



NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION



**Nantucket Planning & Economic Development Commission APPROVED Minutes
Hybrid Participation via Zoom Webinar & Meeting Trailer, Room A, 131 Pleasant St,
Nantucket, MA 02554
April 22, 2024 @ 5:00PM**

Commissioners: Chair Barry Rector, Vice-Chair Nat Lowell, Mary Longacre, 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 Barry Rector called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

The Vice-Chair Barry Rector 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 Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*
John Trudel *Absent*
Mary Longacre *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*
Raissah Kouame, Regional Planning Coordinator, MassDOT *Aye*
Holly Backus, Preservation Planner *Aye*

III. Approval of Agenda:

Motion/Vote: Nat Lowell made a motion to approve the agenda as drafted the motion was duly seconded by Dave Iverson 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 Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

IV. Vineyard Northeast Offshore Wind Energy Development (see packet)

William Cook, a partner at Cultural Heritage Partners, had been working on behalf of the town of Nantucket for over four years, closely collaborating with Holly Backus and Lauren Sinatra on Vineyard Wind projects. Cook provided a brief update and addressed questions regarding the Vineyard Northeast project. The Town of Nantucket and related entities had received a standard Consulting party request from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the Vineyard Northeast project, covered by the Good Neighbor Agreement. This agreement aimed to resolve adverse visual effects on Nantucket's National Historic Landmark district. A mitigation fund of over \$16 million was created under the agreement for historic preservation and coastal resiliency projects. Cook highlighted the significant increase in mitigation funding negotiated by the town through Cultural Heritage Partners. The Good Neighbor Agreement addressed adverse visual effects through financial mitigation and avoidance measures, surpassing typical federal offers. Cook also emphasized that although the town wouldn't formally participate as a Consulting party, contractual guarantees from the agreement remained in place. Cook clarified misinformation about the Vineyard Northeast project, including turbine distance, number, and height. Despite taller turbines, expert assessments indicated minimal visual impact from shore. Efforts were underway to provide updates and clarify information through a new offshore wind website. Cook assured ongoing monitoring of projects by Cultural Heritage Partners. In summary, Cook's update provided insight into the town's negotiations, the significance of the Good Neighbor agreement, and efforts to address concerns related to the Vineyard Northeast project.

Joseph Topham sought clarification on whether the Vineyard Northeast project is based on kilowatts per wind turbine or if there are limits on the maximum number of wind turbines. He mentioned that currently,

each turbine generates 15 kilowatts, with expectations of increasing to 17 or 18 kilowatts in the next year or two. Topham is curious if these parameters affect the number of turbines installed.

William Cook responded by explaining that the technology in turbine manufacturing is evolving rapidly. While he cannot provide the exact kilowatt output during the call, he offered to send the information via email afterward. Cook explained that the kilowattage typically increases with turbine height. Regarding the parameters of the project, Cook indicated that there is a set number of turbines planned to meet the agreement between the developer and the state regarding the power purchase agreement. While it's theoretically possible to have fewer turbines if taller turbines are installed, Cook suggested that it's unlikely due to the need for approval of construction and operations plans, which typically specify a maximum height. Cook anticipates that the actual turbines may not reach the maximum proposed height, as seen in other projects. He expects to have more concrete information from the developer within the next six months and assured ongoing updates to the town. Developers must make informed decisions upfront, as amending plans would restart the environmental review process.

Val Oliver expressed frustration with the lack of public involvement in pre-decision discussions regarding the Vineyard Wind projects. As a stakeholder, Oliver believes that the public should have a voice at the table, especially considering the potential environmental and economic impacts. Oliver also highlighted concerns about the scale of the projects, with 1,400 turbines planned collectively, covering an area larger than Rhode Island. Oliver went on to criticize the portrayal of the project as a single entity when, in reality, there are nine separate projects. The Good Neighbor agreement, signed without public input, was also criticized for allegedly disregarding the rights of Nantucket residents and business owners. Oliver believes that the agreement allows for major impacts on the National Historic Landmark without proper mitigation. Concerns were raised about the height of the turbines, which are taller than initially conveyed to the public, and the potential impact on energy bills. Oliver questioned if anyone is advocating for Nantucket's interests and urged leaders to review the impact statements and plans. Oliver called on the commission to protect Nantucket's resources and implores them to push back against the projects and pointed out that other municipalities and organizations are fighting back and urge Nantucket to do the same.

Amy Disibio echoed Val Oliver's concerns and expresses disappointment with the lack of public involvement in the decision-making process regarding the Vineyard Wind projects. She criticizes the Good Neighbor agreement for restricting public access to the process and believes it benefits developers more than residents. Disibio challenged William Cook's statements, particularly regarding the \$16 million mitigation fund, citing other municipalities that have received larger settlements. She also questions the legality of binding stakeholders through the agreement without public input. She advocated for the protection of Nantucket's interests, suggesting that turbines be moved out of the viewshed to protect the environment and endangered species like the North Atlantic right whale. Disibio argued that financial settlements do not adequately mitigate the long-term impacts of the projects on the community. Overall, Disibio called on the commission to prioritize Nantucket's well-being and ensure that residents have a voice in decisions that affect their island.

William Cook rebutted the notion that the town is gagged or that the public cannot participate in the environmental review process. He emphasized that there is nothing preventing public participation in ongoing reviews. The Good Neighbor agreement specifically addressed the Vineyard Wind project, which had the closest visual impact to Nantucket. Cook asserted that subsequent projects will be further offshore and less visible. Regarding concerns about turbine visibility, Cook explained that while turbines may be taller, they will not appear taller due to visual perspectives. He cited verification from visual simulation experts to support this claim. Cook also assured that his firm, along with town officials, is carefully

reviewing all projects to ensure Nantucket's interests regarding historic properties are addressed. Cook went on to clarify that it's not possible to move turbines out of view due to fixed lease areas established years ago. He encouraged public participation in the review process, stating that residents, property owners, and business owners are free to participate as interested members of the public. Cook defends the Good Neighbor agreement, stating that it protects Nantucket's rights and does not prevent advocacy on behalf of the town.

Commissioner Lowell highlighted the strong governmental push for climate policies and the challenges individuals face in opposing them. He likened individual resistance to swatting a fly with a small fly swatter against a large fly, indicating the difficulty of effecting change. Lowell emphasized the pressure on government agencies to approve such policies, regardless of public sentiment. Reflecting on past events like the Cape Wind project and the ocean plan of 2008, Lowell noted the inevitability of these policies taking shape and the frustration they cause among citizens. He concluded by acknowledging that the outcome of these policies remains uncertain and that future generations might have to deal with the consequences.

Danielle Sparks, a part-time resident of Nantucket, expressed deep concern about the impact of offshore wind projects on the island's beauty and ecosystem. Despite being a part-time resident, Sparks had been closely monitoring the situation for several years and felt compelled to voice her distress. He questioned why Nantucket would allow such projects to proceed and speculated that state and federal powers were driving the decision, leaving the town with little ability to oppose it. Sparks lamented the potential detrimental effects of the projects on the island's economy and environment, expressing doubt about their long-term viability. Sparks emphasized the importance of preserving Nantucket's natural beauty and wondered if there was any way to mitigate the negative impacts of the projects. He pondered whether the town should reconsider its acceptance of financial incentives in exchange for silence about the true consequences of the projects. Ultimately, Sparks called for a reevaluation of the situation and urged stakeholders to consider whether the perceived benefits outweighed the potential harm to Nantucket and its residents.

Commissioner Wendy Hudson emphasized that the situation isn't one of acquiescence but rather one where there's room for optimism regarding the positive impacts that renewable energy initiatives like offshore wind could have. She highlighted the importance of acknowledging the invisible yet tangible effects of climate change that are increasingly evident, suggesting that a balanced perspective that considers both viewpoints is necessary.

Galen Gardner expressed frustration with the lack of public input regarding the Good Neighbor Agreement and raised concerns about the potential negative impacts of renewable energy initiatives like offshore wind. While supportive of exploring alternative energy sources, Galen questioned the wisdom of current approaches, citing concerns about environmental damage and the lack of guaranteed benefits for Nantucket. Gardner emphasized the need for more transparency and public discourse in decision-making processes surrounding such projects.

Victoria Bridges expressed skepticism about Vineyard Wind's promises, particularly regarding the installation of an aircraft detection system and the visibility of turbines from beaches. She highlighted concerns about the discrepancy between what was promised and what has been delivered, suggesting that this calls into question the trustworthiness of Vineyard Wind. Bridges concluded by questioning the rationale for continuing the Good Neighbor agreement with them.

Victoria Bonnet expressed concern about Nantucket prioritizing the interests of a foreign energy company over its citizens. She emphasized that the issue isn't about wind energy itself, but rather whether the

agreement with the energy company benefits Nantucket. Victoria criticized the lack of direct communication from developers and government agencies about the impacts of the project on the island. She also found it shocking that the Planning and Economic Development Committee (NPEDC) was directed not to advocate for Nantucket's interests and highlighted the absence of information about the project on the town website. Bonnet concluded by expressing her disappointment in the decision made several years ago to sign the agreement without adequate public input.

Amy Disibio clarified that Nantucket may not have been as fortunate as commonly believed in securing the agreement with Vineyard Wind. She suggested that Vineyard Wind needed the Good Neighbor agreement to proceed with their project due to the significant impact on Nantucket as a National Historic Landmark. Amy emphasized that signing the agreement posed challenges for future projects. Additionally, she pointed out that despite concerns about climate change, the projected impacts of the offshore wind projects on climate change were negligible according to the documents. She expressed hope for better decision-making and advice moving forward.

Holly Backus, as the representative for Section 106 as Town of Nantucket's Preservation Planner, emphasized the importance of Section 106 and 110f of the National Historic Preservation Act. She clarified that the Good Neighbor agreement negotiated directly with Vineyard Wind was crucial for Nantucket to have a voice in the development process. Holly highlighted that the agreement was specific to Vineyard Wind's project and that there were other proposed developments along the Eastern seaboard not covered by it. She underscored the significance of Nantucket's status as a National Historic District, which allowed the town to be consulting parties in the development process. Backus encouraged people to visit the town's website for accurate information and reiterated the town's commitment to protecting its historic landmarks. She concluded by offering to address any questions and forward them to relevant parties.

Bert Johnson sought clarification from Holly Backus as to the size of the booster station that's shown on that map uh south of Tuckernuck. Ms. Backus mentioned that she intends to gather more information from Vineyard Wind's attorneys to provide a thorough answer regarding Bert Johnson's inquiry.

Daniel Sparks suggested creating a five-minute video to explain the process behind the windmill project on Nantucket. The video would outline who approved the project, clarify that Nantucket did not approve it, explain the role of representatives in the decision-making process, and detail the provisions of the Good Neighbor Agreement. This video would aim to help residents understand the mechanics of the decision-making process and what Nantucket has agreed to regarding the project, without taking a subjective stance on the benefits or drawbacks of wind power.

Veronica Bonnet made three points: first, the substations are as large as ocean liners; second, all wind turbines will be lit 24/7 for marine interests, regardless of whether they have aircraft detection lighting; and third, the summary tables regarding adverse impacts indicate that they are major for all projects. She suggested sharing these summary tables with people on Nantucket and re-evaluating the Good Neighbor agreement, which was signed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Wendy Hudson sought clarification on how long the Good Neighbor Agreement is in effect. Ms. Backus stated that it is for the duration of the wind farm cycle which is typically a span of 30 years.

Dawn Holdgate emphasized that the Good Neighbor Agreement was not negotiated under the cover of COVID-19 and that the Select Board worked diligently to secure the best deal possible for Nantucket. She clarified that the agreement was a result of the existing federal lease agreements for the wind farm and

that the town's hands were tied in certain aspects of negotiation. Despite challenges, she expressed confidence in the town's advisors and the benefits obtained through the agreement.

Joseph Topham highlighted that discussions about the Wind Farm Project began as early as 2016 when he was a member of the Conservation Commission. He expressed confidence that there are still members involved in monitoring the project's progress and advocating for the town's best interests. Topham also suggested that negative comments may not fully capture the efforts made by various parties and expressed his personal view that the project could benefit Nantucket.

Seth Engelbourg clarified that the Good Neighbor Agreement is publicly available on the town's website and outlines the responsibilities of all parties involved, including the town and Vineyard Wind. He emphasized that the Conservation Commission has been extensively involved in reviewing permit applications for various projects over the past five years, with rigorous questioning and discussions. Engelbourg also explained the advisory role of the NP&EDC, stating that their primary function is to provide data and analysis to inform decision-making by other entities such as the Select Board, Con Com, state agencies like CCM, and federal agencies like BOEM. He suggested that while public discourse is valuable, certain decisions are better suited for these other bodies with greater authority and jurisdiction.

Preservation Planner Holly Backus informed the commission that herself and Lauren Sinatra (Energy Coordinator), as the town's liaisons for the offshore Wind Work Group, have sent out meeting invitations to consulting parties and stakeholders listed on the town's website. The Cultural Heritage Partners (CHP) will serve as the spokesperson, providing updates on the wind projects in progress and addressing any questions ahead of town meeting. This meeting is not open to the public but is intended to ensure that relevant entities are informed and aligned on these matters.

V. Approval of Minutes

March 18, 2024

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to approve the 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*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

March 25, 2024

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to approve the 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*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

VI Transportation Action/Discussion Items:

A. Massachusetts 2050 Transportation Plan (Beyond Mobility) – Notice of Public Comment Period ending May 5, 2024

<https://www.mass.gov/beyond-mobility>

Raissah Kouame shared an update on the Statewide long-range Transportation plan "Beyond Mobility." This plan, part of the MAST15 initiative, aims to inform future planning and programming efforts of the agency. The plan, which has been open for public comment until May 31st, focuses on various priority areas such as social and geographic equity, financial and staffing resources, safety, reliability, clean transportation, destination connectivity, resiliency, and travel experience. Each priority area includes problem statements and corresponding action items aimed at addressing challenges and improving transportation in Massachusetts. Kouame highlighted key problem statements and action items from the plan, emphasizing the importance of public engagement and collaboration with various stakeholders.

Mike Burns discussed a rough exercise in aligning the regional planning priorities with Beyond Mobility. Burns highlighted affordability as a significant goal for the Planning Commission, noting that some priorities weren't directly addressed in Beyond Mobility. He mentioned reliability priorities such as vehicle regulation and guaranteeing access on the ferry, which differed from those in Beyond Mobility. The discussion touched upon several important points related to transportation planning, including the integration of concepts like complete streets and safe routes to schools into the Beyond Mobility plan. Mike Burns clarified that destination connectivity is where policies related to accessibility and complete streets align. Additionally, the importance of addressing issues around bridges, particularly the Cape Bridges program, was emphasized. While the Cape Bridges program remains a standalone initiative, it aligns with the priorities outlined in Beyond Mobility. The discussion also raised the significance of ferry systems, highlighting their role in providing access and connectivity, especially for islands like Nantucket. Overall, the conversation underscored the importance of considering various modes of transportation and their impacts on communities within the context of long-range planning efforts.

Billy Cassidy inquired about a sign mentioned in the discussion, seeking more information about its location, purpose, and whether it was mandated.

Mike Burns provided information about the sign, indicating that it was tested on Milestone Road during the winter at the intersection of Milestone Road and New Street. He mentioned that Milestone Road is a state highway and exempt from LED signage regulations. The test period has concluded, and a permit has been obtained from MassDOT to install a permanent sign at the location. The sign has been purchased and is expected to be installed sometime within the following week.

B. Transportation Program Manager Update (see packet)

1) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP):

<https://nantucket-ma.civilspace.io/en/projects/transportation-improvement-program>

- a) FY2024-28 TIP – Close public review period and approve Highway and Transit Program Amendment Number 3

Mike Burns presented Amendment Number Three for the FFY 2024-28 Transportation Improvement Program, which involved adding \$1.7 million to the Milestone Road and Pulpus Road projects. The funding would be sourced from the region's funding target and approximately \$1.1 million from Statewide Safety Improvement funding. He highlighted that the project aligns with public transportation, sidewalk, and path improvements, as well as enhances the reliability and operations of an intersection. Additionally, it includes funding for electric vehicle infrastructure and the purchase of two electric demand response vans and six biodiesel buses. Public comments were received, with 23 positive and 15 negative responses for the Milestone/Pulpus Road Amendment. Concerns mainly revolved around the necessity of the transit upgrades and purchases. For the electric vehicle infrastructure and bus purchases, there were 20 positive and 17 negative responses, with concerns about the use of biodiesel and the frequency of bus replacements. Mr. Burns recommended approving Amendment Number Three and noted that the public review period was ongoing, with the meeting serving to collect any remaining public comments.

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to close the public review period 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 Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to approve amendment Number 3 to the FFY 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program 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 Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

Discussion on the Motion

Kristina Jelleme raised a valid point about the importance of broader public involvement in decision-making processes. She suggested that reaching out to platforms like the Nantucket Current could help increase public engagement and garner more diverse perspectives. Jelleme emphasized the need for broader support from the public in decision-making and suggests that efforts should be made to improve outreach and communication channels.

b) Draft FY2025-29 TIP – authorize release for 21-day public review

Mike Burns provided an overview of the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for fiscal years 2025 through 2029, highlighting key projects and funding allocations for both highway and transit programs. He mentioned specific projects such as the Wauwinet multi-use path and intersection improvements for Milestone Road and Polpis Road. Burns also discussed the proposal to initiate a public review period for the draft TIP document, starting from April 26 to May 20, 2024, with a public meeting scheduled for discussion and action on May 20, 2024, at 5:00 pm.

Nat Lowell raised concerns about the narrow width of Sconset Road and the need for safety measures, particularly at the intersection with Bunker Road. He suggested creating a turning to allow trucks to turn left more safely. Lowell expressed a desire to ensure that the road improvements address this safety issue effectively, especially considering the potential deterioration of the road after completion. He directed his question to Transportation Program Manager Mike Burns, seeking information about any plans or discussions regarding this safety measure.

Mike Burns assured Nat Lowell that the design process for the Milestone Road improvements will include a public outreach component. He emphasized that comments like Lowell's will be valuable in shaping the project design before it progresses to construction. While specific details about the design process haven't been shared yet, Burns indicated that notifications about the next steps will be provided, giving the community an opportunity to contribute ideas and feedback.

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson made a motion to authorize a public review period for the draft FFY 2025-2029 Transportation Improvement Program from April 26 to May 20, 2024, with a public meeting for discussion and action on May 20, 2024 at 5pm. 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 Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

VII. Other Action/Discussion Items:

A. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair (see packet for letters of interest)

The Commission only received one letter of interest for both the Chair & Vice Chair positions.

Motion/Vote: Bert Johnson made a motion to select Barry Rector as the Chair of the Commission. 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*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Joseph Topham made a motion to select Nat Lowell as the Vice-Chair of the Commission. The motion was duly seconded by Wendy Hudson and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Wendy Hudson *Aye*
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Seth Engelbourg *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

B. Other Committee Reports

• Rural Policy Advisory Committee – Wendy Hudson

Wendy Hudson provided updates from the Rural Policy Advisory Commission's recent meeting. She mentioned that they discussed various legislative support letters, including one for a housing bill and another advocating for the creation of an office for rural and seasonal communities, which could benefit Nantucket. Micro-transit initiatives were also discussed, with reports from several communities. Additionally, Wendy and Mary Longacre attended the Cape Cod Commission's Economic Summit, where they discussed water quality, housing costs, sea level rise, and the importance of addressing these issues collaboratively with Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. Wendy emphasized the need for effective communication to ensure that important information reaches the public, suggesting leveraging social media, radio, and other creative channels.

• Affordable Housing Trust – Dave Iverson

Dave Iverson provided updates on affordable housing efforts, highlighting progress on the Fairgrounds Road project and ongoing efforts by the trust to purchase more properties. While there was only one applicant for the Orange Street property in response to recent requests for proposals (RFPs), which did not work out, the trust remains committed to expanding housing options and will be reissuing the RFPs.

Joseph Topham raised concerns about the new stretch code potentially impacting modular home companies, leading to increased costs per unit due to the additional weight from features like windows. Dave Iverson explained that the stretch code issue hasn't affected their current projects like Fairgrounds Road. Regarding the failed RFP on Orange Street, he suggested it was more of a technical or funding issue. Director Leslie Snell who is on the review committee for that particular project confirmed that it came down to a funding issue.

• Harbor Plan Update Committee -Seth Engelbourg

Seth Engelbourg provided an update on the progress of the Harbor Plan Update committee's work. He mentioned that they completed the public input phase in the fall of 2023, which received significant participation. Since then, they've been working with consultants to draft the plan based on public input, committee input, and technical considerations. They've completed about half or three-quarters of the sections and plan to finish the rest in the coming months. Once the draft plan is complete, there will be a second round of public comments before it's sent to the select board for adoption and then to the state for approval. He anticipates that the process will continue into next year.

• Madaket Area Plan Workgroup Update – Joe Topham

Joseph Topham acknowledged the work of Bruce Mandel, who he mentioned is doing a great job with the workgroup.

• Other

Nat Lowell expressed frustration over the delay in implementing roundabouts on the island, particularly referencing the Milestone Rotary. He emphasized the need for better understanding of roundabouts and their benefits, suggesting that visual aids such as videos could help educate the public. He recalled a presentation by an expert on roundabouts and rotary conversions, highlighting its impact on his perception of roundabouts. Lowell hopes that the completion of the Milestone Rotary conversion to a roundabout will change the opinions of those who are still skeptical about roundabouts.

Mike Burns acknowledged that while there were high expectations for the Sparks Avenue roundabout, there are still conceptual improvements being considered. He emphasized that the implementation of these improvements ultimately depends on community input and support.

Leslie Snell explained that there's a general bylaw prohibiting certain improvements to roadways, including increasing traffic capacity or speed, and adding turning lanes. However, there are exceptions, such as in Town Overlay Districts or if required as part of a subdivision approved by the Planning Board. For the intersection at Nobadeer Farm and Milestone, a turning lane cannot be added because it's in the Country Overlay District and not associated with a subdivision. However, the state can implement a roundabout because it's considered an intersection rather than a turning lane. The language of the bylaw does not specifically address roundabouts.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion/Vote: Dave Iverson moved to adjourn the meeting 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*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Chair Barry Rector *Aye*
Dawn Hill Holdgate *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye*
Bert Johnson *Aye*

Links to the documents included in the Meeting Packet:

1. [04-22-24 NPEDC AGENDA FINAL.PDF](#)
2. [VINEYARD NORTHEAST OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.PDF](#)
3. [DRAFT MINUTES 031824 NPEDC FINAL.PDF](#)
4. [DRAFT MINUTES 032524 NPEDC FINAL.PDF](#)
5. [TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGER UPDATE 04-22-24.PDF](#)
6. [NPEDC CHAIR LETTER OF INTEREST BARRY RECTOR.PDF](#)
7. [NPEDC VICE CHAIR LETTER OF INTEREST NAT LOWELL.PDF](#)

Submitted by: Nicky Sheriff