Minutes of the Commission Meeting
Held on January 20, 2005
In the Stone Building,
33 New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, MA

IN ATTENDANCE


Staff: Mark London (Executive Director), Bill Veno (Senior Planner), Paul Foley (DRI Coordinator

There being a quorum present, Linda Sibley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

1. VINEYARD ENERGY PROJECT: PRESENTATION


Presenters: Kate Warner, Bart Smith

Bart Smith made a presentation on behalf of the Vineyard Energy Project (www.vineyard-unplugged.org) seeking support of an Island Energy Resolution to promote greater energy awareness and outline the beginning steps for more sustainable energy for Martha’s Vineyard.

- Vineyard Unplugged functions as an advisory committee to the non-profit Vineyard Energy Project which functions solely to assist Vineyarders in planning the Island’s energy future.
- After the energy workshop 18 months ago, the Vineyard Energy Project set a goal of energy independence for the Island within a generation with the Island producing as much energy as it consumes.
- During the slide show, Bart Smith presented information on energy use in the United States, the world oil supply, and a project on Samso Island in Denmark, which sought energy independence by managing consumption and becoming producers.
- He described local energy-related projects in Hull and Woods Hole, and the energy audit done on his family’s house.
- He explained that energy independence may be accomplished by using energy more efficiently and producing renewable energy locally, which might include power from solar, wind, biomass, biogas, and tidal including wave generation.
- The Island Energy Resolution puts forward several initiatives to balance consumption and production.
James Athearn asked about tidal energy. Jane Greene said they are doing it in Scotland; conceptually it’s like a windmill with the blades in the water. Kate Warner said there are three or four different technologies currently being tested.

James Athearn asked about earth-sheltered houses. Kate Warner wondered whether they don’t match the East Coast conventional thought of a house. She said energy efficiency could be accomplished through passive solar and a well-insulated house. She said geothermal with ground source heat pump hasn’t been pushed because of the cost; however, priced out in the long-term, the up-front cost is worth it.

Linda Sibley asked how to make a house airtight. Kate Warner said Cape Light would do an assessment of people’s houses if requested.

Doug Sederholm said the idea of having an energy neutral island is fantastic. He asked how summertime transportation energy consumption could be quantified. Kate Warner and Bart Smith said Samso Island dealt with similar issues of tourism but their population is just 5,000. Their goal was to use all electric vehicles and produce their own energy with offshore wind turbines. Bart Smith said there’s some idealism in Vineyard Energy’s goal, but as the Island shifts its energy consumption values, there may be a shift in the values of people coming to the Island.

Megan Ottens-Sargent said she was impressed with the presentation and noted the importance of incentives. Kate Warner said incentives could be put in place for the consumer, like a subsidy for buying a hybrid car and a tax for buying a Humvee.

The presenters reiterated that the point of the resolution is to get people to start thinking about the issue. It doesn’t require anyone to do anything. An MVC Energy Forum is scheduled for May 7th with State Senator Robert O’Leary, focusing on the question of policy options open to residents in Massachusetts.

Linda DeWitt asked about television energy consumption. Kate Warner said the first step in energy reduction is to replace the big energy users in the house, like refrigerators, dehumidifiers, and hot water heaters, with EnergyStar or other energy efficient appliances. Then phantom-load appliances that are always on – like TVs – can be looked at.

Doug Sederholm moved and it was duly seconded that the Martha’s Vineyard Commission support the adoption of the draft energy resolution at all six annual town meetings this spring.

• Jane Greene said a Chilmark selectmen had a problem with the fifth bullet under “resolved”. It was suggested that they would rather that market forces determine the energy path. Kate Warner said discussions took place about changing the wording, but the Vineyard Energy Project decided that they wanted each town to discuss the same wording, so they decided to submit the Chilmark resolution by citizen petition.
• Mimi Davisson asked whether the Commission’s vote could be deferred to the next meeting.
• James Athearn said none of the resolution seemed binding or fixed.
A voice vote was taken. In favor: 12. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0. The motion passed.

2. ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET


Mark London explained aspects of the budget.

• 3% COLA on salaries, plus the first step in salary adjustment based on a new salary policy. These salary increases address the long-standing issue of under-comparable salaries, with the aim of reaching targets in the next two or three years. Some of the salary increase will be covered by an allocation from the legal line to the salary line as projected legal expenses are lower than for FY’05
• 2.5% overall increase in basic operating budget.
• New line item of $120,000 for special comprehensive planning process. $80,000 would be from grants and private donations and $40,000 from assessments. The funds for the comprehensive planning effort wouldn’t be spent in advance and would wait until the $80,000 was secured.

Megan Ottens-Sargent moved and it was duly seconded to adopt the budget.

• Mark London explained that the allocation for each town is based on the total equalized valuation for each town and the overall share for the Island.
  - Gosnold shares in planning costs but not in regulatory costs.
  - Aquinnah: FY’05 $26,001; FY’06 $28,170
  - Chilmark: FY’05 $125,858; FY’06 $136,358
  - Edgartown: FY’05 $212,994; FY’06 $237,064
  - Gosnold: FY’05 $5,366; FY’06 $5,814
  - Oak Bluffs: FY’05 $101,218; FY’06 $109,663
  - Tisbury: FY’05 $102,031; FY’06 $110,543
  - West Tisbury: FY’05 $102,532; FY’06 $111,086

A voice vote was taken. In favor: 10. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 2. The motion passed.

3. PERSONNEL POLICY

Mark London said that a draft version of the revised policy had been sent to Commissioners.

Jane Greene suggested that Commissioners read it carefully and to call her with suggestions. After the next revision, Mark London will send the draft to legal counsel.

4. MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of December 2nd

Jane Greene voiced her objection to repeating the list of Commissioners Present under each agenda item. After discussion it was agreed to list Commissioners Present under each agenda item in which an action is taken.

Jane Greene moved and it was duly seconded that the minutes of December 2, 2004, be approved with the following corrections:
  - Page 6 Line 40 - correct spelling of ‘continued’

A voice vote was taken. In favor: 9. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3. The motion passed.

4.2 Minutes of December 16th

Christina Brown moved and it was duly seconded that the minutes of December 16, 2004, be approved with the following corrections:
  - Throughout should read “Abbe Burt”
  - Page 4 Line 26 should read “Megan Ottens-Sargent pointed out”

A voice vote was taken. In favor: 9. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3. The motion passed.

4.3 Minutes of January 6th

James Athearn moved and it was duly seconded that the minutes of January 6, 2005 be approved with the following corrections:
  - Throughout should read Deborah Pigeon
  - Page 3 Line 32-33 - omit “Mark London said”

A voice vote was taken. In favor: 9. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3. The motion passed.

5. OTHER

5.1 Correspondence

Mark London read a letter from the Oak Bluffs Conservation Commission Steering Committee thanking the Martha’s Vineyard Commission for its work on the 418 Community Development Project. Elizabeth Durkee noted that the collaboration was a successful one.

5.2 LUPC

Christina Brown said LUPC would resume meeting every Monday at 5:30 to 7:00 and all Commissioners are invited to attend. Upcoming topics are DRI applications from Vineyard House, Vineyard Gardens, and the Vineyard Tennis Center. A topic for discussion will also be new ways
L UPC members might work with different DRI applications.

5.3 Website

Mark London reminded Commissioners that many of the DRI documents are usually uploaded to the Commission’s website including the four-page staff reports.

5.4 DRI Process

Mark London reported that proposed changes to the DRI Process Standards and Criteria had finally been approved by Secretary Herzfelder. Christina Brown said that standards and criteria have to be looked at every two years and they would be reviewed in 2005.

6. DRAFT RESPONSE TO CAPE WIND PROPOSAL AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT


Linda Sibley presented options for proceeding:
- Take no action;
- Vote to send a letter to the Army Corps in opposition to the project;
- Vote to send a letter in support of the project;
- The sub-committee’s recommendation is to address the project’s procedural and general planning problems without taking a position on the merits of the proposal. The sub-committee’s draft response suggest that the Army Corps postpone its decision until an Ocean Policy is adopted including a clear regulatory framework.

Mimi Davisson asked what the Committee’s end objective was and whether Commissioners were to vote on this or give feedback on the response. Linda Sibley said that Commissioners don’t have to vote on it tonight.

Mark London said he hoped he would have an indication of which of the four options the Commission would pursue.

Commissioners discussed various aspects of the draft response:
- “Ocean Policy” is a standard term used by Coastal Zone Management.
- Linda DeWitt believed the Commission would review the proposal like it was a DRI, outlining benefits and detractors. Megan Ottens-Sargent questioned the benefit of going through that process.
- Kathy Newman said the Commission’s major concern is that no project should go forward if there isn’t a plan or Ocean Policy.
- Mimi Davisson said her concern is that a technical organization is making a decision that should be a political decision. She said she supported the draft response.
- Megan Ottens-Sargent agreed that the Army Corps report is technical and the decision is political. No local or state authority is looking at qualitative impacts.
• Christina Brown said she agreed that first of all this is a policy question, and secondly a technical question involving federal, state and local people. She said there should be a broad policy for wind energy systems.

• Doug Sederholm said he would like to say it’s amazing but unfortunately predictable that a comprehensive policy for protecting one of the greatest resources is not in place. A private developer is taking advantage of the fact that the Commonwealth and the Federal Government have not done planning. He said he thinks it’s a travesty that the project could go forward without being properly looked at.

• John Best said he generally agrees with the Commission response and feels the document could use a fine-tuning. He strongly supports a planning process.

• Deborah Pigeon said she believes planning needs to take place.

• Bill Veno said there is a regulatory process in place but it is not adequate. The Army Corps is acting as the authority. There is a federal permit involved and thus the environmental impact has to be evaluated. The underlying framework is that no one has looked at whether this is an appropriate use for this portion of the ocean and a process is not in place to make that assessment.

• Christina Brown said that the Cape Wind proposal devolved to the Army Corps and they’ve done a yeoman’s job tackling it without a context.

• Katherine Newman asked whether there was a planning process in Samso Island. It was a community planning process.

Commissioners discussed revised wording and whether it was appropriate to send the Commission position paper to Island towns. Linda Sibley said as a planning agency it’s appropriate for the Commission to take a position on planning and then send a copy to towns, then to Kerry, Kennedy and Delahun. Jane Greene suggested that the response be sent to the proper congressional committee.

Commissioners were asked to give feedback to Mark London by Wednesday, January 12th to allow preparation of a final draft for discussion at the next Commission meeting.

Mimi Davisson suggested that it would be useful to see the transmission letter for sending it to other people.

The meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.
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