

Town Government Study Committee

Final Report

Annual Town Meeting 2021

6-5-2021

To: Residents of Nantucket

From: Town of Nantucket Government Study Committee

John B. Brescher, Chair

Campbell Sutton, Vice Chair

Rick Atherton

Curtis Barnes

Tucker Holland

Linda Williams

Date: June 5, 2021

Re: Final Report for Town Meeting 2021

Dear Members of the public:

Over the past three years, the Town Government Study Committee (“the Committee”) has been meeting on a monthly or bi-monthly basis on the charge of analyzing the role and efficacy of the form of Town Government for the Town and County of Nantucket. The Committee has met with multiple members in Town Government, as well as members of the public during our two Public Hearings. Over the course of these 70 or so meetings, we have had the privilege of meeting with various members of the public, employees and staff of the Town of Nantucket, as well as elected officials to receive their feedback and opinion on the form and function of the Town Government.

It has been a rewarding experience, especially when coupled with the challenges facing the Town during the COVI-19 pandemic.

The report below addresses what the Committee has reviewed during the tenure of their service to the Town of Nantucket. Many of these recommendations are just that: recommendations. They are a compilation of years of diligence and recognition of the social and political climate in Nantucket. The actions taken by the Committee have been to recommend the changes below and, for each recommendation, the Committee has given a brief synopsis of why the change was recommended.

Nantucket is a unique community facing unique problems – and the local Government is no exception. While these recommendations may not solve all of the problems that were brought to the Committee’s attention, hopefully they can provide a blueprint to effectuate change in the future. All of these recommendations should have their language and syntax further vetted by Town Counsel to ensure compliance with Massachusetts General Laws, as well as so as to avoid any conflicts with existing provisions in the Town Charter.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve the Town these past few years and we sincerely appreciate all the support and patience given.

Respectfully yours,

The Town Government Study Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. The Basic Form of Government in Nantucket**
- 2. Organization of Local Government**
- 3. Semi-Annual Town Meeting**
- 4. Code Enforcement**
- 5. Examining The Audit Committee**
- 6. Revisions to Historic District Commission Charter**
- 7. Establishment of Licensing Board**
- 8. Establishment of Parking Commission**
- 9. Establishment of Sewer Commission and Sewer Abatement Commission**
- 10. Review of Airport Warrant Article**
- 11. Revisions to the Parks and Recreation Department and Commission**
- 12. Creation of Town Ombudsman**
- 13. The Town Government Study Committee**
- 14. Edits to the existing Town Charter**
- 15. Increasing Citizen's Warrant Article Signatures to 25**
- 16. Extending the Moderator's Term to Three Years**
- 17. Non-Voting Taxpayer Representation at Town Meeting**
- 18. Communication and Collaboration between Town Boards and Committees**
- 19. Appendices and Attachments**

1. *The Basic Form of Government in Nantucket:*

The Committee reviewed the basic form of government in Nantucket, Open Town Meeting, and sought to identify any problems or concerns and ways to improve the function of Government.

The Committee, without making any determination, reviewed the types of government available in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Town Council with Mayor or Town Manager, Representative with Town Manager, Town Meeting with Town Manager. An informational sheet that was circulated at our Public Forums is attached hereto for reference. These sheets discuss, in great detail, the four types of government that are considered which are: Open Town Meeting, Representative Town Meeting, Town Council, and a Mayoral form of government. This information is attached as Exhibit A along with this report.

Furthermore, the Committee gathered an unofficial ad hoc poll from the citizens who attended the public forums and the results are attached as well. The Committee also requested two non-binding ballot questions for the 2020 election relative to the satisfaction of the electorate with the form of Town Government and the role of the Town Government Study Committee relative to investigating the topic further. Those results are attached as Exhibit B

Some of the factors and considerations the Committee reviewed while looking at these forms of Government were:

- Ease of decision-making;
- The potentially challenging degree of difficulty determining the election process for Representative Town Meeting;
- Which forms potentially removed citizens from participation;
- The requirements for ballot approval of overrides and debt exclusions;
- The realities of needing quorums at Annual and Special Town Meetings;
- The number of signatures for open town meeting articles;
- The length of presentations at Annual or Special Town Meetings; and,
- The time of any town meeting (e.g., summer v. winter).

While the Committee has taken the time to research these forms of Government, they have not yet arrived at a conclusion as to whether or not the Town of Nantucket needs to change their form of Government and, to that end, what that change would look like. A change of that significance would require a great deal of public support, education, and careful consideration and planning. The form of Government is a passionate topic for voters and this Committee is cognizant of that fact. Because of this, the Committee can safely say that any change to the form of Town Government would need to be carefully analyzed and properly vetted before it could be effectuated.

Also, the options available to Nantucket regarding the form of Government are population-based and for that reason, the Committee also thought it prudent to wait for

the release of Town-specific data from the Federal 2020 Census results this Fall before ruling out any potential form of Government.

The Committee voted to recommend that the Town of Nantucket establish a special commission with the sole purpose of investigating the form of Town Government and Town Meeting in Nantucket. All members of the Committee voted in favor.

2. Organization of Local Government:

The Committee also reviewed the organization of Nantucket's local government. This included not only the mechanics of the interactions between the various departments within the Town of Nantucket, but also the common questions and concerns the average citizen faces when interacting with municipal agencies. The Committee concluded that it would be advantageous for the public and local officials to have access to a comprehensive organizational chart to be displayed on the Town's website and perhaps be made available in hard-copy. This, in turn, would help eliminate confusion with respect to which department has jurisdiction over a particular issue in order for a layperson or average citizen to know where best to address their issue or complaint. Also, such a chart could be especially important to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the various municipal and administrative offices and branches within the Town of Nantucket. This organization should also include a comprehensive, but plain-spoken guide for citizens to understand the code enforcement process and which office or branch has jurisdiction over the matter.

The Committee voted to recommend that the Charter be amended to require an annual presentation by Town Administration or the Select Board for an organizational chart. All members of the Committee voted in favor.

3. Semi-Annual Town Meeting:

As part of the public hearings held by the Committee, one of the criticisms that was brought up was the inefficiency of Annual Town Meeting. Other criticisms of having only one Annual Town Meeting were the number of warrant articles proposed and the duration of the meeting. Without changing the form of Town Government, the Committee considered a potential solution being an amendment to the Charter to require a semi-annual Town Meeting and in the event there is no need for the second Town Meeting, it can be duly cancelled.

The Committee voted to recommend to amend the Charter to require a Semi-Annual Town Meeting. The Committee voted unanimously in favor.

4. Code Enforcement

One of the issues facing the Committee was the suggestion to have an annual presentation relative to code enforcement as an update to its Residents. The Committee discussed the merits of this idea at length and did not come to a unanimous conclusion on suggesting

the Charter be amended to include a provision requiring an annual update on code enforcement.

The Committee voted not to include language to amend the Town Charter to require an annual presentation of the Town's enforcement actions for the Select Board to review. The vote was 4-2 in favor, but noted that a comment should be included in the Town Government Study Committee's report to Town Administration that while there is merit to this idea to keep the public informed, it is not appropriate to include it in the Charter.

5. Examine the Audit Committee:

After discussions with the Finance Director and the Chair of the Finance Committee, the Town Government Study Committee submitted a warrant article relative to updating the audit committee. Article #96 was approved at the 2020 Annual Town Meeting. This Article is attached as Exhibit C to this report.

6. Historic District Commission Charter:

The Committee suggests having a more comprehensive amendment to the Historic District Commission Charter to better address any inconsistencies and mechanisms for appeal. However, the Committee is not empowered within our scope and mission to review this matter. Any future revisions, which the Committee would suggest investigating, should be further developed by other entities.

7. Establishment of a Licensing Commission or Board:

The Committee heard from members of the public and the Select Board regarding the licensing duties of the Select Board. It seemed prudent to the Committee that if the Select Board deems it appropriate, the Select Board is empowered to create its own Licensing Commission/Board. This could be done administratively and would not need any type of charter amendment. This type of Commission/Board would be a step in lessening the amount of time the Select Board spends on certain issues. The establishment of this Commission/Board is also within the purview of the Select Board and Town Administration.

The Committee noted that while this topic has been discussed for some time, it may behoove the Town to have a more impactful recommendation. And as such, the Committee recommended amending the Charter to require the Select Board to establish such a Licensing Commission or Board.

The Committee voted to recommend amending the Town Charter so that the Select Board shall establish a separate Licensing Commission or Board. All voted in favor, however, one member abstained from the vote.

8. Parking Commission:

The Committee heard from members of the public and the Select Board regarding the need for a Parking Commission. A separate Parking Commission has been addressed by the Select Board and by warrant article 66 at the 2018 Annual Town Meeting. Said article is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

The Committee noted that while this topic has been discussed for some time, it may behoove the Town to have a more impactful recommendation. And as such, the Committee recommended amending the Charter to require the Select Board to establish such a Parking Commission or Board.

The Committee voted to recommend amending the Town Charter so that the Select Board shall establish a separate Parking Commission or Board. All voted in favor, however, one member abstained from the vote.

9. *Establishment of a Sewer Commission:*

Similar to the Licensing Board or Commission, in the event the Select Board wants to set up a Sewer Commission, further due diligence should be done to better understand the roles and responsibilities of the tasks necessary to accomplish this mission. The Committee, while potentially supportive of this concept, is wary of the unintended consequences that may be created by creating such a Commission. However, the Committee is supportive of the study of a separate Commission in order to better understand the unintended consequences.

The Committee did, however, find that it would be prudent next step to establish a Sewer Abatement Commission. As the municipal sewer system systematically expands, there will be more homeowners who will need to tie-in to the sewer system. It is anticipated that there will be more sewer abatement requests before the Select Board. With this in mind, the Committee thought it would be logical step to create a Sewer Abatement Commission to handle the influx of abatement requests.

The Committee voted to add a comment that the Town should study a separate Sewer Commission and to direct the Select Board to create a separate Sewer Abatement Commission. All members voted in favor.

10. *Review of Airport Warrant Article:*

This article allowing the Airport to delegate authority to the Select Board in order to approve capital projects was approved at the 2020 Annual Town Meeting. A copy of the Warrant Article and Home Rule Petition is attached as Exhibit E.

11. *Revisions to the Parks and Recreation Commission:*

In the spring of 2019, the Town Government Study Committee began looking into issues relating to the Park and Recreation Department/Commission as it had received complaints/negative comments from members of the public relating to the condition of the parks, the confusion as to who was overseeing what, and that the commission had not met in over a year. The question arose “what happened to it”?

Over the summer of 2019, the Town Government Study Committee reviewed documents relating to the formation of the commission (under MGL chap. 45, Nantucket’s ACT of 1987 chap. 459, ACT of 1965 chap. 169) and the power of appointments to said Parks and Recreation Commission (under MGL chap.45, Nantucket’s town charter sections 3.4 a3, 4.3 a&b, 4.4 a&b, 4.8, 4.9, and 2007 ATM warrants 44 &51). Many anomalies and contradictions were found in both the formation of and the power to appoint within the Town’s Charter. In the fall, the Town Government Study Committee’s concerns were communicated to the Town Manager and Town Counsel (through Lauren F. Goldberg, Esq.). It was agreed that Town Counsel would look into these issues since the Charter was already under review for such anomalies. Also, a citizen’s article calling for the hiring of a Parks and Recreation Department Head had been submitted for 2020 Annual Town Meeting. In January 2020, the Town Government Study Committee voted to see what the outcome of the citizens article was at the 2020 Annual Town Meeting before moving ahead with a recommendation. That article was called and will be voted on at the next Annual Town Meeting. The Committee has not heard back from Town Counsel relative to amendments to the Charter as it relates to this issue.

Since the submission of the November 2021 report to the Select Board, the Town Government Study Committee received a response from Town Counsel on May 5 , 2021. Though several comments were made, Town Counsel did not specifically address the issues with the Park and Recreation Commission/Department. For this reason, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. While the Park and Recreation Commission was required to be instituted by a state Act, the department was not. Gradually, over time, the Park and Recreation department was subsumed by the DPW and then eliminated as a separate entity with a separate budget and responsibilities. As a result, there has been a lack of perceived focus on the parks and recreations areas, including playgrounds, beaches, bathhouses, and the like. Scheduling of field space and events has been moved from entity to entity and has caused confusion, versus field maintenance and access. It is recommended that the Park and Recreation Department be re-instituted as a separate entity, with a fully funded line-item budget and adequate staff, resulting in a return to the status it had prior to the elimination of the department.
2. The appointment authority to the Park and Recreation Commission should reside solely with the Select Board to eliminate any appearance of conflict and ensure that the Town Manager did not get embroiled in the politics of appointment to this Commission as has happened in the past.
3. While the Park and Recreation Commission is outside of Town Administration as so stated in the Charter, it is acknowledged that the staff of the department is and most

appropriately be within Town Administration to manage staff accountability, department budget control, and administrative oversight which is critical in the operation of the town.

Chapter 4 of the Charter is attached to this Memo as Exhibit F

The Committee voted to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Department be re-instituted as a separate entity, with a fully funded line-item budget and adequate staff, resulting in a return to the status it had prior to the elimination of the department. All members voted in favor, with one member abstaining.

The Committee voted to recommend that the appointment authority to the Park and Recreation Commission should reside solely with the Select Board to eliminate any appearance of conflict. All members voted in favor, with one member abstaining.

12. The creation of a Town Ombudsman to settle disputes:

After a lengthy review of this issue with members of the public and Town Counsel, the Committee concluded that it was not feasible from a legal standpoint to create an ombudsman or a position that could settle disputes between citizens and the Town. There are already legal mechanisms in place to resolve such disputes and having a position like this would erode the checks-and-balances in place. The Town Government Study Committee voted to communicate this recommendation and send a letter to the Town Moderator and Town Manager. The letter was dated October 30, 2019 and sent via email.

13. The Town Government Study Committee:

After discussing the role of the Town Government Study Committee with former members of the Committee, as well as its current members, the Committee suggested potentially amending terms of the existing Committee to three (3)-year staggered terms. At one point, the Committee thought it may also be prudent for the Select Board and Town Administration to establish an internal review committee, separate from the Town Government Study Committee that could review some of the day-to-day operations within the Town that fall outside the purview of the Town Government Study Committee. However, the Committee did not ultimately find merit in this idea during their discussions.

However, the Committee was cognizant that while the Select Board is the appointing authority for the Committee, the Committee's ultimately accountability is to Town Meeting. This helped frame the discussion of creating a separate Governance Committee or revising the Charter so that the Town Government Study Committee reports to the Select Board. Ultimately, the Committee determined it was best not to change the mission of the Town Government Study Committee in the Charter, but instead recommend changing the appointing authority to the Town Moderator to foster a sense of independence and autonomy, as well as to reinforce the mission of the Town Government Study Committee that they report to Town Meeting. This practice is not uncommon and the Committee looked at towns like Sutton, MA that have a similar practice.

The Committee made a motion to recommend changing the appointing authority in Section 5 of the Charter from the Select Board to the Town Moderator and to change the duties of the Town Moderator to include the power to appoint the Town Government Study Committee every 5 years. All members voted in favor.

14. Review to the Charter:

After multiple requests over the past 27 months, Town Counsel's office was kind enough to provide us with potential edits to the Charter. The reviewed charter, which is attached as Exhibit G to this document is a list of the potential changes suggested by Town Counsel. After a through review, the Town Government Study Committee made the following motions as they relate to updating the charter:

The first item discussed was extending the length of the term of the moderator to three (3) years. The Committee overwhelmingly supported this idea, even if this item was not necessarily something they had been looking at. A motion was made by Rick Atherton and seconded by Linda Williams to recommend extending the length of the term of the moderator to three years per Town Counsel's suggestion. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next item discussed was an edit noting that if the Moderator needs to appoint a Clerk for Town Meeting (section 2.4), that this person should be a registered voter for the Town. The Committee again unanimously supported this idea. A motion was made by Linda Williams and seconded by Rick Atherton to recommend noting in Section 2.4 of the charter that in the event the Moderator needs to appoint a Clerk of Town Meeting, that person shall be a registered voter of the Town of Nantucket. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next comment addressed suggesting adding that the Warrant shall also be available on the Town website in Section 2.5(b) of the Charter. The Committee agreed this too was a good idea. A motion was made by Linda Williams and seconded by Tucker Holland to recommend amending Section 2.5(b) of the Charter to allow the Town Warrant to be available on the Town website as well. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next comment addressed Section 2.5(c), which requires the Board of Selectmen to publish the Warrant by mailing it to each registered voter. The comment from Town Counsel was that many other Towns are eliminating this language. The Committee noted the importance of having a hard copy of the Warrant and while the point was well-taken,

there is still a great importance to having a physical copy of the Warrant available for voters. The Committee did, however, recommend that the language in Section 2.5(c) should be amended to extend the time to deliver the Warrant to 14 days. A motion was made by Tucker Holland and seconded by Linda Williams to recommend amending Section 2.5(c) of the Charter by replacing "...seven days..." to "...fourteen days...". All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next comment was on Section 3.3 which noted that many Towns are removing the requirement to have the public notice of their vote to acquire real estate noticed in the paper. The Committee felt it imperative to leave this requirement in the Charter. A motion was made by Rick Atherton and duly seconded by Curtis Barnes to leave Section 3.3 as written. All voted in favor by voice vote.

Section 3.4(4) was the next item for discussion and the recommendation was to change some of the language relative to the fifteen-day approval. The Committee felt the language was confusing and did not want to create any unintended consequences as they were not certain what the purpose of the change was. A motion was made by Rick Atherton and duly seconded by Curtis Barnes to leave Section 3.4(4) as written. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next section that was discussed was Section 4.2(d)(14) which would be revised to allow the Town Manager to have the power to sign the warrants for payment. The Committee overwhelmingly agreed this would be an increase in efficiency. A motion was made by Rick Atherton and duly seconded by Curtis Barnes to recommend revising Section 4.2(d)(14) of the Charter to authorize the Town Manager to sign the warrants for payment. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The comment regarding Section 4.3(a) was an administrative one and simply suggested changing "heads" to "department heads." There was discussion amongst the Committee if "department heads" is properly defined and Section 4.5 of the Charter seems to imply this. A motion was made by Linda Williams and seconded by Curtis Barnes to recommend revising Section 4.3(a) of the Charter to replace "heads" with "department heads." All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next section reviewed was Section 5.4(b) to amend this section to require petitioners be identified and who the lead petitioner is. The Committee discussed this matter at length and determined that this mechanism was already implicitly in place since the petition would be public record at the Town Clerk's office. A motion was made by Rick Atherton and duly seconded by Curtis Barnes not to amend Section 5.4(b) of the Charter. All voted in favor by voice vote.

Section 5.4(c) was the next section of the Charter that had a comment from Town Counsel's office. In this section, the suggestion was two-fold: to identify a standard from when the 20% of voters would be counted and to possibly change how long the Town Clerk has to certify the signatures. The Committee agreed that adding a benchmark to identify registered voters would be a prudent change, but did not think the change to how long the Clerk has to identify the signatories on the petition was warranted. A motion was made by Curtis Barnes and duly seconded by Linda Williams to recommend revising Section 5.4(c) of the Charter to include a standard that the 20% of registered voters shall be measured from March 1st of the previous year as established by the Town Clerk. All voted in favor by voice vote.

The next section was Section 5.4(d) and the recommendation from Town Counsel recommended changing the resignation provision from seven days to five days and to move the placement of the phrase "not less than 75 days after such certification date" after the clause, "...the Board of Selectmen shall...". The Committee discussed this at length and ultimately agreed that while it was a semantic change, it was an important one. A motion was made by Linda Williams and duly seconded by Campbell Sutton to recommend revising Section 5.4(d) of the Charter by changing the resignation provision from seven days to five days and moving the placement of the phrase "not less than 75 days after such certification date" after the clause, "...the Board of Selectmen shall...". All voted in favor by voice except for Curtis Barnes who abstained.

The next comment from the Town Counsel review was to add "name and title of office" to Section 5.4(f) of the Charter. The Committee agreed this was a smart change. A motion was made by Linda Williams and duly seconded by Curtis Barnes to recommend revising Section 5.4(f) of the Charter to read "name and title of officer". All voted in favor by voice vote.

The final comment from Town Counsel was to delete Section 6.6 in its entirety because it no longer serves a purpose. The Committee agreed and a motion was made by Linda

Williams and duly seconded by Campbell Sutton to recommend to delete Section 6.6 in its entirety. All voted in favor by voice vote.

As an underlying comment, the Committee suggests all language in the motions be further vetted by Town Counsel in order to ensure consistency.

15. Number of Signatures for a Citizen Warrant Article:

The Committee had a robust discussion in the later stages of their tenure regarding the number of signatures required for a Citizen's Warrant Article submission. The discussion ranged from the ease of the democratic process (i.e., that requiring too many signatures would be an impediment to the democratic process, akin to a poll tax) to ensuring the Town Clerk was not overburdened when verifying signatures to the philosophy that an increased number of required signatures would help dissuade frivolous warrant articles and would, implicitly, be a reflection of the will of the public. The original motion proposed by the Committee was to increase the number of signatures on a Citizen's Warrant Article to 25. An amendment was then posed, but not passed to reduce this number to 20. Ultimately, the Committee voted on increasing the number of signatures to 25.

The Committee voted to recommend to amend the Charter to require at least 25 signatures for a Citizen's Warrant Article. The vote was 4-2 in favor.

16. Extending Moderator's Term to Three Years

Although this topic was addressed in the revisions to the Charter by Town Counsel, and duly voted on by the Committee, the Committee formally voted to recommend to amend the Charter to increase the Moderator's term to three years.

The Committee voted to recommend to amend the Charter to increase the Moderator's term to three years. The Committee voted unanimously in favor.

17. Non-Voting Taxpayer Representation at Town Meeting

During the course of the Committee's hearings, the Committee heard from several non-voting tax payers both in person and by alternate correspondence. They unanimously felt that their concerns and "voices" were not heard on a regular basis and certainly at Town Meeting when decisions were being made with their tax monies. The Committee considered the testimony and considered the following:

- Section 2.6 provides for only one (emphasis added) member of the Nonresident Property Owners group to speak on a matter that is to be considered before the voters

at a town meeting. The number should be increased or stricken in its entirety to allow fair and reasonable representation of concerns.

- The Moderator would continue to have jurisdiction over the number who wished to speak with advance notice on which article that the speaker would like to comment on. The Nonresident Property Owner would be seated in a designated area and be known to the Moderator prior to the meeting as to their location.

The Committee was cognizant of the unique situation Nantucket has with respect to the non-voting tax payers and their representation at Town Meeting and on other matters, especially as it relates to Charter issues and financial issues within the Town. The Committee acknowledged that a change would be appropriate, but also did not want to restrict the Town or future generations to a static number of non-voting taxpayer representatives in the Town. An amendment to the motion approved by the Committee was made to restrict the number to up to fifteen members, but the amendment failed for lack of a second.

The Committee voted to recommend either increase the number of speakers from the non-resident property owners group that may speak at Town Meeting, or to delete this section entirely and encourage the Moderator to use the necessary discretion to allow for non-resident property owners to speak at Town Meeting. The vote was 5-1 in favor.

18. Collaboration between elected and appointed Boards and Commissions

One of the topics the Committee focused on was suggesting that other Boards and Town committees update their respective charters and bylaws. The Committee agreed that this idea is one that should be adopted by all Boards and Town committees as a governance practice. The Committee further noted that it seems that often times, various departments and Boards and Commissions within the Town do not understand or know what the other is doing. In an effort to promote community knowledge and transparency, the Committee is suggesting collaboration and communication amongst the various Boards and Town committees.

The Committee voted to endorse an annual joint meeting between all elected Nantucket Boards and Commissions to discuss collective community priorities as reflected in the Town Master Plan and Select Board Strategic Plan and to identify areas of potential cooperation and concern. All voted in favor.

The Committee voted to endorse a bi-annual review of the charge to each committee established by the Select Board and by state or local laws or regulations adopted by the Town. Such a review should involve the Select Board and the commissions or committees and determine if the charge or mission of each remains clear and supportive and in particular addressing the community's strategic goals as developed in the Town Master Plan and the Select Board Strategic Plan. The review will also discuss ways to promote

ongoing coordination between the Select Board and the commissions and committees and between said entities. All voted in favor.

Conclusion:

Over the course of three years, 70 or more meetings, and a pandemic, it has become apparent to the Committee that there are changes that may be necessary to local Government and the charter. Initially, the Committee discussed the three tiers of change: the simple syntax changes to the Charter; the more tangible goals and changes to Government; and ultimately whether or not the form of Town Government should be changed.

Some of the comments received were within the Committee's purview; some were not. One of the points that was raised during an update to the Select Board in November 2020 was the need for education. Some, but not all, of the comments that were received centered around either the lack of civic education or the need for more education for the public. This is not to say that there should be a basic civics class for all residents, but to highlight that there are idiosyncrasies to Nantucket's Government that are unique and require a level of understanding.

One of the goals of the Committee was to simplify some of these idiosyncrasies so that a layperson would be able to easily participate in local Government with a knowledge and understanding of the issues so every citizen can be an informed and educated participant in local Government.

The recommendations that are set forth in this report are just that: recommendations. The Committee is not composed of experts or consultants – it is a volunteer Committee of dedicated citizens who have a desire to make our Town better. The recommendations may be controversial to some; they may not do enough for others. The Committee has heard many differing opinions during the course of their tenure and the Committee has many differing opinions!

However, what is agreed-upon is that any consequential decision should be made by an electorate that is informed and educated about the benefits, consequences, and mechanics of any change in the form of Government. It is the Committee's hope that the momentum created during the last three years will continue into the future.