NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission APPROVED Minutes
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
March 04, 2024 @ 5:00PM

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

III. Approval of Agenda:

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

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

IV. Public Comments:

Hillary Hedges Rayport expressed her concern regarding the ongoing discussions about a petition that she filed, which is now being considered at the State House. She emphasized that despite not passing by a wide margin, the petition did receive support from the town meeting voters, leading to its consideration at the state level. Rayport hopes to support the eventual decisions made and highlights the importance of including a member of the Historical Commission and electing at-large members, which she feels hasn't been adequately addressed. She also mentioned conducting an analysis of a survey, indicating overwhelming support for the Historical Commission, and expressed confusion as to why this aspect hasn't been given more attention.

V. Action/Discussion Items:

1. NP&EDC appointment to Washington Street Working Group

Sustainability Programs Manager Vincent Murphy provided an overview of a joint project between the Town and the Landbank aimed at addressing flooding issues in the Washington Street area. This project involves implementing green infrastructure to mitigate current and future flooding, particularly due to sea level rise. Murphy mentioned that there's potential interest from the NP&EDC regarding transportation issues related to the project. He also mentioned the cancellation of a recent meeting and the possibility of extending the timeline for finding a member to participate. Meetings for this project are held monthly in a hybrid format. Murphy highlighted the proposed design for flood mitigation, which includes a raised berm and rain garden. The project is divided into phases, with the initial phase focusing on the Francis Street and Washington Street intersection. The estimated cost for the current phase is $500,000, split evenly between the landbank and the town.

Chair Longacre confirmed that the project is expected to conclude by the end of the year and clarified that it is not a multi-year commitment for an NP&EDC member. This indicates that involvement in the project would not extend beyond the current timeframe, providing reassurance to potential participants.

Nat Lowell expressed his interest in being part of the work group for the project, highlighting the significance of the progress made in the Washington Street area. He noted the culmination of efforts over time, including developments with properties and Wally's house, and expressed anticipation for the project's completion.

Kristina Jelleme affirmed her presence on the work group and expressed enthusiasm about Nat Lowell's interest in joining. She welcomed him as a representative and emphasized collaboration between them to share information with the Commission.

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to nominate Nat Lowell as the representative for the NP&EDC on the Washington Street Work Group the motion was duly seconded by Seth Engelbourg and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

2. **Transportation Program Manager Update (see packet)**

a) **Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) recommendation on requested Pedicab regulation changes.**

Mike Burns provided an overview of recommendations from the Traffic Safety Work Group and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee regarding requested amendments to the Nan-Tuck-Tuck Pedicab service regulations. The recommendations include allowing pedal-assist bicycles, expanding the number of licenses from two to four, displaying a price structure for the service, and adjusting the service area map to exclude certain roads. Burns highlighted that the BPAC concurs with the requested amendments on pedal assist and licenses, recommends displaying a price structure, and proposes adjustments to the service area map. He concluded by recommending that the committee endorse the BPAC's recommendations for submission to the Select Board.

Chair Longacre requested additional background information on the discussion surrounding the extension of the service area map from Hummock Pond Road to Bartlett Farm. She mentioned watching the Traffic Safety Work Group's discussion, which had a different recommendation, indicating the importance of ensuring all relevant information is available for consideration.

Mike Burns clarified the discrepancy between the recommendations from the Traffic Safety Work Group and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee regarding the extension of the service area map to Bartlett Farm Road. He explained that the Traffic Safety Work Group was hesitant to extend the service area beyond the brewery parking lot due to concerns about the balance of the corridor from the parking lot to Bartlett Farm Road not being conducive to heavy bike or Pedicab traffic. However, the BPAC recommended extending the service area to Bartlett Farm Road as requested.

Barry Rector joined the meeting at this time.

Joseph Topham expressed his agreement with Mike Burns' summary and thanked him for the thorough presentation. He mentioned the robust conversation surrounding the extension of the service area and noted the absence of complaints during the pilot phase, which is promising. Joe acknowledged the surprise regarding the success of the service on Bartlett Farm Road but emphasized the importance of testing and experimentation. Mr. Topham also highlighted the effectiveness of the pedal assist feature and expressed optimism about the upcoming summer season.

Owner of NanTukTuk Pedicab Service Michael Gormley concurred with the previous statements and added a detail regarding the existing service map, noting that for the pilot program, the service area extended up until the rotary. He clarified that the proposed map expansion is not as significant as it might seem initially. Gormley indicated that he didn't have anything further to add as the discussion had covered all relevant points.

Wendy Hudson expressed her intention to recuse herself from the discussion regarding the Brewery leg of the service area if it is considered as part of the broader discussion.

Chair Mary Longacre suggested discussing the first three requests separately from the fourth one to accommodate Wendy Hudson's recusal regarding the service area map. She opened the floor for comments on allowing pedal assist, increasing the number of licenses, and implementing a pricing structure for the NanTukTuk Pedicab service.

Seth Engelbourg made two comments regarding the requested amendments. Firstly, he expressed support for implementing a fee structure for the NanTukTuk Pedicab service, suggesting that the existing taxicab pricing model could serve as a useful template. He recommended adopting fixed-rate pricing shared by all companies operating in the service area to ensure consistency. Secondly, Engelbourg highlighted that while the current request is to grant four pedicab licenses to NanTukTuk specifically, this doesn't preclude the possibility of granting additional licenses to other competitors in the future. This observation suggests a consideration for maintaining an open and competitive market in the long term.

Chair Longacre corrected Seth's statement, clarifying that the request is to change the town's regulations to allow for four licenses, which are not specific to NanTukTuk. Seth Engelbourg asked if any entity could apply for these licenses in a given year, and if granted, would they be eligible to operate. Chair Longacre deferred to Mike Burns for further clarification on the regulations.

Mike Burns shared that the current regulations stipulate that the Select Board sets the number of pedicab owner licenses available in a calendar year without any exclusions. He clarified that the request is to increase the number of licenses from two to four for NanTukTuk Pedicab specifically. However, he deferred to Michael Gormley for further clarification.

Chair Mary Longacre directed the question to Michael Gormley, asking if he had more information based on prior conversations with the Select Board regarding their stance on awarding licenses to multiple owners.

Michael Gormley responded, stating that he believes the market is open to competition, and he personally is applying for four pedicab licenses. He emphasized that his application for four licenses does not restrict or limit anyone else from subsequently applying for additional licenses. Gormley made it clear that he does not perceive himself as having a monopoly on the market. This suggests a belief in the importance of fostering a competitive environment within the pedicab industry.

Chair Mary Longacre highlighted the distinction between recommending a change to the town's legal language and recommending that the Select Board award a license under specific terms. She noted that the regulation does not currently limit the number of licenses, so there may not be a need to recommend changing the regulations to allow for four licenses. Longacre sought confirmation from Mike Burns regarding the accuracy of her understanding.

Mike Burns acknowledged the fair point made by Chair Longacre and suggested that instead of recommending a change to the specific local regulation (362a), the recommendation could be more general. He proposed that the request could be for the Select Board to increase the number of licenses from two to four without necessarily altering the existing regulation. This approach ensures clarity and avoids potential complications with the legal language.
Chair Longacre clarified that recommending an increase in the number of licenses from two to four is not a change in the regulation itself but rather a recommendation on how the Select Board should respond to applications from any entity. This distinction emphasizes that the recommendation pertains to the Select Board's discretion in managing the number of licenses issued, rather than altering the specific wording of the regulation.

Seth Engelbourg reiterated that it's not within their authority or duty to direct another permitting agency on how many licenses to issue. He suggested making a recommendation in general to support an increase in pedicab licenses but emphasized that it's ultimately up to the permitting agency to decide how and to whom those licenses will be issued.

Joseph Topham expressed agreement with the approach taken by Michael Gormley in gradually increasing the number of pedicab licenses, starting with two and now expanding to four. He commended this cautious approach as wise, noting that it allows for a controlled expansion of the service without overwhelming the streets with too many pedicabs. Topham emphasized that this decision was made based on Gormley's leadership in the project. He reassured that while Gormley's company, NanTukTuk, was the focus, the same due diligence would be applied to any other applicants for pedicab licenses. Topham also mentioned the recommendation to consider the taxi service rate fee and suggested exploring a per-mile fee structure, which could provide more clarity and stability for both operators and customers. He believed that implementing a fee structure would be beneficial for the growth of pedicab services.

Nat Lowell provided additional perspective on the discussion, suggesting that the approach to pedicab licenses could be similar to special permits, where there is a review planned annually to assess how things are going. He mentioned that this is a common practice with other permits, such as those for restaurants. Lowell emphasized the importance of not discouraging pedicab operations while also avoiding opening the floodgates all at once. He suggested that the language regarding the number of licenses could be modified to allow for gradual growth without needing to revisit the issue every year. Overall, he expressed appreciation for the effort put into this process.

Seth Engelbourg argued that as a Regional Planning authority, their role isn't to advocate for individual businesses. He believes that fee structures should either be open market or set by a town authority, not influenced by individual businesses. He questioned the need for specific recommendations to another Regulatory Board and suggested that licenses should either follow an open market approach or be subject to annual review by the Select Board. Overall, he emphasized the importance of fairness and consistency in regulatory decisions.

Chair Mary Longacre highlighted the importance of distinguishing between supporting a request for interpreting regulations and supporting a request to change them. This suggested a nuanced approach where the Commission may assist in clarifying existing regulations without necessarily advocating for changes to those regulations.

Michael Gromley suggested that a fee structure explicitly controlled by the Town may not be suitable for pedicab licensing, citing examples like limousines or party buses where prices are agreed upon before services are conducted. He argued for a model where prices are negotiated or agreed upon beforehand, similar to how it's done for limousines, rather than having fixed prices set by the Town that need to be adjusted for different seasons and demand levels.

Kristina Jelleme sought clarification on the recommendation regarding the number of licenses, indicating that because there is no specific number outlined in the regulations, there may not be a need to recommend a change to the bylaw. She questioned whether this recommendation should be struck from the list of recommendations, suggesting that it may not be necessary if it doesn't involve a change to existing regulations.

Chair Longacre suggested discussing each recommendation one at a time to ensure clarity and to tailor motions accordingly. She emphasized the need to clearly explain any variations from the recommendations displayed on the screen and suggested focusing on each item individually to avoid lengthy discussions and ensure efficient decision-making.

Chair Mary Longacre went on to express concerns about the request to strike the phrase "which is powered solely by human power" from the definition of a pedicab. She suggested that simply allowing any form of motion that meets the definition could lead to unintended consequences. Instead, she proposed editing the sentence to include language specifying that pedicabs can be powered by a pedal assist system, provided that a governor is in place to limit the speed to 15 miles per hour.

Chair Longacre sought clarification from Michael Gromley in regards to the bikes being governed to a top speed of 15 miles per hour, as per the recommendation from the pilot season in 2023. Gromley expressed that there seems to be no downside to increasing the speed limit to 20 miles per hour, as there's rarely a need to go beyond that. He notes that the congestion in town often prevents reaching even the current speed limit of 15 miles per hour. Longacre confirmed that the bikes are capable of reaching 20 miles per hour but were limited by the Select Board's conditions last year to 15 miles per hour.

Wendy Hudson clarified that she supports the use of pedal assist on pedicabs but has concerns about striking the sentence regarding human-powered operation, as it could open the door to other forms of locomotion like mopeds or motorcycles. She suggested modifying the language to allow for pedal assist but maintaining the restriction to 15 miles per hour. Upon further reflection, she expressed uncertainty about increasing the speed limit to 20 miles per hour and reiterates her support for the overall initiative of introducing pedicabs to the community. She emphasized the positive impact of having bikes available and expresses willingness to refine certain points either by the authority or the Select Board.

- **<u>Amend § 316-1 to allow pedal assist bicycles.</u>**

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to change the definition of a pedicab to a bicycle with three or more wheels which is designed to transport passengers on seats attached to the vehicle which is operated by one person which is powered by human power, pedal assist or by electric motor with a maximum speed of 20 miles per hour and which is used to transport passengers. The motion was duly seconded by Wendy Hudson and the motion was carried unanimously.

<u>Discussion on the Motion:</u>

Seth Engelbourg pointed out a potential ambiguity in the current regulation language, suggesting that the way it's written could allow for vehicles with electric motors but no pedals, which may not align with the intended use of pedal assist. He emphasizes that the current wording could theoretically permit vehicles solely powered by an electric motor without pedals, which may not be consistent with the operators' intentions. This observation highlights the need for clarity and specificity in defining the requirements for pedal-assisted vehicles.

Chair Mary Longacre acknowledged Seth Engelbourg's point that the regulations should not be specific to a particular operator, indicating that clarity is needed in describing the vehicles. She then directed the question to Mike, asking if it's possible to insert the phrase "pedal assist" into the regulations for clarification. This suggests a collaborative effort to ensure that the regulations accurately reflect the intended use of pedal-assisted vehicles without being overly restrictive to any particular operator.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Abstain*

- **Per § 316-2(A), request to allow four (4) pedicab licenses.**

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved for the NP&EDC to advocate support for an increase in the number of Pedicab licenses for 2024. 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*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*

- **Amend § 316-2(P) allowing fees for pedicab service (vs gratuity).**

Motion/Vote: Seth Engelbourg moved to change article "P" to owners and operators shall be allowed to charge a fare for pedicab service and nothing in this section will prohibit them from accepting gratuities. The motion was duly seconded by Joseph Topham and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:
The discussion revolved around amending the regulations to allow for a price structure for pedicab service, as currently, operators are not permitted to charge a fare. Michael Gormley

expressed frustration with the current system, where he is unable to charge customers, and suggests the need for flexibility in pricing to accommodate demand fluctuations. He proposes the elimination of regulations regarding pricing, except for situations where someone genuinely needs transportation assistance. Chair Mary Longacre clarified that the request is simply to amend the regulations to allow for a price structure, while the specifics of pricing are outside their purview. Mike Burns agrees with this clarification.

Furthermore, the discussion touched on the importance of having a posted fare structure for certainty and to avoid equity complaints. The suggestion is to change the regulation to allow for a posted fare structure that applies to all customers uniformly, rather than allowing situational pricing. This would ensure fairness and transparency in pricing for all customers.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*

- **§ 316-4 (A)(3) extending service area map.**

Wendy Hudson recused from this discussion.

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham moved to modify the service area maps as recommended by BPAC. The motion was duly seconded by Nat Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Discussion on the Motion:

Seth Engelbourg raised concerns regarding the logistics of how pedicabs would travel between the designated service areas without passengers. Michael Gormley responded by explaining that he can transport two pedicabs in the bed of his truck to the Bartlett Farm location, where they would be dropped off within the permitted service area zone. Chair Longacre clarified that the pedicabs would only be shuttling back and forth between the designated endpoints and would not be traveling on Hummock Pond Road from town. This clarification ensures that the operation remains within the designated service areas and adheres to the regulations.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Nat Lowell *Aye*

Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme Aye
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*
Vice-Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Recused*

3. **Ongoing Discussion – Enabling Legislation including the following topics (see packet**

Kristina Jelleme sought clarification regarding the process of electing members to the commission and inquired about Hillary Hedges Rayport's question regarding elected versus appointed members, particularly in the context of at-large positions. She acknowledged her newness to the process and expressed a willingness to discuss the matter offline if necessary.

Seth Engelbourg clarified that the commission has not yet decided whether certain seats will be appointed or elected, and this decision-making process is ongoing. He shared his personal opinion, stating that it's generally more challenging to get elected to a town office or any office compared to being appointed. He also highlighted the extensive effort required for election campaigns, including gathering signatures, campaigning, and fundraising, in contrast to the relatively simpler process of applying for appointment. While elections may seem more democratic, he emphasized that appointments are a lower barrier to participation and may be more conducive to achieving equitable representation within the community.

Chair Mary Longacre shared her concern about finding individuals willing to run for office, particularly given the region's history of non-competitive races. She acknowledges that asking the public to find three more candidates willing to run could be challenging. She also mentioned a potential motivation behind considering changes to the appointment process, which is to address the potential for conflicts when the NP&EDC appoints members to its own body. However, she believed that this concern could be mitigated by expanding the number and diversity of members, reducing the likelihood of groupthink within the commission.

Nat Lowell presented several reasons for maintaining the current appointment process for boards and commissions with regulatory power. He points out that various boards like the Conservation Commission (ConCom), Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), and Airport Commission are appointed and have regulatory authority. This diversity in appointment processes allows for a natural selection process where members can serve for varying lengths of time. Additionally, he highlighted the mix of appointed and elected positions within local governance structures, including Planning Boards and county commissioners. Mr. Lowell also emphasized that changing to elected positions could reduce the pool of interested candidates, making it more difficult to fill these roles. Moreover, since the commission is not regulatory, he argues that an elected structure may be unnecessary and could deter potential candidates. He draws parallels to instances where boards like the Historic District Commission (HDC) struggle to attract members due to the rigorous appointment process. Overall, he advocated for maintaining the current appointment process to ensure a diverse and effective representation within the commission.

Barry Rector proposed two points for consideration regarding the at-large positions on the commission. First, he suggests reducing the term for each position from three years to one year to level the playing field for new members joining from other commissions. Additionally, he proposed changing the appointment process to ensure broader representation. Instead of NRPC solely appointing members, he suggests having NRPC appoint one person, the town moderator appoint one person, and the Finance Committee (FinCom) or the commission itself appoint one person. Moving on to the Planning Board appointments, Barry suggested automating the appointment process. Specifically, he proposed that in the second, third, and fourth years of a Planning Board member's five-year term, they automatically appoint one person each year to the commission. This would allow for a a rotation of Planning Board representation on the commission and simplifies tracking of appointments.

Joseph Topham shared his experience of going through both the application process for the Select Board and running for a position on the Planning Board. He acknowledged that while both processes involve effort, he found the application process for the Select Board, including an interview with all five members, to be easier. He suggested that spreading the word about openings may be more crucial than the specific process. However, he ultimately believed that the commission should be appointed rather than elected. He also mentioned that while campaigning may require effort, he didn't find it significantly different from the application process for the Select Board. Nonetheless, he asserted his belief that the appointment process would work better for the commission.

Chair Mary Longacre provided additional context regarding the requirement to be elected, noting that the number of signatures required has recently increased to 50, potentially making it more challenging for candidates to get on the ballot. She also addressed Barry Rector's suggestion of having at-large members serve one-year terms, expressing concern about the practicality of having them run for election every year or be appointed annually. She emphasized the importance of continuity within the commission and suggests that this concern extends to the entire slate of members, not just the at-large positions.

Seth Engelbourg brought up an important consideration regarding the representation of diverse backgrounds among at-large members. He suggested updating the application process to encourage applicants to provide information not only about their technical skills but also about their identity and sector geography. This could be achieved by incorporating specific questions in the application form that prompt applicants to describe how their background and identity contribute to the diversity and inclusivity of the commission. By doing so, the commission can ensure that its members represent a wide range of perspectives and experiences, thus enriching its decision-making process.

Kristina Jelleme expressed her gratitude to the chair and other members for providing insight into the appointed versus elected debate. Drawing from her own experience of being both elected and appointed to commissions, she understands the perspectives and arguments presented. She went on to suggest a potential compromise or balance in the appointment process for at-large members, echoing Barry's suggestion. Specifically, she proposed considering different groups to appoint members in order to ensure diversity and avoid the perception of homogenous selection. While she doesn't offer a specific suggestion, she encouraged the commission to contemplate this idea as they deliberate on the appointment process for at-large positions.

Seth Engelbourg raised a practical concern regarding Barry's proposal for appointing at-large members by different groups. He seeks clarification on the logistics of this process, particularly regarding how applicants would submit their applications and whether they could apply to multiple appointing bodies.

Barry Rector proposed a practical solution to handle the appointment process for at-large members. He suggested that the Regional Planning Commission could collect all applications and then use a "daisy chain" method for selection. In this method, the commission would select their candidate first, followed by the town moderator, and then the finance committee, each selecting from the remaining pool of applicants. Mr. Rector explained that submitting multiple applications to different appointing bodies would not be necessary or practical, as it could lead to complications if multiple bodies choose the same candidate. He noted that while he hasn't personally discussed this proposal with the town moderator or finance committee, there have been past discussions with the town moderator, and he believes that the finance committee would likely be willing to participate in this process. However, formal discussions have not yet taken place as the process is still in the early stages of development.

Nat Lowell emphasized the effectiveness of the current appointment process for at-large members and suggests that it doesn't require significant changes. He acknowledged the importance of maintaining a diverse and qualified membership on the commission, highlighting examples of current members who bring valuable perspectives and expertise to the table. Mr. Lowell argued that the appointment process allows for a natural and diverse selection of individuals who may not necessarily run for election but have a lot to offer to the commission. He drew a comparison to other appointed bodies like the finance committee, emphasizing the importance of institutional knowledge and expertise in certain positions. While Mr. Lowell remains open to changes regarding criteria for selecting applicants, he cautions against making significant alterations to a process that has worked well for the commission over time. He encouraged the commission to consider the strengths of the current system and be mindful of potential unintended consequences when contemplating changes.

Barry Rector left the meeting at this point.

Chair Longacre referred to research she conducted on the criteria for determining whether a position is better suited to be elected or appointed. She found a framework from the Edward Collins Center for Public Management at UMass Boston (linked below) that outlines various criteria for evaluation. According to this framework, positions with significant policymaking responsibilities are more likely to be suited for election, while advisory roles are better suited for appointment. Longacre indicated that based on her research, the at-large positions on the commission are better suited for appointment. She offered to share this framework for further discussion and invites input on whether there are any changes needed in the way the summary of the discussion is presented. She clarified that the summary is intended as a reference and is open to modification.

Seth sought clarification on the term staggered and its implications for the at-large positions. He understands that staggered terms mean that one position changes every year, ensuring continuity within the commission. Seth also emphasized the need to change the language and application process for all three at-large positions to promote diversity in membership. He clarified that his recommendation does not involve reserving specific seats for specific criteria of applicants but rather aims to enhance diversity within the commission.

Chair Longacre clarified that the transition mechanism for the at-large members is indeed separate from the selection mechanism. She expressed that if the Commission does not make any changes to how they are appointed, the current members serving different years of their terms would be replaced accordingly. Staggered terms mean that one position changes every year, ensuring continuity within the commission.

The discussion went on to highlight these main points below:

1. **Agreement on At-Large Seats**: There is general agreement on the concept of having at-large seats, but the specifics regarding appointment processes, terms, and criteria still need further discussion.

2. **Diversity Concerns**: Some members expressed concerns about diversity and suggested that having the same group appointing all three at-large members might not lead to sufficient diversity. There's a preference for having at-large members appointed by different groups to ensure a broader representation.

3. **Planning Board Memberships**: There's agreement on the concept of having planning board members automatically serve on the NP&EDC during their second, third, and fourth years of service. However, there's a need to consider partial-year terms and whether alternate members should be eligible for NP&EDC representation.

4. **Chamber of Commerce Representation**: Discussion revolved around whether the Chamber of Commerce should appoint its executive director, staff, or board members to the NP&EDC. It's generally agreed to leave the selection criteria open to the Chamber, with the possibility of appointing either staff or board members.

5. **Transition Plan**: A universal statement for the transition plan was proposed, which involves appointing or reappointing one-year terms, including new seats and replacing planning board seats, at the July meeting immediately after the state adopts the petition.

6. **Meeting Timing**: There's a suggestion to ensure that the NP&EDC's July meeting is scheduled later in the month to accommodate other boards' meeting schedules for appointments.

7. **Term Length and Limits**: There's no specific agreement on term lengths or limits, with discussion focusing more on the appointment processes and criteria.

Overall, the discussion is ongoing, with many details still to be worked out regarding membership composition, appointment processes, and transition procedures. Further discussion and consideration of various factors are needed before final decisions are made.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion/Vote: Wendy Hudson moved to adjourn the meeting 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*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Chair Mary Longacre *Aye*

Links to the documents included in the Meeting Packet:

1. 03-04-24 NPEDC AGENDA.PDF (nantucket-ma.gov)
2. WASHINGTON STREET WORK GROUP MOU.PDF
3. EXHIBIT A_FRANCIS STREET BEACH PROJECT.PDF
4. BPAC RECOMMENDATIONS 030424(nantucket-ma.gov)
5. NRPC CURRENT PROPOSAL FOR MEMBERSHIP (nantucket-ma.gov)
6. 2011 05-12 Collins Framework for Considering Elected and Appointed Offices 3424 minutes.pdf

Submitted By: Nicky Sheriff