

**The Nantucket Land & Water Council Recommends that you:  
VOTE NO ON ARTICLE 68**

NLWC has been involved in the debate over erosion control fronting the Sconset Bluff for decades. As an environmental organization, with a mission to protect the island's land and water resources, our objective in reviewing the variety of proposals that have been considered over the years has always been, first and foremost, to ensure that environmental impacts are avoided, minimized, and if they cannot be avoided that they are mitigated to the maximum extent possible. We also recognize that this is an extremely sensitive and important issue because it involves the future of real property and infrastructure. We are certainly sympathetic to private and public property interests in this area.

This article is coming before us at ATM because of a provision of our Bylaw, Chapter 67-MANAGEMENT OF COASTAL PROPERTIES OWNED BY THE TOWN, Section 1E, which states that:

*Leasing or licensing any Town-owned coastal land to a nongovernmental body for erosion-control protection purposes shall be subject to approval by vote at an Annual or Special Town Meeting.*

1. This provision was first added to the Bylaw by a citizen's article submitted by Catherine Stover in 2012, when ATM voted strongly with 72% in favor, to adopt it.
2. This provision was amended by a citizen's article submitted by Spruce Balkind in 2018 which added the "nongovernmental body" to the provision, and ATM again voted strongly with 71% in favor, to support it.

**This article is quite concerning and should be defeated for two primary reasons.**

- 1. The article as drafted is unnecessarily vague and open-ended.**
  - a. It includes no description of what specific erosion control measures are intended, which is critically important because each alternative carries with it its own pros and cons and negative impacts.
  - b. Instead, it essentially issues a blank check for the beach to be utilized for the construction of anything from soft to hard erosion control structures including bulkheads (which would have tremendous negative impacts, if it could even ever be permitted)!
  - c. The article has no time-frame or sunseting associated with it. It is completely open-ended which implies that the Town will not have to come back to Town Meeting for approval of any future changes to the use of this beach. This is unnecessary and not appropriate, especially as the Town has been working hard doing very well to advance the Alternative Access Plans for Baxter Road.
  - d. If this gets approved it would allow this mile long stretch of public beach to be used for any form of coastal engineering structures, without limits, now or in the future.

2. **The nature of the article, as written, without more specificity, and particularly without a requirement to come back to Town Meeting at any point in the future when the use, or conditions may change, is essentially sidestepping the spirit of Chapter 67-1E which has been supported by ATM twice, and which gives Nantucket citizens a voice for what gets built on our beach.**
  - a. Any changes to how the public beach is being used in the future would no longer be subject to voter approval, and this transfer of authority would remain in effect indefinitely.

**Watch NLWC Executive Director speak about Article 68 at the Nantucket Civic League's Meet the Articles on April 6, 2024.**

Time Stamp: 29:58 through 35:00

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CcjeBS3Y\\_g](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CcjeBS3Y_g)