NP&EDC

NANTUCKET PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

NP & EDC - SEPTEMBER 23, 2024 @ 5:00PM APPROVED MINUTES

Hybrid - Meeting Trailer, Room A, 131 Pleasant Street and Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar via Zoom Webinar

Commissioners: Chair Barry Rector, Vice-Chair Nat Lowell, Brook Mohr, Bert Johnson, Joseph Topham, Bert Johnson *(remote participation)*, Dave Iverson *(remote participation)*, John Kitchener, Wendy Hudson *(remote participation)*, Kristina Jelleme, and Michael Misurelli

Staff: Leslie Snell, Director of Planning, Megan Trudel, Senior Planner, Michael Burns, Transportation Program Manager, and Catherine Ancero, Administrative Specialist

I. **Call to Order:**
Chair Rector called the meeting at 5:00 PM.

In Attendance:

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

II. **Approval of Agenda:**
The Board unanimously approved the agenda.

III. **Minutes:**
- **August 5, 2024 (Public Workshop)**
- **August 21, 2024 (11:00am Enabling Legislation Workgroup)**
- **August 26, 2024 (9:45am Enabling Legislation Workshop)**
- **August 26, 2024 (5:00pm Regular Monthly Meeting)**

Motion/Vote: Mr. Misurelli made a motion to approve all the set of minutes listed above as is and the motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

IV. **Public Comment for items not included on the agenda:**
There was a brief discussion whether to allow public comment during the NP & EDC's review of enabling legislation. Chair Rector asked if there were any public concerns not on the agenda. Chair Rector clarified that the discussion is for the Commission only to complete work on the enabling legislation. Tucker Holland, a member of the public requested to speak, stating that a prior meeting where they thought they would have the opportunity to bring up concerns. Chair Rector reiterated that this was a closed session for Commission discussion only. Mr. Kitchener and Mr. Iverson expressed torn opinions. Both acknowledged Mr. Holland's concern's importance, they stressed the need to stay focused to complete the task. Other Commissioners leaned towards not opening the discussion, feeling prepared to represent the public concerns based on prior meeting. The Commissioners decided not to open the session to public comment, agreeing to continue the focus on finalizing the enabling legislation. The Commissioners proceeded with its work without opening the floor for additional public comment.

V. **Enabling Legislation Discussion**
Discussion: The NP & EDC is currently working through final decisions to advance enabling legislation. Mrs. Snell provided a recap, mentioning that discussions began in October 2022 and a timeline was established to help align new commission members. Mrs. Snell stated that tonight's focus is on finalizing membership structure, including appointing authorities and total membership numbers. After finalizing these details, a draft of the legislation will be ready for review at the next meeting, scheduled for October 28th. The Commissioners reviewed a previous vision and mission document, mentioning that it is more aspirational, while the actual legislation should remain broad yet flexible to allow future commission activities within the advisory role. Mrs. Snell stated that they need to be prepared to provide feedback on the draft before the next meeting. This will streamline discussions, helping to finalize important decisions. There was agreement on a 13-member setup, recognizing that it could expand the Commission's scope and help tackle future responsibilities. Commissioners agreed that "at-large" positions would be appointed by County Commissioners, though there was some preference for an 11-member setup. The Commission also revisited the importance of keeping legislation broad yet adaptable to allow for flexibility in the advisory role, acknowledging this as a framework that could evolve as needed in the future. The Commissioners were debating how to structure Board appointments for various sectors and balancing, consistent representation without overburdening the County Commissioners or creating inefficiencies. Members want a clear and consistent appointment process, avoiding multiple confusing methods. They suggest that sector groups, like housing or cultural organizations, nominate members, while County Commissioners make the final appointments. Some argue for direct appointments by sector-specific bodies (like the Affordable Housing Trust or the Cultural Council) without involving the County Commissioners. This would limit the commissioners' involvement and avoid potential conflicts of interest or private-public board overlap concerns. To avoid vacancies, members suggest that in cases where a sector board cannot nominate someone, the County Commissioners could step in to appoint a member. This backup plan could help

avoid empty seats and establish ongoing representation. Members express concerns that requiring sector board members to serve on multiple committees could deter participation. They suggest maintaining a lighter workload for some boards to attract more community involvement, especially for entry-level public service roles. The Commissioners agreed on the need for flexibility, suggesting a trial period for this model, with adjustments if certain appointment methods prove ineffective. The Commissioners debated whether sector-specific seats, like those for social services or cultural groups, should require members to be appointed from the respective committee or if they could be selected from the broader community by the appointing authority. Some members proposed that these sector-specific seats could be filled by individuals from outside the respective committees, based on their expertise, to increase diversity and broaden representation. There was a strong commitment to maintaining the human services sector on the commission, though some suggested modifying the appointment process for these positions. The group also discussed the importance of cultural representation without mandating that members be part of the Cultural Council. It was agreed that if a sector-specific appointing authority couldn't fill a seat, the appointment should roll over to the County Commissioners for an at-large seat. The Commissioners debated the language used in the enabling legislation, with some preferring to move away from sector-specific language, suggesting that once the appropriate appointing authority is determined, titles like "arts and culture" or "social services" could be simplified to reflect the specific committee or authority responsible. Concerns were raised about making sure the language of the enabling legislation was clear and could be easily understood by the state. Minor changes to the appointments could be handled at the local level, but larger structural changes would require state legislation. There was a discussion about the possibility of adding a fifth sector, with some members supporting the inclusion of historical preservation. Others suggested removing cultural council or social services to make room for historical preservation. Some Commissioners expressed concerns about balancing current needs with long-term planning for the community. Most of the Commissioners agreed that housing, business, and social services were critical, however opinions on arts and culture and historical preservation varied. The Commissioners also considered adjusting the number of at-large seats, with some proposing two instead of three. The next steps involve finalizing the sectors and deciding on the appointment process.

Motion/Vote: Ms. Mohr made a motion to accept the Housing of Business as a sector and the motion was duly seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Topham made a motion was made to keep Social Services as a sector, with the council as the appointing authority and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Misurelli and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*

Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Discussion: Ms. Jelleme was asking for clarification about whether the Commissioners has already counted all the votes.

Motion/Vote: Ms. Jelleme made a motion to vote yes on Historical Preservation and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Kitchener and the motion was 8-2 with Mr. Topham and Chair Rector opposed.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Nay*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Nay*

Motion/Vote: Ms. Jelleme made a motion to have the Council for Human Services as the appointing authority for the Human Services sector and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Topham and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Discussion: Ms. Mohr had concerns about the Chamber of Commerce, however, withdrew those concerns, suggesting that the Chamber can be the appointing authority for the business sector if they are acting in their official capacity.

Motion/Vote: Ms. Mohr made a motion for the Chamber of Commerce, as the appointing authority for the business sector and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Kitchener and the motion was carried unanimously.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Ms. Jelleme made a motion to have the Nantucket Historical Commission as the appointing authority for the historic preservation sector duly seconded by Mr. Kitchener.

Discussion: Mr. Misurelli express concern about appointing from two different bodies that meet only once a year. Mr. Misurelli worries that the lack of regular interaction could reduce the quality of the decision-making process. Some of the Commissioners argued that the CLG would provide a more comprehensive approach while some of the Commissioners felt that a single Commission might provide more continuity and better cohesion for appointments. Ms. Jelleme asked for clarification on how often the CLG meets. The CLG is required to meet once a year, though it may meet more frequently. Ms. Jelleme stated that the concern is that if the group is not regularly active, it might be difficult to make a solid appointment decision from a less cohesive body.

Ms. Mohr reiterated the motion.

Motion/Vote: Ms. Jelleme made a motion to have the Nantucket Historical Commission as the appointing authority for the historic preservation sector duly seconded by Mr. Kitchener and the motion was 7-3 with Mr. Kitchener, Ms. Jelleme and Ms. Hudson in favor. The motion failed.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Joseph Topham *Nay*
Brook Mohr *Nay*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Nay*
Michael Misurelli *Nay*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Dave Iverson *Nay (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Nay (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Nay*

New Motion/Vote: Ms. Mohr made a motion to have the Certified Local Government (CLG) to be the appointing authority and the motion was duly seconded by Mr. Topham and the motion was carried a 9-2 in favor with Mr. Kitchener and Ms. Jelleme opposed.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*

Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Nay*
Kristina Jelleme *Nay*
Dave Iverson *Aye (remote participation)*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Aye (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Discussion: Chair Rector suggested to make sure that the CLG could appoint internally from among its own members rather than looking externally. There was a debate about whether the CLG should be restricted to appointing only from its own members, with some feeling that it would be better to allow external candidates if necessary.

Board proceeded to the next discussion Housing.

Discussion: Ms. Snell stated that there were questions whether the Housing appointment should be managed by the Housing Authority, the Affordable Housing Trust. Some of the Commissioners suggested in the packet comment that the appointment responsibilities should shift from Housing Authority to the Affordable Housing Trust, which was the only alternative mentioned. Mr. Johnson, a member in both the Housing Authority and Housing Nantucket, argued that Housing Nantucket would be a more effective authority. Mr. Johnson stated that the Housing Nantucket has actively created over 170 housing units and continues to develop new projects, unlike the Housing Authority, which lacks federal and state funding for new builds and focuses on maintenance of existing housing. Mr. Johnson suggested that Housing Nantucket, being a “mover and shaker” in housing development, should take on the appointing role. Ms. Mohr disagreed stating that the Affordable Housing Trust is more than just a "bank." Ms. Mohr argued that it plays a central role in housing policy, programming, and advocacy at the state level, making it the best-positioned entity to oversee housing appointments. Ms. Mohr expressed regret for not supporting the Affordable Housing Trust in a previous discussion and reaffirmed his strong belief in its suitability for this role.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Kitchener made a motion to make the Affordable Housing Trust the main appointing authority duly seconded by Ms. Mohr and the motion was carried 8-1 with Mr. Johnson opposed.

Note: Dave Iverson left the meeting at 7PM.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Nay (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Discussion: There are three at-large positions to be appointed by the County Commissioners, with a rotation every three years. Each term is three years, and appointments are made on a rotating basis with once appointment per year. There are no term limits, members can renew their positions. Chair Rector discussed whether to bring Lauren into the energy sector role, like Mike Burns. Mr. Lowell stated that this could be managed by staff rather than assigned to external entities. Ms. Hudson then clarified that the current discussion should remain focused on the "at large" seats. Encouraged qualified individuals to apply for thee positions. No formal motion was required for approval of the current at large process. Staff will provide a report which will mark the start of related legislative efforts. Chair Rector advised the Commissioners to review the report thoroughly and resolve any questions or issues with staff prior to the next meeting.

VI. Adjournment:

Ms. Mohr made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:16 pm. The motion was duly seconded by Ms. Jelleme and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:

Joseph Topham *Aye*
Brook Mohr *Aye*
Vice-Chair Nat Lowell *Aye*
Michael Misurelli *Aye*
John Kitchener *Aye*
Kristina Jelleme *Aye*
Wendy Hudson *Aye (remote participation)*
Bert Johnson *Nay (remote participation)*
Barry Rector *Aye*

Submitted By: Catherine Ancero

List of Documents used at the meeting 10-10-2024:

File with associated plans, photos and required documentation

Link to the NP & EDC YouTube meeting:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9obG7TGRIuk

Link to the NP & EDC packet:
https://www.nantucket-ma.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_10102024-14364?html=true