



# Town of Nantucket Finance Committee

[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://www.nantucket-ma.gov)

**Committee Members:** Denice Kronau (Chair), Stephen Maury (Vice-chair), Joseph T. Grause Jr., Peter McEachern, Joanna Roche, Peter Schaeffer, Chris Glowacki, Jill Vieth, George Harrington

## MINUTES

Monday, March 29, 2021

*This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube,  
Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Regarding Open Meeting Law*

Called to order at 4:00 pm by Ms. Kronau

Staff in attendance: Libby Gibson, Town Manager; Brian Turbitt, Director of Finance; Rick Sears, Deputy Director of Finance

Attending Members: Kronau, Maury, Grause, Roche, Schaeffer, Glowacki, Vieth, Harrington

Absent Members: McEachern,

Late Arrivals: Vieth, Harrington

Documents used: Draft minutes as listed; Warrant Articles for 2020 Annual Town Meeting.

Adoption of Agenda.

Motion **Motion to Approve.** (made by: Maury) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Grause, Roche, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

### I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. **Kevin Kuester**, Sponsor Article 82 (Bylaw Amendment: Streets and Sidewalks) – Requested the board reconsider his article discussed last week. Looking at the video, he felt there was some missing information. The 1<sup>st</sup> point was that there was confusion about a document received from Town Administration and that the chair wanted to postpone the vote for that information. He followed up with Town Administration and found it was a formatting issue only. Traffic Safety Work Group (TSWG) had supported the article with no concerns. In the review a comment was made that DPW was doing the work and coordinating with him; he has had no conversations with the Department of Public Works (DPW). DPW isn't the only contractor who puts up signs; it isn't just the Town. He got involved with this with the Milestone Road; people were concerned about the amount of signage going up and were told not to worry about it. If we had this bylaw in place back then, NP&EDC, Planning, Historic District Commission (HDC) or Nantucket Historical Commission could go to the state and point out the bylaw. This is the simplest way to put the issue of signage within our regulations.

**Schaeffer** – Asked if Mr. Kuester talk to Mr. McNeil at DPW.

**Hillary Rayport**, co-sponsor – She did reach out to Mr. McNeil and Ms. Gibson. The DPW has made an effort to implement minimal signs across the Island. The reason for the bylaw is to create guidelines or a policy that could be forwarded to contractors. The trend in signs is to have 30" and larger signs in really bright colors. The committee seems to be voting on the information that the DPW is doing this; however, since we proposed this article, the DPW hasn't reached out to us. Would appreciate that the motion be revisited since it seems the information used was not complete.

Motion **Motion to reopen the discussion and deliberation on the motion.** (made by: Vieth) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-1//Schaeffer, Maury, Glowacki, Vieth, Harrington, Roche, and Kronau-aye; Grause-nay

Discussion **Kronau** – Feels it is more appropriate for the sponsors to reach out to the DPW rather than the other way around. There is a proactive piece for the sponsors of an article.

**Maury** – Asked if the sponsor can describe the worst offenders if not the Town or DPW and where are some of the examples.

**Kuester** – It was coming out of our former Transportation Planner; he doesn't think it was intentional. Engineers hired to install the signs use the State Complete Street Guidelines, which is intended to make roads, markings, and signs uniform across the State. We have a lot of roadwork coming. Most recently the bike crossing at Goose Pond Bike Path has the larger signs.

**Maury** – You say it's contractors and others; but it sounds like the Town is the problem.

**Kuester** – The point is to get a baseline of the minimum we want so it isn't up to a new DPW Director or Traffic Planner.

**Rayport** – There are a lot of different players; we have a priority at the DPW to have smaller signs. However, there are projects that are outsourced. She spent a tremendous amount of time working the Town about using minimum sized and fewer signs and was told that wouldn't happen. The legislative body of Nantucket is the voters and they should decide what they want on our roads. If it's a bylaw, we don't have to think about it anymore; whoever oversees the contractor can direct them to look at the bylaw.

**Glowacki** – It was mentioned the HDC could have an impact; asked why that is.

**Kuester** – Town Counsel said that HDC has jurisdiction over all signs, including Town signs. Explained how HDC oversees placement of signs and push for their removal.

**Glowacki** – If we're in alignment with the concept of decreasing visual clutter, asked why the Town wouldn't want to be armed with this bylaw.

**Gibson** – We can take care of this internally; except for fluorescent safety signs, it is our opinion it's not a big problem.

**Glowacki** – Asked the down side of having this article.

**Gibson** – If we aren't allowed safety signs, there could be a lawsuit from an accident.

**Vieth** – Driving around, she looked at this and noted a lack of consistency. There seems to be some wiggle room to consider this bylaw.

**Maury** – Asked if the Town receives funding from the State's Complete Street Funding program and if so how much

**Turbitt** – Yes, we received around \$400,000 related to work on the Pleasant Street sidewalk. Complete Streets does have grant money we could apply for.

**Maury** – If we don't adhere to those guidelines, asked if the Town would be ineligible for that funding.

**Rayport** – Signs are erected based upon engineering judgement; complete Street is based upon the premise all vehicles are equal. There is a requirement for fluorescent signs in school zones; so, this article excludes school zones. The article is written to allow the "smallest signs available."

**Schaeffer** – It would be a great article but the fact they haven't talked to the people in Town who oversee the roads really bothers him. You're proposing something that will impact the whole Town and haven't spoken to those who run that aspect of the Town. You admitted you haven't talked to Rob McNeil.

**Rayport** – I have had many discussions; she hasn't contacted them since proposing the bylaw.

**Schaeffer** – Asked if Mr. McNeil has seen all this and signed off on it.

**Rayport** – She can't speak for Mr. McNeil. This bylaw was reviewed by TSWG, which voted to support it; Mr. McNeil voted no because he felt the DPW was already doing this.

**Vieth** – She thinks some of the problem might be we don't have a Transportation Planner yet.

**Schaeffer** – Just because we don't have that Planner doesn't mean a group of citizens can take over the position. There is a Town official that Planner would report to.

**Vieth** – A lot of that work is generated in that office and the Planner would coordinate with the engineers. She's concerned more about the volume of signs; we are seeing sign creep.

**Kuester** – This isn’t a high priority for the Town; he agrees it shouldn’t be. If he felt confident this was a focus of the DPW, we wouldn’t need this article; people come and go. This is a basic, simple rule that won’t cost money or make anything less safe. If we don’t have a bylaw to cover the situation, the problem will just get worse as our transportation needs increase.

**Glowacki** – Asked if this would apply to new signs (yes).

**Grause** – After all the debate, the proponents have a right to let voters take action. Thinks FinCom can take an even-handed view. He’d be willing to motion to take no action so this can go before the voters.

**Harrington** – He supports what Mr. Grause said. If it’s going to be addressed, all players have to come together and FinCom isn’t in a position to push that.

**Discussion on the motion to Take No Action.**

**Glowacki** – Disagrees with the meanings of Take No Action versus Not to Adopt. He thinks we’re adding to the confusion of voters.

**Kronau** – She interprets Take no Action is basically a negative motion; the outcome is we don’t have an opinion one way or the other.

Motion **Motion to Take No Action on Article 82.** (made by: Grause) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-1//Schaeffer, Maury, Grause, Roche, Vieth, Harrington, and Kronau-aye; Glowacki-nay

**III. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

1. January 28, 2021
2. February 4, 2021
3. February 6, 2021
4. March 1, 2021
5. March 4, 2021
6. March 8, 2021
7. March 9, 2021
8. March 11, 2021
9. March 16, 2021

Motion **Motion to Approve the minutes as stated.** (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 6-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Grause, Roche, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

**IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

1. None

**V. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION WARRANT ARTICLES FOR 2020 ANNUAL TOWN MEETING (ATM)**

1. Article 1(Receipt of Reports)

Discussion **Turbitt** – Motion would be standard motion to adopt as printed.

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Glowacki) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Vieth, Harrington, Roche, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

2. Article 3 (Appropriation: Prior Year Articles)

Discussion **Turbitt** – Reviewed the transfers being requested in this article.

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Vieth, Harrington, Roche, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

3. Article 7 (Personnel Compensation Plans for FY2022)

Discussion **Gibson** – Increased seasonal salary schedule. Rearranged the categories. Increased Town Clerk salary by 2%.

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Maury) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Roche, Vieth, Harrington, Maury, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

4. Article 25 (Rescind Unused Borrowing Authority)

Discussion **Turbitt** – Explained outstanding issue. Asked for a Take No Action at this time.

Motion **Motion to Take No Action.** (made by: Maury) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Roche, Vieth, Harrington, Glowacki, Maury, and Kronau-aye

5. Article 27 (Renewal of Board of Health Septic System Betterment Loan Program)

Discussion **Turbitt** – Asking for authorization to renew for \$2m. Expecting an increase in applications. No taxpayer dollars go into this; applicants pay back the loan.

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Harrington) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Maury, Glowacki, Harrington, Vieth, Roche, and Kronau-aye

6. Article 28 (Special Stabilization Fund for Substance Abuse Efforts)

Discussion **Turbitt** – This is to modify monies going into this Stabilization Fund to include the Community Impact Fees. An adoption would be with the understanding that any Town Counsel editorial changes would be included.

**Kronau** – Asked if it would require a 2/3 vote to withdraw the money.

**Turbitt** – Yes. Article 9 will require the vote for money to go to NAMI

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Roche) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Schaeffer, Roche, Vieth, Harrington, Maury, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

7. Article 91 (Bylaw: Safety of Drinking Water) Meghan Glowacki

Discussion **Kronau** – She invited Ms. Glowacki to attend; she couldn't come to the meeting. Prior to this meeting, she googled "Nantucket water PFAS" and the report came right up. If you want to know something, the onus is on you to find it; this information is easily findable. When it hits 20 parts per trillion, there have to be corrective actions. She feels this is unnecessary.

**Vieth** – She's okay with the reporting part. Her point is the testing; we need to give the water company a chance to set up the routine. Feels the article is premature at this time.

**Gibson** – Town counsel and Mark Willet have a lot of issues with this, one of which is how this would be enforced.

**Harrington** – this is an evolving issue and science will show us that over time. The construction of this article doesn't suit today's circumstances.

Motion **Motion Not to Adopt.** (made by: Grause) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 8-0//Grause, Schaeffer, Vieth, Harrington, Maury, Roche, Glowacki, and Kronau-aye

8. Article 94 (Home Rule Petition: Town Charter – Select Board Amendment/Airport Capital Projects)

Discussion **Turbitt** – This is to allow the Select Board to petition the State for permission for the Select Board to authorize debt for the Airport capital projects. This was drafted in conjunction with the Airport and Town Counsel.

**Glowacki** – Asked if there is news on prospects of this passing.

**Turbitt** – Explained the State Legislature's stance against it. Airport wants us to try. It's worthwhile to see Boston's appetite for this.

Motion **Motion to Adopt.** (made by: Schaeffer) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 7-0//Glowacki, Roche, Grause, Vieth, Maury, Schaeffer, and Kronau-aye

## VI. NEXT MEETING DATE/ADJOURNMENT

Date: Tuesday, March 30, 2021; 4:00 p.m.

Monday, April 5, 2021; joint with Select Board and Planning.

Adjournment:

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 5:08 p.m.** (made by: Vieth) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 8-0//Glowacki, Roche, Maury, Harrington, Vieth, Schaeffer, Grause, and Kronau-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton