

Vote No on Question 1 March 15

The Act authorized by Question 1 concentrates power in a single unelected person.



- ◆ Sweeping change is not needed. Wellesley government works well—we are **not** in crisis.
- ◆ Elected boards will lose authority over their budgets and staff, cutting off their ability to manage their departments and work effectively for residents.
- ◆ The talented pool of Wellesley citizen volunteers will dry up. Who will want to invest time and effort if they can't make a difference?
- ◆ Checks and balances are very weak and transparency is reduced.
- ◆ There are no identified cost savings or efficiencies gained from adopting the Act.
- ◆ The Act will destroy citizens' meaningful participation in town government, an essential part of our town culture.

**Once lost, citizen government
is hard to regain.**

Get the facts at:
www.SaveWellesleyTownGov.org

**Keep Citizen
Voices Strong**

*Paid for by Save Wellesley Town Government
Don McCauley, Chair*

Vote No on Question 1 March 15

- ◆ Only one elected board, the Board of Selectmen, voted to support the Act. Many prominent town leaders actively oppose it.
- ◆ There is no consensus; Town Meeting and Advisory Committee are sharply divided.
- ◆ The process was deeply flawed:
 - ⇒ The Town Government Study Committee was appointed to study our current system and make recommendations, not to change our government.
 - ⇒ No alternatives were presented.
 - ⇒ Very little time was allowed for public discussion.
- ◆ If adopted, the Act will be hard to undo; it will take new legislation and a town-wide vote.
- ◆ The Act is overkill. The town can make many changes by simply amending our bylaws without involving Beacon Hill.



**This is no way
to change a government.**

**A No vote asks for a more thoughtful,
inclusive process.**

**Keep Citizen
Voices Strong**

www.SaveWellesleyTownGov.org