NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission APPROVED Minutes
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
February 20, 2024 @ 6:00PM

Commissioners: Chair Mary Longacre, Vice-Chair Barry Rector, Nat Lowell, Bert Johnson, Seth Engelbourg, Joseph Topham, Dave Iverson, John Trudel, Kristina Jelleme, 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 6:00pm.
Chair Longacre read a prepared statement in accordance with Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2023 regarding open meeting law, which outlines how the meeting is conducted via remote participation and states the ground rules for any discussion.

Establishment of quorum:

In Attendance:

Commissioners:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *(joined the meeting later)*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (joined the meeting at 6:02)*
John Trudel *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Absent*

Staff:

Leslie Snell, Director of Planning *Aye*
Megan Trudel, Senior Planner *Aye*
Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager *Aye*
Nicky Sheriff, Land Use Specialist *Aye*

II. FFY 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Close public review period and approve TIP Amendment #2 (NP&EDC only)

Mike Burns provided a summary of the public review period that ended on February 20, 2024. During this period, there were 161 public comments received, with 116 (72%) being positive and supportive of the amendment to add the purchase of three electric buses per the Department of Environmental Protection Grant, totaling $879,000. The remaining 45 comments (28%) did not express any concerns or provide feedback on the proposed amendment. The Town communication offices assisted in notifying the public about the review period. Mr. Burns requested action to approve the closure of the public comment period and to approve Amendment Number Two to the federal fiscal year 2024 to 2028 Transportation Improvement Program.

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell moved to close the Public Hearing and the motion was duly seconded by Dawn Hill Holdgate and the motion was carried unanimously.

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell moved to approve Amendment Number Two to the federal fiscal year 2024 to 2028 Transportation Improvement Program and the motion was duly seconded by Dawn Hill Holdgate 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*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye

Chair Holdgate called the Select Board meeting to order at 6:03 PM. She noted the original purpose of the meeting was to discuss the MOA, which will be moved to the beginning of the meeting. Some discussion followed about the order of the agenda items.

III. Joint Meeting with the Nantucket Select Board

1. **Review/Possible Action of Proposed Updates to Memorandum of Agreement Between Select Board and NP&EDC for Operation of Planning and Land Use Services (PLUS) Department**

Town Manager Libby Gibson provided a historical overview of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) initiated 12 years ago in response to difficulties in coordinating regulatory departments under one management structure. Over time, changes in staffing and department functions prompted a request from select board members to discuss updates to the MOA. During the summer, meetings involving the chair, planning director, Planning Commission chair, and Town Council were held to propose updates to the MOA. The main modifications include incorporating new departments like the energy office and the affordable housing trust fund, as well as addressing personnel issues related to collective bargaining agreements. Libby clarified that the language in the proposed MOA regarding collective bargaining agreements is not relevant to the current situation. Additionally, changes were made to reflect the Planning Commission's statuary functions.

Leah Hill from Luna Local 1060 Union expressed concern about a section in the proposed MOA (Memorandum of Agreement) that they believe violates their Union contract. Specifically, she pointed out that the proposed grievance procedure outlined in the MOA was not discussed during recent negotiations and could conflict with their existing collective bargaining agreement. Leah emphasized the need for collaboration and dialogue to ensure that any changes align with their contract and avoid inconsistencies.

In response, Town Council John Georgio disagreed with Leah's assessment, stating that the language in question, which involves the Director of Planning responding to grievances under the direction of the Personnel director and town manager, is standard operating procedure for municipal operations. He argued that it is appropriate for department heads to consult with HR before engaging in the grievance process, as it can have significant impacts on departmental operations.

Leah Hill respectfully disagreed with John's perspective, citing language from their current contract that specifies the grievance procedure, which does not mention HR involvement at the initial stage. She reiterated the importance of adhering to their Union contract and ensuring that any changes are made through collaboration and alignment with existing agreements.

The discussion highlighted differing views on the role of HR in the grievance process and the need for clarity and consensus in navigating potential changes to the MOA. The discussion revolved around the inclusion of a provision in the agreement regarding the handling of grievances within the MOA. John Georgio asserts that it's within Town Administration's prerogative, particularly Libby Gibson (Town Manager), who manages union contracts, to establish internal procedures for responding to grievances, consistent with Chapter 150E of the general laws. He argues that this is not subject to the authority of the unions to object to.

Dave Iverson expressed a query about why the paragraph wouldn't mirror the language in the Union contract for consistency. John Georgio responds by emphasizing the need for consistent policies across departments and argues that the provision aims to ensure uniformity in handling grievances, which isn't a matter for the unions to influence.

Brooke Mohr supported the inclusion of the provision, stating that it strengthens the reporting structure and ties the Planning Department closer to the Town Administration. She believes it enhances consistency and alignment with general town policies.

Finally, the Planning Director, Leslie Snell highlighted that the reporting structure has been clear since 2012, with Planning Commission-related matters going to the commission and Town Administration-related matters going to the Town Manager. Thus, there shouldn't be confusion regarding the roles and reporting lines.

Matt Fee brought up concerns about the role of the NPEDC (Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission) in evaluating the Planning Director and setting pay without consultation with Town Administration. He suggested that this dynamic can lead to conflicts and highlights similar issues seen in Boston. Matt believes that the split between regional planning and town planning has caused problems and suggests that having one person oversee both roles might be too much. He also delved into historical tensions within the NPEDC, mentioning a past incident where half the board resigned in protest. Matt feels that this incident contributed to ongoing mistrust within the organization. He emphasizes the importance of acknowledging these issues rather than glossing over them. Finally, Fee reiterated the question posed by Malcolm Macnab about the necessity of the MOA, suggesting that its functions could be achieved without the need for such a document. He expresses a desire for a clearer justification for the agreement's existence.

Seth Engelbourg raised the point that the agenda is focused on the review of the proposed update to the MOA rather than a discussion about eliminating the agreement altogether. He suggested that a separate meeting with a specific agenda item would be more appropriate for that discussion. However, he also offered a general comment about the potential challenges of the current structure, where the Planning Director has discretion over the allocation of their time between NPEDC-related activities and town planning duties. Seth proposed that a more detailed MOA could specify the percentage of time allocated to each aspect of the role, ensuring a balanced approach that addresses both NPEDC and town planning concerns. He emphasized that this suggestion is not a critique of any individual in the position but rather a hypothetical consideration for optimizing the effectiveness of the role.

Dave Iverson highlighted that while some individuals have expressed dissatisfaction with the current arrangement, they have not provided specific reasons to support their stance. He emphasized the importance of identifying clear reasons for why the existing MOU between the NPEDC and the Town should be terminated. Iverson suggested that without specific justifications for discontinuing the MOU, there is no basis for considering its elimination. He also referenced Seth Engelbourg's earlier point about the need for constructive criticism and improvement rather than outright dismissal of the agreement.

Nat Lowell and Joseph Topham both express their support for the current MOU between the NPEDC and the town, highlighting its effectiveness in maintaining clear communication and delineation of responsibilities between different departments. They emphasized that the MOU has led to improved processes and collaboration, with defined lanes and guardrails ensuring smooth operations. Topham suggested that the few complaints about the MOU do not outweigh its overall benefits, and he advocates for its continuation. Topham echoed this sentiment, stating that the MOU has created valuable separation and clarity, and he suggested periodic reviews to ensure its relevance over time.

Chair Mary Longacre emphasized the importance of understanding the implications of removing the current agreement between the Planning Director and the town. She clarified that the agreement formalized an existing relationship dating back to 1973, aimed at improving town operations. Mary highlighted the need for a detailed proposal if there is a serious consideration of removing the agreement, emphasizing the importance of understanding the potential consequences and alternatives.

Billy Saad raised a question about the process for filing a grievance in the future. He clarifies that while he is a member of the union, he is speaking on behalf of himself and not representing the union. Billy seeks clarification on whether he should follow the procedures outlined in the contract he signed or the proposed language in the MOU if it's approved. In response, Libby Gibson explained that the Union contract specifies the grievance procedure, while the language in the MOU outlines internal processes between the planning director and town administration. Employees with grievances should follow the procedures outlined in the contract they signed.

The discussion went on to touch on several key points:

1. **Termination Clause:** Concerns are raised about the termination clause in the agreement, with suggestions for adding a provision to end the contract after a certain period.
2. **Enforcement and Compliance:** There's a discussion about the need for better enforcement and compliance monitoring for permits and regulations.
3. **Review Period:** Participants suggest that the agreement should be reviewed regularly, with suggestions for a review period between three to five years.
4. **Purpose of the Agreement:** Clarification is provided regarding the purpose of the agreement, which formalizes existing collaborations and oversees various departments.
5. **Potential Structural Changes:** Some members propose exploring potential structural changes, such as appointing an assistant or deputy town manager to oversee certain aspects, to improve efficiency.

Overall, the discussion revolves around ensuring effective collaboration, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and finding ways to improve processes and efficiency within the town administration.

2. **Review Planning and Land Use Services Department Staffing Recommendations (Excerpt from Town-wide Staffing Study/December 2018); and Planning and Land Use Services Operational and Staffing Review/May 2019**

Libby Gibson discussed the Town's 2018 Town-wide gap analysis study, which included the Planning and Land Use Services (PLUS) Department among others. This study generated numerous recommendations, and the planning director has prepared a summary outlining which recommendations have been implemented. Additionally, a separate operational and staffing review for the PLUS Department was conducted several months later, with a similar summary report available. Over the summer, select board members requested a status update on the implementation of recommendations from both studies.

Leslie Snell highlighted the progress made regarding the staffing study conducted in 2018, noting that almost all recommendations from the consultants have been implemented. Regarding the operational review, which included a staffing component, Snell mentioned that many initiatives are ongoing, as they require continuous attention rather than being one-time actions. Snell emphasized that the studies have led to significant improvements in the operations and effectiveness of the PLUS Department since 2012, particularly since the studies were conducted in 2018 and 2019. This improvement is evident in enhanced customer service and departmental effectiveness.

Brooke Mohr sought clarification on item number four under development review, which aims to provide guidance to boards and commissions to clarify the development process. Mohr expressed uncertainty about the interpretation of this item and questioned why it was deemed impractical.

Leslie Snell provided context for the discussion around item number four. Snell explained that the consultant had suggested developing a step-by-step approach to permitting, such as going to the Historic District Commission (HDC) first, then the Conservation Commission, and finally the Zoning Board. However, Snell noted that this approach doesn't align with the regulatory framework in Massachusetts, where applicants can choose the order in which they approach various boards based on their decision-making process. For some projects, it may make sense to start with HDC, while for others, seeking zoning relief first might be more appropriate. Snell concluded that it's not practical to enforce a strict step-by-step process since it varies depending on the applicant's path.

Matt Fee addressed several concerns regarding the current permitting process and potential conflicts within the system. Fee noted that there is sometimes an issue with applicants seeking the answer they want by "shopping" between different committees or entities. This can lead to conflicting decisions and confusion, particularly when one committee approves something that another does not. Fee recalled discussions from previous administrations about the goal of streamlining the review process and acknowledged that while there have been improvements in customer service, there are still inherent conflicts between tasks related to building and development and long-range planning. Fee highlighted enforcement as another challenging aspect of the current system, noting that the public often feels discouraged or ignored when reporting issues. This, in turn, contributes to dissatisfaction and frustration among residents. Fee suggested that reevaluating the organizational chart or changing the approach to enforcement could help address these issues and improve overall effectiveness, similar to how customer service improvements have been made in the past.

Malcom Macnab expressed reservations about the continued necessity of the existing arrangement, particularly regarding the contract or memorandum of understanding (MOU) in question. Macnab indicated a lack of conviction regarding whether this arrangement is truly beneficial for the island and the overall functioning of operations. The concept of outsourcing major activities to entities other than elected officials has long been a source of concern for Macnab, even predating their tenure on the select board. Macnab raised questions about the reporting structure, particularly concerning whether the planning director reports to the town manager on administrative matters only or also on policy matters. The practice of key personnel being hired by the boards they support, rather than by the town directly, appeared unconventional to Macnab, who cited the example of the health director not being hired by the Board of Health but still functioning effectively under town management. While acknowledging the efforts made to address issues and improve the system, Macnab remained unconvinced of the ongoing necessity of the current arrangement. He suggested that a more traditional management structure, where the Planning Director reports directly to the town manager, could potentially address these concerns.

Barry Rector and Matt Fee engaged in a discussion regarding various points raised during the meeting. Fee recalled the challenges faced in bringing together different departments prior to the establishment of the PLUS Department, highlighting the significant improvements in cooperation and efficiency since then. However, Fee expressed concern over potential overload of administrative responsibilities and suggested exploring options for more efficient operation, such as the appointment of an assistant town manager. Fee responded, acknowledging the complexities involved in long-range planning and the need for accountability in management. He expressed concerns about the slow progress in certain planning efforts and suggested that the Planning and Economic Development Commission (NPEDC) might be responsible for implementing some long-range planning initiatives. Rector disagreed with Fee's assessment, arguing that there are coordinated efforts in place for long-range planning, including cabinet meetings and coordinated reviews. Rector emphasized the importance of understanding the complexities of decision-making processes and regulatory frameworks, particularly in cases involving multiple boards and disciplines. He underscored the need for clarity and understanding when evaluating the effectiveness of planning efforts, cautioning against generalizations and emphasizing the importance of considering underlying regulations and laws governing decision-making processes. The discussion between Rector and Fee highlighted the nuanced nature of planning and decision-making processes, as well as the importance of understanding the intricacies involved in assessing the effectiveness of planning efforts.

Seth Engelbourg raised important points regarding the permitting process, particularly concerning the sequence of obtaining permits in Massachusetts. While it's technically true that applicants can submit permits in any order, Engelbourg pointed out that the Nantucket Conservation Commission (NCC) bylaw specifies that applicants must have either applied for or obtained all other applicable permits before receiving an order of conditions from the NCC. Engelbourg acknowledged that this clause is often ignored by both applicants and the NCC due to the challenges of permitting and the practicalities of the process. However, this inconsistency highlights the need for better communication and coordination among permitting bodies. Engelbourg advocated for ongoing meetings between chairs of all permitting bodies to discuss regulations, updates, and collaboration opportunities, but noted that efforts to establish such meetings have been lacking. While Engelbourg recognized that a strict order of operations may not be necessary, they emphasized the importance of providing resources and guidance to applicants regarding the permitting process and promoting interorganizational collaboration to improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of permitting procedures.

Nat Lowell provided insights into the historical context that led to the establishment of the current building department. While not delving into specific incidents, Lowell mentioned that several significant events in 2012 necessitated the creation of the department. He emphasized the efficiency and functionality of the current building department, likening it to a centralized hub that effectively addresses the needs of the public. Lowell cautioned against focusing on past practices or debating the need for separate buildings for each department, highlighting the practicality and success of the existing setup. Mr. Lowell stressed the importance of continuous improvement and adaptation rather than radical changes, acknowledging the ongoing need for coordination between departments. Regarding long-range planning, Lowell noted that various plans and strategies have been in place for years to address development on the island. He also highlighted the limited amount of buildable land remaining on the island and emphasized the need for property rights and regulations to balance development with conservation efforts. Lowell concluded by suggesting that discussions should focus on refining existing processes rather than overhauling them entirely, emphasizing the importance of recognizing the successes of the current system while acknowledging areas for improvement.

Dawn Hill Holdgate highlighted the availability of resources and processes to assist professionals and homeowners in navigating the permitting process, particularly for those unfamiliar with Massachusetts laws or specific regulations in Nantucket. She acknowledged the challenges faced by individuals new to the area or homeowners without professional expertise but expressed confidence in the staff's ability to provide assistance. Holdgate mentioned specific steps that can be taken to streamline the permitting process, such as obtaining a wetland determination before designing a house or seeking a preliminary review at the Historic District Commission (HDC) for large projects. She emphasized the importance of utilizing these tools and processes to ensure smoother and more efficient permitting procedures. Regarding coordinated review processes, Holdgate noted their value, especially for major commercial developments, suggesting that reinstating such processes could further improve efficiency and collaboration among permitting bodies. Overall, Holdgate emphasized the importance of utilizing available resources and coordinating efforts to facilitate the permitting process for professionals and homeowners alike.

Malcom MacNab reiterated his concern about the current structure, emphasizing that while the PLUS Department may be efficient, they believe a major function of the government has been outsourced to another party. MacNab expressed his belief that the Planning Director should report to the Town Manager, suggesting a different organizational arrangement. MacNab also noted that his question about the necessity of the current structure had not been directly addressed by others in the discussion.

Matt Fee clarified his perspective, acknowledging that the discussion hadn't directly addressed the question of whether the current structure is necessary. Fee emphasized that his concern was not about moving everyone out of the building, as suggested by some, but rather about exploring potential improvements to the existing system. Fee stressed the importance of delving into the details and discussing potential changes or enhancements to the structure, rather than focusing solely on the idea of completely overhauling it. He expressed a desire for a more nuanced conversation about how the system could be improved to better serve the community's needs.

John Trudel shared their perspective, emphasizing their positive experiences with the PLUS building and its staff over the past 30 years. Trudel, who uses the building daily for his work as a realtor and construction supervisor, praised the professionalism, politeness, and helpfulness of the staff. While acknowledging that there's always room for improvement, Trudel expressed caution against making structural changes to a system that is currently functioning well. He highlighted the importance of not fixing something that isn't broken and emphasized their satisfaction with how the building is currently managed and operated.

Barry Rector provided a historical perspective on the relationship between the Planning Commission, Planning Board, and Town Administration, particularly during the tenure of John Vini. Rector noted that there was a significant division among these entities at that time. However, efforts were made, especially during Rector's tenure as chair of the Planning Board, to improve collaboration and cohesion between these groups. Rector highlighted the benefits that came from these efforts, including the consolidation of the Planning Director and NP&EDC Director roles under one person. Despite past challenges, Rector expressed a belief in the importance of keeping these entities working closely together. He also challenged those who criticize the current system to provide specific examples rather than generalizations. Rector emphasized the need for constructive discussion and suggested that while some adjustments may be necessary, separating these entities may not be the solution. He concluded by acknowledging the efforts to undermine the process in recent years and suggested that this issue merits further exploration and discussion.

Emily Molden of the Nantucket Land Bank Council expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the conversation and shared several comments related to the development review process and code compliance:

1. **Establishing a Development Review Team:** Molden supported the idea of establishing a development review team, which she believed could provide value if conducted both internally and publicly. She inquired about examples of such teams being successful and their potential benefits.
2. **Improving Awareness Among Boards and Departments:** Molden suggested the implementation of specific questions in permit applications to raise awareness among boards and committees about other permits required for a project. She referenced the planning board's practice of asking about Wetland jurisdiction and Conservation Commission review and proposed extending this practice to other boards.
3. **Code Compliance and Reporting Requirements:** Molden acknowledged the impracticality of reviewing and enforcing every permit but emphasized the importance of prioritizing certain areas for improvement. She proposed exploring the use of software to track reporting requirements, citing the example of specialized software used for Innovative Alternative Septic Systems in Barnstable.

Overall, Molden advocated for increased collaboration, awareness, and efficiency in the development review process and code compliance efforts.

Rick Atherton expressed his concern about the structure of the memorandum or contract governing the operation of PLUS. He emphasized that while he has no issue with how the units are currently operating, he is troubled by the lack of a termination clause and the inability to modify the contract unilaterally by the town. Atherton likened the contract to a union contract without a termination clause, highlighting the inflexibility it imposes on both parties. He stressed the importance of allowing for changes over time and expressed skepticism about the long-term implications of such a contract. Furthermore, Atherton suggested that the discussions about operational management and coordination are distinct from the contract itself. He proposed that a town planning director, paid directly by the town rather than through the NP&EDC, could fulfill the same managerial responsibilities. In conclusion, Atherton urged the Board to exercise caution when entering into contracts that lack termination clauses and cannot be changed by the town at its discretion. He advocated for a structure that allows for flexibility and responsiveness to future changes and challenges.

Curtis Farms referred to page 37 of the Novak report, emphasizing the importance of carefully reading it, especially the section concerning the Planning Board. They noted that the report suggests alternative structures for the Resource Protection Area (RPA) that could enhance efficiency and clarity within the PLUS Department. Curtis Farms encouraged everyone to review this page thoroughly.

Select Board Motion
Brooke Mohr moved to adopt the amended MOU agreement, with the condition that it undergoes a review in a minimum of three years. This review will be conducted by a committee comprising the NPEDC Chair, the Select Board Chair, the Town Manager, and the Planning Director. The motion was duly seconded by Tom Dickson.
Vote taken by Roll Call: *Brooke Mohr Aye, Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye, Tom Dixon Aye, Matt Fee Opposed*

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to adopt the amended MOU agreement, with the condition that it undergoes a review in a minimum of three years. This review will be conducted by a committee comprising the NPEDC Chair, the Select Board Chair, the Town Manager, and the Planning Director. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell.

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

Barry Rector left the meeting at this time.

3. Presentation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Recommendation for Pilot Program of One-way Conversion and Bike/Pedestrian Improved Access along Williams Lane and Pleasant Street

Mike Burns emphasized the thorough examination of two alternatives for accommodating all modes along Pleasant Street in Williams Lane. He highlighted the trade-offs between preserving the existing two-way traffic flow and implementing a one-way traffic flow, with considerations for pedestrian and bicycle facilities, property impacts, utility concerns, and construction costs. Alternative one, maintaining two-way traffic flow, preserves current conditions but comes with higher costs and property impacts, while alternative two, a one-way configuration, offers better accommodation for all users with fewer impacts and lower costs. The main concern raised was the potential delay at the already congested Four

Corners intersection with alternative two. Based on public input prioritizing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, the Bike Pedestrian Advisory Committee recommended piloting the one-way alternatives, with the option to pursue two-way traffic flow design if the pilot is deemed not viable. The ultimate goal is to address traffic congestion while prioritizing investments in paths and accommodating all transportation modes, as per the town's Complete Streets policy. Therefore, the recommended action is to conduct a pilot of the one-way alternatives and consider two-way traffic flow alternatives if necessary.

Dawn Hill Holdgate noted that this is just a presentation tonight and there will be a broader discussion, which will also allow for public comment at a later date.

4. Request for Review of Pending Four Corners Intersection Improvement (Roundabout) Project and Potential Reappropriation of Outstanding Funding (Current Funding for Design and Permitting)

Town Manager Libby Gibson provided context for why the item regarding reappropriating funds from a dormant capital article is on the agenda. She explained that during their annual review of unexpended prior-year capital articles, they identified this particular item, which has been inactive for at least four years. Given its dormancy and the need to reallocate funds to other capital projects, they sought input from Mike Burns regarding the feasibility of reappropriating the funds. However, recognizing the significance of such a decision, it was suggested that the Select Board and the Planning Commission should weigh in. Comments received in the past few days have further supported the idea of reappropriation, considering the project's lack of priority and potential resource constraints. Libby mentioned the substantial amount of $109,000 associated with the dormant project and expressed a desire to repurpose it, especially given standing opposition and uncertainties surrounding its revival.

Chair Longacre clarified whether the decision made tonight regarding the allocation of funding would directly impact the potential for the project to move forward. Libby Gibson stated that even if the funding is reallocated, it doesn't permanently close out the project. Instead, it would mean that the project would require a new appropriation at a later time to proceed.

Mike Burns' comments summarizing the history of the project:

- The contract with VHB was awarded in February 2018.
- A preferred alternative was approved by the Select Board on October 24th, 2018.
- Property acquisitions took place throughout 2019.
- By the end of 2019, there was a lack of project managers available on the island to handle the project, leading to its dormancy.
- VHB's contract expired during this time, and they did not finish the work they were contracted for, which included developing a preliminary design plan (25% design submission) to provide a cost estimate for implementing the project. They only completed the development of one alternative analysis resulting in the preferred roundabout alternative.

Brooke Mohr expressed concerns about investing money in projects that face vocal opposition in the community. Despite personal beliefs about the effectiveness of a roundabout or its merits, she highlighted the importance of voter approval for funding such projects. Given the controversial nature of the project, she suggested that the $100,000 allocated to it might be better utilized for less contentious work.

Seth Engelbourg suggested that if a consultant failed to meet their contractual obligations, there should be consequences, such as requiring them to fulfill those obligations or return the funds. Regarding the $109,000 allocated six years ago, he indicated that it might not even be sufficient to conduct the necessary study at this point. Therefore, he recommended reallocating the money and seeking a reasonable appropriation later if the decision is made to proceed with the project. He argued that keeping the money allocated without a clear path forward would ultimately necessitate requesting additional funds later, which would be inefficient. This approach prioritizes efficient use of resources and ensures that funding aligns with project needs and viability.

Chair Longacre noted that she is happy with reappropriating.

In summary, the discussion highlighted the history of the roundabout project dating back to 2003, with the first roundabout being built in 2007. There was acknowledgment of community resistance to new projects initially, such as the case with the First Way roundabout, which eventually gained acceptance. However, there were concerns about the current project's funding and progress, including the failure of the consultant to meet contractual obligations. While some suggested reallocating the funds for other purposes, there was a recognition of the importance of not abandoning long-term planning efforts. Some individuals expressed support for the roundabout project, citing vocal community members who favor it. It was clarified that there is still funding available, with $75,000 left in the contract and $109,000 remaining in the account. There were discussions about the different options considered for the roundabout design, with a preference for a design that minimized pedestrian crossings. Ultimately, there was a consensus to reappropriate the funding for the project and potentially seek additional funds if needed, to avoid the perception of abandoning the project entirely.

Select Board Motion
Matt Fee moved to take no action with the understanding that Mike Burns will look into whether the funds will finish the project. The motion was duly seconded.
Vote taken by Roll Call: *Brooke Mohr Aye, Dawn Hill Holdgate Aye, Tom Dixon Aye, Matt Fee Aye*

NP&EDC was not required to vote on Four Corners Intersection project reappropriation.

5. **Presentation of NP&EDC Draft Vision and Mission Statements for Select Board Comment**

The discussion revolved around reviewing draft objectives related to planning and development as part of the Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission's (NPEDC) efforts to update its foundational documents in light of the 50th anniversary. There was acknowledgment of the importance of planning across all town departments and a focus on regional impacts and strategic alignment with the Select Board's plans. Comments highlighted the importance of inclusivity, community engagement, economic sustainability, and responsible stewardship of resources. Concerns were raised about housing, infrastructure capacity, and the need for proactive planning to address evolving challenges. The conversation emphasized the value of ongoing collaboration between boards and community members to shape the island's future in line with shared values and aspirations. Ultimately, there was agreement to continue refining the objectives based on feedback and evolving needs.

Select Board adjourned at this point.

6. Approval of Minutes: NP&EDC ONLY

December 05, 2023

Motion/Vote: Mr. Lowell made a motion to approve the minutes as drafted and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

January 22, 2024

Motion/Vote: Mr. Lowell made a motion to approve the minutes as drafted and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Iverson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

VIII. Adjournment

Motion/Vote: Dawn Hill Holdgate moved to adjourn the meeting and the motion was duly seconded by Dave Iverson 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*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*

Links to the documents included in the Meeting Packet:

1. 02.20.24 NPEDC AGENDA MT UPDATE 2.PDF
2. TIP AMENDMENT.PDF
3. BPAC PLEASANT AND WILLIAMS.PDF
4. PLUS OPS REVIEW.PDF
5. NPEDC DRAFT VISION MISSION OBJECTIVES 09-12-23 RED DRAFT MARK.PDF
6. REVIEW OF MOU AND PLUS AGREEMENT.PDF
7. FOUR CORNERS INERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS.PDF
8. DRAFT MINUTES 120523 NPEDC.PDF
9. DRAFT MINUTES 012224 NPEDC.PDF

Submitted By: Nicky Sheriff