment to collaborative problem-solving with the commission. Ms. De Molina advocated for diverse perspectives, noting that large bodies like the commission are more effective when various viewpoints are considered. Drawing from her nearly two decades of experience in financial services, she stressed the importance of a collaborative and data-based approach in decision-making. She highlighted her expertise in financial planning, budgeting, strategic planning, funding, and project management, emphasizing the significance of process alongside outcomes. De Molina expressed her intention to advocate for voices without dedicated votes, particularly in historic preservation and coastal resiliency. She highlighted her membership in the Nantucket Historical Commission and Coastal Resiliency Advocacy Committee, indicating her readiness to represent their concerns on the board. As an alternate on the Planning Board, Ms. De Molina mentioned her role in learning about town Planning, Zoning, and Long-term strategies, which provided her with essential context for decision-making. She assured her willingness to work closely with staff and align with town priorities. Ms. De Molina thanked the commission for their time and consideration, expressing hope for their selection for the at-large seat.

Christina Jelleme, a Nantucket native and year-round resident, expressed her interest in joining as an At-large member of the commission. She mentioned her employment with a large construction firm on the island and her desire to gain insight into the organization's workings and contribute to Nantucket's long-term planning. Having served on the Land Bank Commission for seven years and participated in various other island organizations, Ms. Jelleme highlighted her increasing involvement in the community and governance of the island, which has fueled her interest in its future. She expressed her aspiration to represent the Nantucket community as a whole and requested consideration for the at-large position. Ms. Jelleme's speech focused on her desire to contribute to the island's future and her commitment to understanding and participating in its planning processes.

Hillary Hedges Rayport opened her address by acknowledging her reputation as the individual who proposed legislative changes to the Commission, advocating for five directly elected At-large members and six appointed members representing various commissions, including the Land Bank. While recognizing that her actions may have caused disruption, she characterized it as "good trouble," suggesting that it has stimulated innovative ideas. Ms. Rayport expressed optimism about parallel legislative paths that could benefit the community, including the idea of integrating a representative from the Land Bank onto the commission. Ms. Rayport then made a surprising announcement, stating her decision to withdraw her own candidacy and throw her support behind Christina Jelleme, citing her as a potential positive addition to the commission. She urged others to form their own opinions but hoped for support for Ms. Jelleme's candidacy. Ms. Rayport expressed skepticism about her chances of securing enough votes and encouraged those who were considering voting for her to support the idea of Land Bank representation (Christina Jelleme) instead.

Megan Trudel announced the voting results for the candidates. Chair Longacre voted for Christina Jelleme, as did Dave Iverson, Joseph Topham, Nat Lowell, Bert Johnson, Dawn Hill Holgate, Seth Engelbourg, and Wendy Hudson. Barry Rector & John Trudell voted for Abby De Molina. After confirming each vote, Megan declared Christina Jelleme as the winner with a majority vote.

Chair Longacre extended congratulations to Christina Jelleme and expressed gratitude to Abby De Molina and Hillary Hedges Rayport for their interest in the position. She also expressed hope that Ms. De Molina and Ms. Rayport's interest would persist in the future.

2. Transportation Program Manager Update (see packet)

a) FFY 2024 – 2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – authorize public review period for TIP Amendment Number 2.

Mike Burns presented information regarding a funding addition from the Department of Environmental Protection for the NRTA (Nantucket Regional Transit Authority). The grant was awarded to fund three electric buses, replacing three diesel buses and increasing the total number of diesel buses being replaced from two to five, aligning with regional transit and long-range transportation plans. He noted that there had been considerable feedback advocating for electrifying public transportation services. The funding addition amounted to $879,000 for the purchase of three electric buses. The presentation included visuals of the proposed low-floor buses for improved accessibility. The timeline included a review period from January 26th to February 20th, with a public meeting scheduled for February 20th. Notices were being prepared by the town communications staff for public notification. An online portal for public outreach had been set up, allowing individuals to express support or concerns regarding the amendment. Mr. Burns concluded by requesting authorization for a public review period for Amendment Number Two to the FY 2024 through 2028 Transportation Improvement Program, with the public meeting scheduled for February 20th, 2024, at 5:00 pm.

Motion/Vote: Wendy Hudson moved to authorize for a public review period for TIP Amendment Number Two to the FY 2024 through 2028 Transportation Improvement Program 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*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*

b) Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Recommendations
• Pleasant Street and Williams Lane Complete Street Design Alternatives

Mike Burns provided an overview of the issue regarding design options for Pleasant Street and Williams Lane, focusing on bike and pedestrian improvements. Funding for design was approved at the 2019 annual town meeting, with the scope of work including evaluating alternatives for one-way and two-way traffic flows along the corridors. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) evaluated eight alternatives, including maintaining the existing condition. They looked at options for both corridors and considered the impacts on traffic flow, property, utilities, and cost. Public feedback via the Zen City web page was split on preferences for design alternatives. Two main alternatives were discussed: one-way traffic flow and two-way traffic flow. The one-way option was favored for accommodating both bicyclist and pedestrian traffic with minimal impact on properties and utilities. However, it would restrict vehicle traffic flow and could cause congestion at the Four Corners intersection. The BPAC unanimously recommended conducting a pilot of the one-way alternative for Pleasant Street and Williams Lane. If deemed viable, the recommendation is to pursue design alternatives for two-way traffic flow. Survey data showed support for investing in accommodation for all users and implementing a Complete Streets policy. Mr. Burns concluded by stating that the scope of the pilot has not been finalized, and further coordination and discussion will be needed with various stakeholders, including the Select Board and Traffic Safety Committee. He clarified that while a recommendation was not necessary at the moment due to the complexity of the issue, he was available to answer any questions as the decision-making process progressed.

Chair Longacre sought clarification on the project's progress in terms of input from other entities besides the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the presenter, Mike Burns. She inquired whether other stakeholders had been given the opportunity to provide input or if the project was still in its early stages of discussion.
Mike Burns clarified that regarding the Nantucket Regional Transit Authority (NRTA) routes, there wouldn't be any directly impacted routes. However, there could be some additional delay at overburdened intersections, potentially affecting the Mid Island Loop, which utilizes Atlantic Avenue and passes through the Four Corners intersection. He estimated a slight impact, perhaps a couple of minutes, during peak summer seasons. He mentioned the historical context of the

one-way concept for Pleasant Street, dating back to the mid-Island Area Plan in the early 2000s, which suggested mirroring the one-way condition of Main Street downtown. This idea has resurfaced with the current discussions. While BPAC has been involved in the discussions, the project is still in its early stages, and efforts to broaden stakeholder input are ongoing. They have launched a public participation website but noted that it hasn't been extensively promoted yet, and more participation from the public is desired to inform decision-makers. Overall, the discussion is seen as the initial step in the process, with more outreach planned to gather input from various stakeholders.

Chair Longacre informed the other commissioners about discussions regarding an upcoming joint meeting between the Select Board and the NP&EDC. She suggested that the joint meeting would provide an excellent opportunity to gather additional public input and create a public hearing setting with the Select Board.

Joseph Topham shared his perspective on the issue, encouraging everyone to visit the web link provided by Mike Burns for more information. He acknowledged the thorough review conducted by the Commission, with the topic occupying a significant portion of their recent meetings. Mr. Topham expressed uncertainty about the best course of action but leaned towards trying the pilot to assess its impact. He referenced a comment made by Jason Bridges about walking down the street with his daughter, indicating a sense of the traffic congestion's seriousness. Mr. Topham noted that while biking in the morning, he hadn't encountered significant issues, but he recognized that traffic conditions might vary depending on the time of day. He emphasized the importance of taking a serious look at the issue and thanked the commission for their consideration.

John Trudel expressed support for the idea of a pilot program, citing a previous successful example involving the installation of a stop sign. He highlighted the potential benefits of piloting initiatives before fully implementing them. Additionally, John raised a question about whether the police department had been consulted regarding safety concerns, particularly regarding any history of bike accidents in the proposed areas. He suggested that involving the new police chief in the discussions could be beneficial, fostering collaboration between the commission and the police department. Overall, John's comments emphasized the importance of considering safety aspects and seeking input from relevant stakeholders, including the police department, in the decision-making process.

Seth Engelbourg raised a consideration regarding parking on Pleasant Street, noting that parking is available on both sides of the street. He suggested exploring the possibility of retaining two-way traffic flow and implementing a bike lane while only allowing parking on one side of the street.

Mike Burns provided clarification on the plan for angled parking across the street from Stop and Shop, near the pharmacy and the old restaurant. He explained that under a one-way scenario, formal angled parking closer to the street was recommended. The contraflow lane, or the southbound lane, would be flexible to allow vehicles parallel parking access to the area. However, if this setup proves to be a concern during the pilot, adjustments can be made, such as flipping the design to have bike traffic closer to the curb line and parking closer to the street.

Mr. Burns acknowledged that this area presents challenges due to its complexity and high activity. He mentioned that the original concept from the Mid Island area plan involved having parking on both sides of the road and accommodating bike and pedestrian users. The current process aims to refine the design to best suit the needs of all users while addressing the complexities of the area.

Chair Longacre sought clarification from Mike Burns regarding the recommendation to conduct a pilot. She noted that the proposal mentioned piloting the one-way alternatives, but it wasn't clear if both proposed alternatives would be piloted simultaneously. Specifically, Chair Longacre inquired whether the pilot would involve testing both the one-way alternative from the roundabout to Five Corners and the one-way alternative from Williams to Five Corners simultaneously, or if there was a different proposal under consideration.

Mike Burns clarified that the recommendation is to include both proposed options for piloting. This includes Alternative Five, which covers the entire stretch of Pleasant Street, and Alternative Six, which focuses on a portion of Pleasant Street from Williams Street to the Five Corners intersection. He suggested starting with piloting the entire corridor to observe its operation. However, if there's no appetite for that approach, they can consider piloting Alternative Six, which covers a specific section of Pleasant Street.

Barry Rector recalled details from the Mid Island plan, emphasizing that Pleasant Street and Sparks Avenue were envisioned as an integrated network for traffic flow. He mentioned that converting Pleasant Street into a one-way street was just one aspect of a more comprehensive plan. The plan also included opportunities for significant enhancements to the streetscape, particularly along the Pleasant Street side near the pharmacy and bank, with the goal of creating a more pedestrian and bike-friendly corridor. Mr. Rector expressed concern that the current discussion might not be capturing the full scope of the original plan, which aimed for a more holistic approach to addressing traffic issues in the entire area. He suggested that further exploration of the original plan's elements could provide valuable insights and potentially inform the ongoing discussions about Pleasant Street.

Mike Burns highlighted that the angled parking along Pleasant Street aligns with the recommendations from the Mid Island area plan. He acknowledged that while some streetscape elements have been implemented gradually, such as those related to the Stop and Shop development and the Cape Cod 5 area, not all aspects of the plan have been addressed simultaneously due to feasibility constraints. Mr. Burns emphasized that the current focus is on implementing one aspect of the long-term vision outlined in the Mid Island plan: determining whether Pleasant Street should be converted to one-way or two-way traffic. Once a direction is established, the design can be refined to address additional aesthetic and mobility considerations outlined in the plan. He noted that further enhancements may be needed along other sections of Pleasant Street in the future to fully realize the vision outlined in the Mid Island plan.

Barry Rector expressed his desire to revisit the comprehensive plan outlined in the Mid Island area plan. He emphasized the need to ensure that all aspects of the plan are considered, as he recalled a more holistic approach being proposed. Mr. Rector mentioned his intention to discuss the matter further with Mike Burns in the coming days to gain a better understanding of the current status of the plan. Mr. Rector also invited Leslie Snell to share any additional insights she might have on the matter, indicating a willingness to explore the topic further to ensure that all relevant details are considered in the ongoing discussions.

Leslie Snell highlighted the origins of the current discussions in the Mid Island area plan from the early 2000s, which proposed various streetscape improvements and changes to traffic flow patterns. She acknowledged the challenges in implementing these changes over the years due to the magnitude of the proposed alterations and the need for coordination with different stakeholders. Ms. Snell pointed out that while some projects, like the installation of the roundabout, have been successfully implemented and proven beneficial, others have faced obstacles and delays. She mentioned the efforts made by the planning board to work with applicants to incorporate streetscape improvements into their projects, citing the example of Stop and Shop's contribution to creating on-street parking along Pleasant Street. Ms. Snell expressed hope that the current discussions would lead to the realization of the proposed improvements, particularly in terms of creating on-street parking, which has been successful in enhancing the area around Stop and Shop. She emphasized the potential benefits for all users of the area and property owners if these improvements were to be implemented.

Joseph Topham highlighted the extensive review conducted by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) regarding the proposed changes to Pleasant Street and Williams Lane. He suggested that in future meetings, they should also discuss William Street and how it ties into the overall plan for bike lanes and sidewalks in the area. Mr. Topham emphasized that while the BPAC focused primarily on the section from Williams Street to Five Corners, they also considered the impacts of the proposed changes on William Street. He clarified that their discussions delved into the potential effects of implementing a one-way traffic flow in that section rather than getting into detailed design considerations.

Nat Lowell brought up the history of discussions about making the section of Pleasant Street from Williams to Five Corners one-way, noting that this idea predates recent developments related to property and sidewalk improvements. He emphasized the importance of addressing the longstanding issue of the roundabout at the school, suggesting that failing to build it could exacerbate the challenges posed by other changes. Mr. Lowell expressed support for testing the one-way traffic flow from Williams to Five Corners, particularly given the ongoing construction work on Atlantic Avenue. He also mentioned previous discussions about angle parking in the area near the Wine Place. Mr. Lowell highlighted the complexity of the area's infrastructure and the need to address various challenges, such as underground poles and curbing issues near the Stop and Shop. He emphasized the importance of collaboration with stakeholders like the Chicken Box to address these issues effectively. He expressed gratitude to Mike Burns and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for their efforts in addressing these challenges.

Joseph Topham acknowledged the challenges and complexities involved in making decisions about the area's infrastructure, emphasizing the importance of considering what's best for everyone and learning from past mistakes. He expressed gratitude for Nat Lowell’s input and highlighted the commitment to ensuring effective outreach and decision-making processes moving forward.

Chair Longacre opened the floor to members of the public, inviting them to provide any comments or feedback on the topic under discussion.

Arthur Gasbarro, the current chair of the Traffic Safety Work Group, expressed appreciation for the work done by Mr. Burns, the BAC, and the commission on the matter. Drawing from his 20 years of experience on the traffic safety work group, he offered several thoughts on the proposed changes. First, he likened traffic flow to hydraulics, cautioning that removing a street from the network could increase pressure on the remaining streets, which aligns with the data presented by Mr. Burns. He advocated for considering the holistic impact of changes rather than viewing them in isolation, highlighting the challenges of implementing one-way streets and the potential negative impacts on traffic patterns and movements. Gasbarro emphasized the importance of corridor improvements and cited past plans for sidewalk improvements along the corridor from Williams to Five Corners that hadn't been implemented. He agreed with concerns raised by Mr. Lowell about the need for improvements at Four Corners to mitigate potential negative impacts. Additionally, Mr. Gasbarro raised concerns about the impacts on residents and the challenges of implementing pilot programs, suggesting that such changes require careful consideration and may not be easily implemented. Overall, he encouraged caution and thorough consideration of the potential impacts before moving forward with any changes to the street layout.

Chair Longacre raised several important concerns regarding the proposed alterations to Pleasant Street. Firstly, she highlighted the necessity of waiting until the sewer project in the area is completed before implementing any changes to the street layout. This approach prevents adding additional disruptions to the community. Secondly, Chair Longacre expressed concern for residents living on the side streets of Pleasant Street, noting that many of these streets are one-way and that changes to Pleasant Street could impact their access and convenience. Understanding the extent of this impact is crucial before proceeding with any alterations. She requested more information about what a pilot program would entail. Chair Longacre also questioned whether it would involve only temporary measures like paint, signs, and cones, or if it would involve more substantial changes such as moving curbs and asphalt. This clarification is necessary for understanding the feasibility and potential impacts of a pilot program, especially on the eastern half of Pleasant Street towards the roundabout. Overall, Chair Longacre emphasized the importance of considering the trade-offs involved in the project, particularly in terms of pedestrian and bicycle improvements versus potential disruptions to the community. This highlighted the need for a comprehensive understanding of the project's implications before moving forward.

Wendy Hudson expressed similar concerns and questions regarding the proposed one-way configuration for Pleasant Street. She echoed Nat Lowell's suggestion of not giving up too quickly on alternatives such as the roundabout idea. Wendy also questioned the extent of public feedback received on the proposed changes and highlighted the importance of considering past suggestions and advocating for what would work best for the community. Ms. Hudson emphasized the need for thorough consideration and evaluation of options before settling on a course of action. She suggested that while pilot tests could be beneficial, the one-way configuration might not be the optimal solution.

Chair Longacre sought clarification from Mike Burns regarding the additional information he might need to bring to the Commission before making a decision. She also suggested the possibility of bringing the matter to a larger public setting through a joint meeting with the Select Board.
Mike Burns stated that the idea was to introduce the topic at the current meeting and utilize additional material, such as street-level renderings, to help everyone better understand the proposed changes. He proposed concluding the discussion for now and resuming it at a joint meeting with the select board, allowing for more thorough consideration and input. Mr. Burns emphasized that there's no rush to make a decision, as there's ample time to gather information and discuss the details, potentially extending the discussion over several months if necessary to ensure all concerns are addressed.

Chair Longacre asked if there was funding for the project and whether there are any associated deadlines or plans for payment, whether as a pilot or a permanent solution.

Mike Burns explained that there is some funding available for the preliminary conceptual stage of the project for Pleasant Street and Williams Lane. However, the original appropriation is insufficient for actual construction, so there may be a need to request additional funding from the Capital Program Committee and the town meeting. This process typically begins around September, coinciding with the end of the summer season.

- **Sidepath Stop Sign Removal Strategy per §57-14 Right of way for users of multiuse/shared use paths.**

Mike Burns explained that during the pandemic, a town meeting approved a Bylaw allowing the extension of rights of way at crossings for not just pedestrians but also for bicyclists and other users of paths. Patrick Reed, his predecessor, provided recommendations for sign removals and adjustments for Madaket, Polpis, Hummock Pond, and Milestone Roads. These recommendations were shared with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), which recommended the sign removals and additions as presented. The requested action from the NP&EDC is to recommend to the Select Board the implementation of these recommended sign removals and additions along Madaket, Polpis, Hummock Pond, and Milestone Roads. If recommended, Mike Burns will take this recommendation to Erica Mooney for consideration at a future traffic safety meeting. Mr. Burns has already discussed this with the Department of Public Works (DPW) director and plans to review the recommendations further between planning, DPW, and members of traffic safety before providing the Select Board with a recommendation for implementation.

Nat Lowell sought clarification from Joseph Topham as to whether Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) had taken a look at this proposal and questioned if this will be putting things back to where they were before. Joseph confirmed that they have been discussing various options, including potential changes to the structure or surface of the road to achieve slower speeds. Mr. Topham expressed his view that driveways pose more of a problem than the road itself. He observes that people entering or exiting driveways tend to encroach onto the road, potentially causing hazards. He suggested that homeowners, in particular, contribute to these issues, implying that their behavior is a significant factor in the challenges faced in these areas. Barry expressed concerns about the potential elimination of any warning signs or traffic control measures in certain areas, particularly during the busy summer months when there were increased traffic volumes, including bicycles and vehicles. He worried that removing these measures could have set up potential conflicts, especially among unfamiliar drivers and cyclists. Barry emphasized the need for caution, particularly during the summer season, when traffic volume was high.

Chair Longacre expressed support for maintaining traffic flow along all lanes in a certain direction, emphasizing that cyclists should not give up their right of way just because the bike path is offset from the roadway. She believed that this approach would simplify the traffic flow and make it easier for people to understand, despite acknowledging that it might require a transition period.

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to recommend the Select Board implement these recommended sign removals and additions along Madaket, Polpis, Hummock Pond, and Milestone Roads Multi-Use Paths and 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*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Opposed*

c)Appointment to fill the Vacant Seat on Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (see packet for letters of interest)

Chair Longacre announced the next item on the agenda, which was the appointment to fill the vacant seat on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). She mentioned that there were 10 letters of interest in the packet and that the voting process would involve emailing votes to Mike Burns. Chair Longacre also invited any applicants present in the public to use the "raise your hand" feature for a three-minute speaking opportunity. Chair Longacre expressed gratitude for the interest shown by the 10 applicants in improving bike and pedestrian access to roadways. She also acknowledged the work of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

(BPAC) over the past year in putting together town meeting articles, project recommendations, and rule change suggestions.

Mike Burns tallied all the votes from Commissioners and the applicant Edwin Claflin had the majority votes.

Bert Johnson Abstained

d) Milestone Road at Polpis Road – Notice of Virtual Public Information Meeting on January 25, 2024, at 6:00PM.

Mike Burns provided information about a virtual public informational meeting for improvements at the Milestone Road and Polpis Road intersection, including extending the Sconset bike path. He encouraged public participation and mentioned that comments could be submitted via email if unable to attend the meeting. Nat raised a question about the inclusion of a median turning lane similar to the one at the Nantucket Shop entrance on Old South Road. Mr. Burns confirmed that a similar configuration was part of the plan and clarified that the project was funded primarily by the state with some regional matching funds, not local funds. He also noted that the design was done by GPI with input from the town's departments.

Commissioner Lowell asked if there would still be a turning lane implemented as it was part of the original agreement to this path. Mike Burns confirmed that one will be implemented.

Chair Longacre asked Mr. Burns to talk about funding for the project.

Mike Burns mentioned that Milestone Road is a state highway owned by MassDOT, and funding primarily comes from the state with some regional matching funds. There are no local funds involved in the project. The design responsibility lies with GPI, not NPNC. However, there has been significant coordination with various stakeholders, including the Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Town Administration, to review the design and offer input. The design by GPI is intended to be similar to their reconfiguration of Tom Nevers and Monomoy Road.

Nat Lowell emphasized the significant benefits of the new path on the east/north side of Milestone Road, particularly its positive impact on bicycle safety. The path will improve safety by reducing conflicts between bicycles and trucks at the bike path crossing. Lowell believes that this project should have been implemented decades ago, and its completion will greatly enhance safety and accessibility for users of the multi-use path.

Bert Johnson asked Mr. Burns if he had an idea of when the project would start.

Mike Burns mentioned that the project is scheduled to be bid for construction at the end of May or early June. Typically, there's a 90-day period for procurement, so construction could potentially start either in the fall or in the spring. The official start date will depend on coordination with the successful contractor, but the bidding process is set to begin at the start of summer.

e) Acceptance of Safety Performance Measure (PM1) Targets as recommended by MassDOT (addresses fatalities, serious injuries, and non-motorist serious injuries and fatalities)

Mike Burns discussed the process of NP&EDC accepting performance measures from SD, particularly focusing on safety performance known as PM1. He explained that safety falls under the PM1 category, while conditions of facilities are categorized as PM2, and performance of the facility or delay falls under PM3, typically for National Highway Systems and interstates. Since NCKA doesn't have National Highway Systems or interstates, PM1 is the relevant category for them. Burns noted that they don't usually work with PM2 or PM3, except for transit-related issues. The discussion centered on accepting fatality data or performance measures under PM1.

Raissah Kouame from MassDOT provided detailed information about the federal performance measures regulations passed in 2016, which include three main categories: PM1 for safety, PM2 for pavement and bridge condition, and PM3 as a catchall category for system performance measures. Within PM1, metrics include roadway fatalities, roadway serious injuries, and total non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. For the calendar year 2024, UMass sets targets for these metrics based on projections from previous data. For example, targets for total fatalities and serious injuries are projected to decrease, reflecting a vision zero goal set by the state. Year-over-year changes indicate a decrease in non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, with a 5-year average showing a reduction. The board is required to endorse the state targets or establish their own by the end of February 2024, with previous adoption of MOT's targets by all MPOs and regions to contribute towards the state's goal of improving safety.

Mike Burns reiterated that if the RPA (Regional Planning Agency) doesn't accept the statewide figures, they are required to establish their own. However, traditionally, they have accepted the statewide figures. Burns emphasized the overarching goal of zero deaths, aligning with the vision zero statement and the Safety Action Plan. The plan, including the Safe Streets and Roads action plan, aims to implement strategies to achieve zero fatalities in Nantucket. Therefore, the requested action is the acceptance of the calendar year 2024 MassDOT safety performance measure targets.

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to accept the calendar year 2024 MassDOT safety performance measure targets and 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*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*

Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

f) Update on articles proposed by BPAC for 2024 ATM

Mike Burns outlined the process of reviewing recommendations from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission (NP&EDC) with Town Administration. After coordination, it was decided that BPAC could work with representatives from Mass Bike and state representatives to incorporate changes to e-bike classifications into state law rather than local bylaws. Therefore, neither the definitions for e-bikes nor regulations for e-bikes on the rental side were recommended for incorporation into local bylaws. Additionally, the helmet bylaw wasn't recommended as there's already a state law governing helmets, and the local bylaw requirement for bike helmets for those 16 and over will remain due to its enforceability through state law.

3. Articles of Planning Concern

Chair Longacre informed the attendees that there would be an opportunity for public comments on the articles, especially those where additional information is needed since there aren't recommendations from staff. However, she clarified that this is not a public hearing intended for debate on the merits or contents of the articles. Comments should focus on providing background information and clarification if possible. Additionally, a three-minute time limit will be observed for each comment.

Leslie Snell presented a chart identifying articles of potential regional planning concern, categorized into "yes" for support, articles needing further discussion, and those not recommended for support. She highlighted the first five articles with recommendations.

- Article 11: Funding for town employee housing, previously supported due to its importance for local government operations.
- Article 13: Funding for the design of a new Public Works facility in a more centrally located area to alleviate traffic and safety congestion.
- Article 14: Transportation improvements for New Town Road, an important connector lacking pedestrian infrastructure.
- Article 15: Funding for Tom Nevers debris removal and erosion control, crucial for coastal preservation with regional impact.
- Article 17: Funding to reconstruct Jetties Beach tennis courts, aligning with recent open space and recreation plan recommendations.

Snell suggested discussing these articles first and addressing any questions before moving on to the next set of articles.

Article 19 pertained to the acquisition of the composting facility and transfer station at Madaket Road. The town already owns the underlying land, and this article would provide funding for the town to purchase the structures and infrastructure at the site. While it may not directly relate to regional planning concerns, addressing solid waste management is an important issue. Snell suggested including it for discussion if the Board wishes to weigh in on it.

Chair Longacre noted that the Select Board submitted Article 19, indicating their involvement and support for the proposal. Additionally, an informational meeting was held to discuss the operations at the dump, providing more details on the benefits of purchasing the equipment proposed in the article. She expressed hope that everyone had the opportunity to watch the meeting and gain a better understanding of the proposal.

Bert Johnson raised an important question regarding the consequences of not purchasing the buildings and infrastructure at the composting facility and transfer station. He pointed out that Waste Management may not continue to haul waste off the island if the facilities are not acquired.

Chair Longacre clarified that if the buildings and infrastructure are not purchased, Waste Options, the current operator, may negotiate a new contract to continue owning and operating the facilities. She also suggested reviewing the recording of the solid waste session available on the town's YouTube channel, as it provides detailed information that could address many questions related to the topic.

Leslie Snell discussed Articles 60, 61, and 62, which all address Chapter 123, the short-term rental regulations. Article 60 is town-sponsored, while the other two are citizen petitions. Snell noted that these articles are similar but have some differences, making them somewhat competing. She suggested that due to the complexity and competing nature of these articles, it would be better for the Finance Committee (FinCom) to discuss and hash out the details. Snell recommended that the commission not weigh in on any specific article related to short-term rentals.

Dawn Hill Holdgate and John Trudel recused from any article regarding Short-Term Rentals.

Articles 67 & 69

Vincent Murphy provided an overview of the proposed funding model for the Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee. He explained that the model incorporates requirements outlined by the committee, including a home rule petition and a bylaw. The goal is to respond to the structure outlined in the coastal resilience plan while ensuring public accessibility. The proposal includes an island wide Coastal Resilience District, outlined to cover all of Nantucket Island. Additionally, there would be Coastal Resilience Subdistricts, which would be developed as projects are brought forward. These subdistricts would address localized coastal resilience issues such as flooding and erosion. The funding model involves contributions from those benefiting from the projects, with the town potentially contributing based on the public benefit of the project. Murphy highlighted that this approach differs from traditional benefits districts by including operation and maintenance funding for coastal structures. He also noted differences from state-level coastal resilience districts, emphasizing a focus on local initiatives.

Peter Brace provided clarification regarding the development of the proposed coastal resilience funding model. He explained that the Select Board initially presented the concept to the Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee (CRAC) and tasked them with fleshing it out and providing advice. The committee worked on drafting the bylaw and the home rule petition, collaborating over multiple meetings to refine the details. Brace further explained the distinction between the islandwide Coastal Resilience District, which encompasses all three islands and addresses shared infrastructure needs, and the specific subdistricts, which will be determined based on future project submissions. He emphasized that the committee spent significant time deliberating and refining the proposal before presenting it to the Select Board.

Article 72 – Repeal Stretch Energy Code

Andy Buccino provided insights into the importance of maintaining the stretch energy code, which was adopted in 2019 at town meeting. He highlighted the relevance of energy efficiency, particularly in light of sea-level rise and the state's commitment to reducing carbon emissions. Buccino, as a Home Energy Rater with extensive experience in energy efficiency, emphasized the potential for further improvements in energy efficiency, citing the upcoming implementation of the 2021 International Energy Code. He noted that the average HERS (Home Energy Rating System) score on the island is 50, which has been the standard for about a decade. Buccino also mentioned successful collaborations between HERS raiders, builders, and homeowners in achieving energy-efficient construction. He provided examples of buildings with HERS scores of 45 or lower, demonstrating the feasibility of achieving high energy efficiency standards. Buccino advocated for maintaining the stretch energy code to continue promoting energy efficiency and reducing carbon emissions on Nantucket Island.

Seth Engelbourg expressed his understanding that adopting the stretch energy code would make Nantucket eligible for certain state and federal grants that would otherwise be unavailable. He emphasized the importance of considering the potential impact on future funding before making any changes to the code. Engelbourg also suggested seeking input from Laurence Sinatra, the Energy Coordinator, as she would possess valuable knowledge and expertise on this matter. He requested consulting with her to gather additional insights before making any decisions regarding the stretch energy code.

Joseph Topham expressed hesitation about immediately repealing the stretch energy code but suggested taking a pause before implementing it. He mentioned hearing concerns from HVAC contractors, builders, and modular home companies about the feasibility and potential costs associated with meeting the higher energy efficiency standards, particularly achieving a HERS score of 45. Topham highlighted concerns about the potential need for extensive HVAC systems like mini-splits in every room and dehumidification throughout the entire house, which could lead to increased costs and aesthetic concerns, especially in historic districts regulated by the HDC (Historic District Commission). He emphasized the need to ensure that the technology and standards align and suggested convening a roundtable discussion involving various stakeholders, including the Builders Association, to thoroughly investigate the potential ramifications and feasibility of implementing the stretch energy code. Topham concluded by proposing the idea of delaying the implementation for further evaluation.

Nat Lowell raised concerns about the limitations of the HERS rating system, particularly in penalizing buildings that use fossil fuels for certain appliances or heating systems while still achieving high energy efficiency. He highlighted the challenges of meeting stringent energy efficiency standards while incorporating features like hydronic heating or hybrid HVAC systems. Andy Buccino responded by acknowledging the complexities of the energy code and the state mandate regarding fossil fuels. He emphasized the importance of efficiency as the primary goal and mentioned accommodations and relief valves within the stretch code to address financial hardships. Buccino invited further discussion and collaboration to address these issues effectively, stressing the value of the stretch code as a tool for driving deep energy efficiency on the island.

Chair Longacre suggested scheduling a future meeting to discuss the topic further with the Energy Coordinator Lauren Sinatra.

Joseph Topham expressed appreciation for Andy Buccino’s efforts in bringing attention to the topic and acknowledged the need for further investigation. He also thanked the Chair for suggesting discussing the matter further in a future meeting, indicating a willingness to delve deeper into the issue.

Leslie Snell referred to an email from Lauren Sinatra, prompted by the town manager's request for input on the matter, indicating Lauren's opposition to repealing the stretch code. Leslie emphasized Ms. Sinatra’s support for green communities and the associated benefits.

Articles 77 & 78

Leslie presented Articles 77 and 78, which pertain to the Wind Farm project. She noted that Article 77 proposes withdrawing from The Good Neighbor agreement, while Article 78 seeks to require a town meeting vote before pursuing offshore wind power. However, she clarified that Town Council has deemed Article 77 non-binding, as town meeting cannot compel actions within the jurisdiction of Town Administration or the Select Board. Leslie suggested discussing these articles as part of a broader conversation about supporting alternative energy.

Staff recommendation was not to support these articles (77 &78).

Seth Engelbourg expressed his personal lack of support for Articles 77 and 78. He suggested that since neither article would have any effect whether they pass or not, it might be unnecessary for the commission to make any recommendation. Mr. Engelbourg proposed letting the articles proceed without any endorsement or opposition from the commission, as they would not impact the region either way.

Articles 79, 80, 81 & 83

Leslie Snell presented Articles 79 and 80 together. Article 79 pertains to a Home Rule petition for the Housing Bank real estate transfer fee, which has been under discussion for several years, and the NP&EDC has previously supported this legislation. Article 80 is a new Home Rule petition for a year-round housing occupancy restriction, aiming to create year-round housing for the local population. Leslie recommended that the commission support both articles.

Article 81 is also related to housing. It's a Home Rule petition that would empower the sewer commissioners to waive certain fees associated with sewer connections for year-round housing units. Leslie Snell recommended supporting this article as it could help offset some of the costs associated with creating year-round housing.

Article 83 is simply the extension of the authority to create fertilizer regulations. Leslie Snell recommended supporting it again, as it doesn't reference any particular regulation but maintains the authority to regulate fertilizers.

Article 92

Leslie summarized Article 92 which proposes a charter change to require all department heads, including the director of Plus, to report to the town manager. However, Town Council has identified legal issues with this proposal as it is currently written.

Leslie provided an overview of several articles related to real estate acquisition and disposition:

Article 99 proposes real estate acquisition for 75a and B and 77 Bartlett Road primarily for installing a sewer pump station to extend sewer services into the area. Leslie recommended supporting this article due to its regional impact on preventing pollution from septic systems.

Articles 100 and 101 concern acquisition and disposition of paper streets in the Maya Comet Park area, aiming to consolidate these roads into adjacent land bank-owned parcels for improved open space access. The recommendation was to support these articles.

Article 104 is a disposition article related to the Wauwinet side path project, involving a small triangular parcel of land needed to advance the path. Supporting this article was also recommended.

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to recommend articles 11, 14, 15, 17, 79, 80, 81, 83, 99, 100, 101 & 104 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*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson Aye

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to not to support articles 77, 78 & 92 and the motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:

Barry Rector suggested treating Article 92 separately from Articles 77 and 78. He proposed the possibility of gathering more information before making a decision on Article 92. This approach would allow the board to consider any additional details that may influence their stance on the matter.

Seth Engelbourg concurred with Barry Rector's suggestion, emphasizing the legal ramifications of Article 92 on the NPDC. He supported refraining from making a comment on Articles 77 and 78 and proposed not taking any action on Article 92.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>

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

Articles 60, 61 & 62

Nat Lowell expressed the view that these articles are currently being vetted at the Finance Committee (FinCom), indicating that it might be better to let them proceed without a specific recommendation from the MPDC. He mentioned the complexity of assessing their impact on the entire community and suggested that a discussion about whether to weigh in or not is crucial. Nat also highlighted Leslie's earlier point about the differences between the town's articles, emphasizing their significance in the decision-making process.

Barry Rector recommended that the commission wait to see the developments with the Finance Committee (FinCom) before making a decision on whether to weigh in on the articles. He suggested that it would be prudent to observe the progress and potentially provide input later if necessary. Additionally, Mr. Rector mentioned that his previous vote aligned with the commission's decision to support an article proposed by Megan Perry to ensure collaboration on that particular matter.

Chair Longacre and Leslie discussed the procedural options for handling the articles. Leslie suggested that if the commission wants to keep the option open for future discussion, they should formally continue the articles. Alternatively, if someone is ready to make a motion that the commission not comment on them, that motion should be made. They agreed that it's essential to definitively dispose of the articles one way or another.

Motion/Vote: Barry Rector moved to delay a response on articles 60, 61 & 62 to a future meeting and the motion was duly seconded by Joseph Topham 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*
Bert Johnson Recused
John Trudel *Recused*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Recused*

Motion/Vote: Barry Rector moved to not comment on Articles 19, 67, 69 & 72 as they are not of planning concern to the NP&EDC and the motion was duly seconded by Bert Johnson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:

Seth Engelbourg expressed the view that Articles 67 and 69 concerning Coastal Resilience Districts should be weighed in on at some point. He outlined two main reasons for this: potential impacts on the Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP) and the opportunity for regional collaboration and coordination. Seth suggested supporting the home rule petition in Article 67 but withholding comment on the bylaw in Article 69 until more details are available. He emphasized the importance of doing things right to avoid potential conflicts and maximize regional benefits.

Chair Longacre expressed disagreement with the motion to lump together three separate topics and treat them as not of planning concern. Instead, they proposed handling each topic separately to develop individual recommendations. They suggested addressing the two coastal resilience articles as one topic, the dump equipment as another, and the stretch energy code separately.

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

Motion/Vote: Barry Rector moved to not comment on Article 19 as it is not of planning concern to the NP&EDC and the motion was duly seconded by Dave Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mary Longacre expressed her personal support for the article, considering the potential implications if the equipment acquisition did not proceed.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Wendy Hudson *Opposed*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Opposed*
Bert Johnson Aye

John Trudel *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to support Article 67 and the motion was duly seconded by Joseph Topham 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
Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye
Chair Mary Longacre Aye
John Trudel Aye
Bert Johnson Aye

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to hold over recommendation on Article 69 until a map and other details can be published & furnished to the NP&EDC and the motion was duly seconded by Bert Johnson and the motion was carried unanimously..

Discussion on the Motion:

Chair Longacre highlighted the foundational nature of Article 69, explaining that it establishes a funding mechanism for a district without requiring a specific project. She expressed confusion about the motion to hold it over until a map is available, noting that it would be counterproductive to disallow the funding mechanism due to the absence of a map.

Seth Engelbourg formally withdrew the motion considering the complexity of the matter and the foundational nature of Article 69 and Bert Johnson concurred.

Motion/Vote: Mary Longacre moved to support Article 69 and the motion was duly seconded by Seth Engelbourg 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

Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye
Chair Mary Longacre Aye
John Trudel Aye
Bert Johnson Aye

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to not support Article 72 and the motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:

Nat Lowell clarified whether the Commission had discussed earlier that Lauren Sinatra would come to a future meeting to discuss this Article.

Megan Trudel mentioned that Lauren Sinatra was not supportive of this Article as it would take away Nantucket's Green Community status.

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

4. Authorize the Chair to sign the 2024 District Local Technical Assistance (DLTA) fund contract.

Leslie Snell recommended executing the DLTA (District Local Technical Assistance) contract or authorizing the chair to sign it. The contract, awarded annually to NPDC (Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission) due to its status as one of 13 regional planning agencies, comprises a base amount of $50,000 with an additional supplemental amount of just over $33,000, totaling around $83,000. These funds must be allocated for specific purposes related to housing or planning for growth.

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell moved to authorize the Chair to sign the 2024 District Local Technical Assistance (DLTA) fund contract 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
Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye
Vice-Chair Barry Rector Aye
Chair Mary Longacre Aye
John Trudel Aye
Bert Johnson Aye

Dawn Hill Holdgate lost connection at 7:30pm

5. **Ongoing Discussion – Enabling Legislation including the following topics (see packet)**
    - Membership Composition

Chair Longacre suggested beginning this discussion on the composition of the Planning Board. She mentioned a proposal to expand membership to include all five Planning Board members and increase the total count to 15 alternates. Alternatively, the Commission could maintain three Planning Board members without any alternates. Other options are also open for consideration.

Seth Engelbourg expressed gratitude for the staff's efforts in coordinating the complex process. They acknowledged not providing opinions earlier due to the need to consider the broader scale of the issue. Seth suggested seeking outside assistance from consultants or agencies experienced in government planning for the technical aspects, such as turnover and appointment procedures. They clarified that this suggestion wasn't a reflection on the in-house expertise but rather a recognition of the complexity of the matter.

Leslie Snell highlighted the anticipated need for assistance from legal counsel in navigating the complexities of the process. While acknowledging that they're not at that stage yet, Leslie emphasized the importance of having thorough discussions before seeking outside help. Ms. Snell mentioned that Town Council routinely assists with drafting home rule petitions and other legislative matters. Additionally, they mentioned the availability of Professional Services Funds to explore other consulting options if desired.

Seth Engelbourg clarified that he wasn't suggesting the commissioners refrain from weighing in altogether but rather emphasized the importance of seeking support from other regional planning agencies or consultants in the policy aspect of the process. He highlighted the need for examples from other regions and states to inform their decision-making and ensure feasibility. Seth emphasized the importance of driving the narrative internally while leveraging external support for guidance and recommendations.

Joseph Topham supported Chair Longacre's viewpoint, suggesting that they should complete more groundwork, gather additional input, and move closer to finalizing their decisions before seeking the assistance of a consultant. He felt that they still had some work to do internally before involving outside experts.

Commissioner Rector expressed his surprise at the limited response to their previous exercise and emphasized the importance of the board taking an active role in making decisions rather than relying solely on outside consultants. He suggested delaying the decision for another month to gather more input from the board members before seeking external assistance.

Chair Longacre clarified that the questionnaire was not sent out as homework but rather as a study aid. She expressed the need for further discussion on the topic of the planning board, especially regarding the suggestions received and the number of Planning Board members, which they consider a key component.

Nat Lowell advocated for simplifying the structure of the planning board members, suggesting three voting seats without any alternates. He proposed aligning the appointment terms with other boards, where members are reappointed annually. This approach aims to streamline the process and maintain consistency across different Boards within the Commission.

John Trudel expressed agreement with the proposal to have three planning board members with annual reappointments, aligning with the turnover process in other boards and ensuring continuity. He acknowledged that the initial consideration of alternates may not be necessary given the consensus around having three members.

The discussion among commissioners went on to highlight a need for clarity and structure in their decision-making process. There were concerns about whether all viewpoints are being adequately considered and whether the process is unfolding in a systematic manner. Some commissioners feel that the discussion has become disjointed and unproductive. There was a suggestion to continue the discussion to the next meeting to allow for a fresh perspective and clearer heads. This reflected a desire for a more organized and effective approach to addressing the issues at hand.

Motion/Vote: Bert Johnson moved to hold the discussion until the next meeting and 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*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

2. Discussion of Schedule for joint Select Board/NP&EDC Meeting on February 20, 2024 at 6:00 PM. Agenda for joint meeting to possibly include:

a) Finalize Updated Memorandum of Agreement

The joint Select Board and NP&EDC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 20th at 6:00 PM, in a hybrid format at 131 Pleasant Street and on Zoom. Chair Longacre stated that the proposed agenda will include the following:

- Discussion of the memorandum of agreement between the select board and the NP&EDC for the services of the Director of Planning.
- Review of the 2019 Novak Consulting Group report on the town of NP&EDC's Planning and Land Use Services Department operational and staffing review.
- Presentation by the NP&EDC on its vision and mission, followed by comments from the Select Board.
- Discussion of the Pleasant Street Williams Lane BPAC proposal for a pilot project.

3. Discussion to reschedule February 22, 2024, meeting to February 20, 2024

The commissioners discussed whether to cancel the meeting scheduled for February 22nd and potentially reschedule it for an earlier date in March. Some commissioners expressed concern about the gap between meetings and the need to keep discussions moving forward, while others are mindful of the workload and potential conflicts with other meetings, such as those of the planning board. There's a suggestion to meet earlier in March to avoid a long gap between meetings. The decision hinges on finding a date that works for everyone and allows for productive discussions without overburdening commissioners or conflicting with other commitments.

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to cancel the February 22, 2024, meeting and reschedule the March 25, 2024, meeting to a date earlier in March that can be provided by PLUS staff upon further review 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*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

VIII. Adjournment

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson 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*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

Links to the documents included in the Meeting Packet:

1. 01-22-24 NPEDC AGENDA.PDF
2. DRAFT MINUTES 112723 NPEDC ML FINAL (nantucket-ma.gov)
3. DRAFT MINUTES 121823 NPEDC ML FINAL (nantucket-ma.gov)
4. AT LARGE MEMBER LETTERS OF INTEREST (nantucket-ma.gov)
5. TRANSPORTATION MANAGER UPDATE 24-01-22 (nantucket-ma.gov)
6. ATM 2024 WARRANT ARTICLES INFORMATION (nantucket-ma.gov)
7. NPEDC 2024 DLTA AGREEMENT (nantucket-ma.gov)
8. NPEDC MEMBERSHIP SELECTION PARAMETERS (nantucket-ma.gov)