



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*Independent Review of the Investigation of the March 11,
2018, African Meeting House Vandalism*

Prepared for Town of Nantucket, Massachusetts by LCG, LLC on July 7, 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the Town of Nantucket, LCG conducted an independent review of the Nantucket Police Department's investigation into the March 11, 2018, vandalism of the African Meeting House, a historic African American landmark located on Nantucket Island.

The purpose of this review was not to conduct a new criminal investigation or determine criminal responsibility. Rather, the review assessed whether the investigative actions documented in the available record were consistent with accepted law enforcement practices, applicable Nantucket Police Department policies, and Massachusetts law governing bias-motivated offenses.

LCG reviewed investigative reports, supplemental reports, dispatch records, audio recordings, photographs, evidence records, departmental policies, publicly available records, and other materials provided by the Town of Nantucket and related agencies. LCG also submitted records requests and engaged in communications with outside agencies, including the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office, regarding the status of the matter and the availability of additional records. Following that outreach, the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office advised that the applicable statute of limitations had expired and that the matter is considered closed.

The findings contained in this report are limited to an assessment of the investigative response and do not affect the current legal status of the matter.

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY OVERVIEW

The records reviewed by LCG reflect a substantial investigative response during the initial stages of the investigation. The initial response involved six officers, including supervisory personnel and a detective. Investigators conducted an extensive neighborhood canvass, generating at least 26 documented radio updates regarding investigative activity and witness-contact efforts.

The investigative record further reflects a minimum of 18 documented witness contacts and interviews during the initial canvass, along with 34 additional documented attempts to contact residents and potential witnesses in the surrounding area. Investigators photographed the scene, collected physical evidence, pursued available surveillance opportunities, submitted preservation requests to digital and social media providers, and conducted multiple follow-up interviews as investigative leads developed.

As part of this review, LCG also evaluated the operational environment existing at the time of the incident, including departmental workload, staffing levels, and competing investigative responsibilities. The available records indicate that the Department was operating with staffing



vacancies while investigators were simultaneously managing numerous other serious criminal investigations and routine public safety responsibilities. This operational context provides perspective on investigative workload but does not alter the findings or conclusions of this review.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Overall, the investigative record demonstrates that the incident received substantial attention and sustained investigative effort. The principal issues identified during this review relate not to whether the investigation occurred, but to missed evidentiary opportunities, incomplete documentation, and limited verification or corroboration of certain investigative leads that likely reduced the ability to fully evaluate potential suspects and preserve potentially valuable evidence.

While the review found no evidence suggesting the incident was ignored or intentionally minimized, certain investigative opportunities were either not fully pursued or were insufficiently documented within the available record.

KEY FINDINGS

INITIAL RESPONSE

The initial police response was prompt and appropriately prioritized. Patrol officers responded quickly, supervisors became involved early, additional personnel were deployed, and investigators immediately began witness identification efforts.

The investigative record reflects that officers recognized the significance of the incident and treated it as a matter of substantial community concern.

CRIME SCENE PRESERVATION

Investigators photographed the scene and collected limited physical evidence.

However, the graffiti was removed shortly after discovery, limiting future forensic opportunities. The available record does not document whether certain forensic techniques, including latent fingerprint processing or DNA collection, were attempted before the scene was altered.

As a result, potential evidentiary opportunities may have been lost.

WITNESS CANVASS AND FOLLOW-UP

Officers conducted an extensive neighborhood canvass and documented numerous witness contacts during the initial response.

The review found substantial evidence of early witness identification efforts. However, the record does not consistently document follow-up contact with all residences and businesses where no initial contact was made.

DIGITAL AND SURVEILLANCE EVIDENCE

Investigators pursued multiple digital and surveillance leads. The investigative record documents requests for surveillance footage from Nantucket Bank, preservation requests to Facebook and Instagram, and an inquiry to Google/Nest Labs, INC regarding a privately owned Nest camera located near the African Meeting House.

These documented actions demonstrate that investigators recognized and pursued potentially relevant digital evidence. However, the available record does not consistently document the ultimate disposition of every preservation request or surveillance lead, whether all requested information was ultimately obtained, or how any recovered digital evidence was analyzed and incorporated into subsequent investigative decision-making.

INVESTIGATIVE DOCUMENTATION

The investigative file reflects considerable investigative activity, however, several decisions, follow-up efforts, and investigative conclusions were not consistently documented. In some instances, it was not possible to determine whether certain investigative steps were not performed or simply not recorded.

Because documentation itself is a critical component of professional investigative practice, these gaps limited the ability to independently evaluate portions of the investigation.

BIAS-MOTIVATED CRIME CONSIDERATIONS

The vandalism involved explicit racial language directed at a historically significant African American landmark. The review found that investigators recognized the seriousness of the incident and treated it as a bias-motivated offense requiring elevated attention. The deployment of supervisory personnel, detectives, and additional resources is consistent with that assessment.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST REVIEW

The review considered concerns raised by members of the public regarding potential conflicts of interest and the appearance of investigative impartiality. These concerns primarily arose because

one individual identified through community rumor and multi-level hearsay was the juvenile child of a Nantucket Police Department command officer, while the juvenile's mother served as an official of the town. The investigative record reflects that the command officer was present during the juvenile interview, which was conducted by detectives within his supervisory chain of command.

Although Massachusetts law permits a parent or guardian to be present during a juvenile interview, and the record did not reveal evidence that investigative decisions were improperly influenced or that applicable conflict-of-interest laws were violated, earlier documentation of investigative oversight, recusal considerations, or the rationale for proceeding as structured would likely have strengthened public confidence in the process. Ultimately, the allegation remained based on multi-level hearsay and rumor and was not corroborated by objective investigative evidence developed during the investigation.

The review also considered concerns regarding the Nantucket Police Department's command staff relationship with a witness who later reported that an individual had admitted responsibility for the vandalism. Rather than withholding the information, the investigative record reflects that the command officer documented the witness' statement, advised this individual that confidentiality could not be guaranteed, and promptly referred the matter to detectives for investigative follow-up. Detectives subsequently documented the information and incorporated it into the investigation. Although the individual was later indicted on a witness intimidation charge arising from this investigation, which was subsequently dismissed by the Commonwealth through a nolle prosequi, the available record reflects that the command staff's handling of the information was consistent with his duty to report potentially relevant investigative information.

FINAL ASSESSMENT

The investigation into the March 11, 2018, vandalism of the African Meeting House reflected substantial effort by responding officers, supervisors, and detectives under challenging circumstances and significant public scrutiny. The investigative record demonstrates that the department responded promptly, recognized the significance of the racially offensive graffiti, deployed supervisory personnel and detectives, conducted an extensive neighborhood canvass, documented and collected physical evidence, pursued surveillance and digital evidence, conducted numerous witness interviews, and continued investigative activity over an extended period.

At the same time, the review identified several missed evidentiary opportunities, documentation deficiencies, and investigative practices that could have strengthened the investigation. These included incomplete documentation of certain investigative decisions, limited documentation

regarding the exploitation of surveillance and digital evidence, missed opportunities for forensic evidence collection, failure to corroborate certain investigative information, and documentation gaps that limited independent evaluation of portions of the investigative record. In several instances, the investigative record did not reflect whether certain investigative steps were undertaken, making it impossible to determine from the available documentation whether those actions were not performed or simply not documented.

These findings should not be interpreted as evidence that no meaningful investigation occurred or that investigative decisions were improperly influenced. Rather, they identify opportunities to strengthen future investigations involving significant public interest, bias-motivated offenses, and other complex community-impact incidents through enhanced documentation, evidence preservation, investigative corroboration, and transparency. Where the report identifies documentation deficiencies, those observations reflect limitations within the investigative record reviewed and should not be interpreted, absent supporting evidence, as definitive proof that an investigative action did not occur.



C001008 – Nantucket African Meeting House Investigation Executive Findings and Report

Prepared for Town of Nantucket, Massachusetts by LCG, LLC on July 7, 2026



TABLE OF CONTENTS

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF EXPERT'S EXPERIENCE	3
BACKGROUND/ENGAGEMENT.....	4
INITIAL ENGAGEMENT.....	4
NATURE AND SCOPE OF REVIEW AUTHORITY	4
ACCESS TO RECORDS AND PRODUCTION PROCESS.....	5
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY.....	6
MATERIALS REVIEWED	6
INVESTIGATIVE REVIEW	18
Document Authentication and Chronological Reconstruction	19
Policy Compliance Analysis	20
Bias-Motivated Crime Framework Review.....	20
Assessment of Corroboration and Investigative Rigor	20
LIMITATIONS	21
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	22
INITIAL RESPONSE AND EARLY INVESTIGATIVE ACTIONS	23
Crime Scene Preservation and Forensic Processing.....	25
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	26
WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND CANVASS	27
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	27
SURVEILLANCE AND TIME-SENSITIVE EVIDENCE	28
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	28
INTERVIEW PRACTICES AND CORROBORATION.....	29
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	30
HANDLING OF RUMOR-BASED INTELLIGENCE	31
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	31
BIAS-MOTIVATED CRIME ESCALATION AND RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT.....	32
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	33
OPERATIONAL WORKLOAD AND PART I OFFENSE CONTEXT	34
CONFLICT OF INTEREST/RECUSAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	35
Policy/Standards/Legal Compliance	36
PROSECUTORIAL POSTURE AND CASE STATUS CONTEXT.....	37
OVERALL INVESTIGATIVE ASSESSMENT.....	39
RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURAL ENHANCEMENTS.....	40
SCENE PRESERVATION AND FORENSIC ESCALATION PROTOCOL	41
TIME-SENSITIVE DIGITAL EVIDENCE PRESERVATION.....	41
STRUCTURED CORROBORATION STANDARDS	41
CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE RELIABILITY DOCUMENTATION.....	42
BIAS-CRIME ESCALATION FRAMEWORK	42

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSAL DOCUMENTATION.....	42
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	43
Supervisory Documentation and Case Review.....	43
Public Communication and Case Disposition Transparency.....	43
APPENDICES.....	46
APPENDIX A: INVESTIGATIVE CHRONOLOGY	47
APPENDIX B: SCENE PRESERVATION AND FORENSIC OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS	50
Incident Discovery and Initial Response Timeline.....	50
Documented Scene Conditions and Evidence Handling	51
Policy Reference - Directive 601 (Collection and Preservation of Evidence).....	52
Summary	52
APPENDIX C: INVESTIGATIVE FOLLOW UP.....	54
Timeline of Surveillance Inquiry and Requests.....	54
Digital Media Receipt and Access	54
Retention and Preservation Considerations.....	55
Policy Reference – Directive 301 (Follow-Up Investigations).....	55
Summary	55
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW CORROBORATION AND STATEMENT RECONCILIATION ANALYSIS	56
Investigative Development Chronology.....	56
Subject A.....	57
Subject B.....	59
Subject C.....	61
Subject D.....	62
Subject E.....	64
Subject F.....	66
Subject G.....	67
Juvenile A	69
Subject H.....	71
Confidential Source 1 (CS-1).....	73
Corroborative Summary.....	75
APPENDIX E: POLICY COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS.....	76
Directive 101 – Rules of Conduct & Conflict of Interest Standards.....	76
Directive 301 – Follow-Up Investigations	77
Directive 306 – Bias Crimes	77
Directive 601 – Collection and Preservation of Evidence.....	77
Documentation-Based Compliance Observations	78
Operational and Staffing Context.....	79
Public Communication and Transparency Assessment.....	81
APPENDIX F: PUBLIC MEETING RECORD REVIEW / TOWN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE.....	84
APPENDIX G: SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT AND OBSERVATIONS	89
General Site Observations.....	89
Site Access and Safety Observations	91
Findings	91
Conclusion	91



BRIEF OVERVIEW OF EXPERT'S EXPERIENCE

James Brigham - Vice President of Risk Management – Project Manager/Team Lead

James Brigham brings more than 35 years of investigative, threat management, and operational security leadership experience spanning municipal law enforcement, statewide security operations, criminal defense investigations, and large-scale evidence remediation projects.

Mr. Brigham previously served as the Emergency Preparedness & Threat Mitigation Operational Chief for the State of Vermont, where he directed statewide threat assessment, emergency response planning, and physical security operations across more than 230 state facilities supporting over 8,000 employees. In that capacity, he led multidisciplinary teams responsible for ongoing risk assessments, behavioral threat evaluations, executive and residential security reviews, and coordinated response protocols involving HR, IT, facilities, and federal, state, and local law enforcement partners. He also oversaw the development of a centralized threat management system tracking more than 1,000 threats annually and managed uniformed security operations for the State Capitol Complex.

Prior to his statewide leadership role, Mr. Brigham served as a municipal police detective and senior law enforcement officer, leading complex criminal investigations, multi-jurisdictional task forces, and proactive public safety initiatives. His experience includes narcotics trafficking investigations, homicide support, undercover operations, intelligence collection, threat assessment, high-risk warrant service, and the coordination of state and federal enforcement resources. He developed nationally recognized investigative and offender accountability programs and earned numerous commendations for exemplary service, establishing a reputation for operational leadership, investigative excellence, and collaborative problem-solving.

Mr. Brigham later served as a chief investigator supporting private defense conflict counsel through the Vermont Office of the Defender General across seven counties. He supervised teams handling complex felony and misdemeanor caseloads and conducted comprehensive case audits involving forensic review, policy compliance analysis, witness re-interviews, scene reconstruction, and assessment of constitutional and statutory adherence. His investigative work routinely identified procedural deficiencies, evidence handling failures, and supervisory breakdowns, contributing to corrective actions and, in certain instances, criminal prosecution of public officials.

Currently serving as Vice President of Threat and Risk Management at LCG, Mr. Brigham leads complex investigations, operational reviews, and risk mitigation engagements for government and private sector clients. His experience integrates investigative methodology, evidence integrity analysis, and executive-level operational oversight—providing a disciplined, defensible framework for independent assessment.

BACKGROUND/ENGAGEMENT

INITIAL ENGAGEMENT

On August 11, 2025, the Town of Nantucket formally retained LCG pursuant to a professional services agreement executed following a public procurement process associated with RFP No. 2025-TA-0428. The engagement was initiated after community concern regarding the adequacy of the Nantucket Police Department's handling of the March 11, 2018, vandalism incident involving racially offensive graffiti spray painted onto the African Meeting House ("AMH"), located at 29 York Street in Nantucket, Massachusetts. This incident was documented under Nantucket Police Department case number 18-004506.

The purpose of the engagement was to conduct an independent, document-based review of the overall investigation of the March 11, 2018, African Meeting House incident. This included a comprehensive review of available and provided Nantucket Police Department case materials, as well as publicly available records from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the District Attorney Cape & Island District, Massachusetts Attorney General and the Massachusetts State Police. The review evaluated the investigative actions in relation to applicable departmental policies, accepted law enforcement investigative standards, and Massachusetts law governing bias-motivated offenses. This work was performed in accordance with the scope of services outlined in the Town's Request for Proposal and culminates in the development of this report.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF REVIEW AUTHORITY

LCG was not retained to conduct a subsequent criminal investigation, to identify or develop new criminal suspects, to compel testimony through subpoena authority, execute search warrants, perform independent forensic testing, or to make charging determinations. The authority to investigate criminal conduct and pursue criminal prosecution rests exclusively with law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies.

The purpose of this engagement was to conduct an independent, documentation based review of the investigative response to the March 11, 2018, African Meeting House vandalism. This review was based on the records, materials, surveillance evidence, policy directives, and related information made available to LCG during the course of this review. This assessment evaluates whether the investigative actions documented within the available record were consistent with applicable Nantucket Police Department directives, professional investigative standards, and governing law in effect *at the time of the incident*.

ACCESS TO RECORDS AND PRODUCTION PROCESS

As noted, this investigative review is solely based upon documentation provided to LCG in the available investigative record. Accordingly, numerous public records requests were made to various agencies to obtain the relevant records. Specifically, the following requests were made:

On November 4, 2025, LCG submitted a formal public records request to the Town of Nantucket seeking all materials related to the March 11, 2018, African Meeting House vandalism investigation. The request was acknowledged by the Town on December 5, 2025. On January 9, 2026, the Town responded to this request and provided initial document production via electronic file transfer links.

Upon review, it was found that the initial production provided by the Town of Nantucket was in a heavily redacted form, materially limiting the ability to identify participants, assess investigative sequencing, and evaluate decision-making chronology. LCG conducted a preliminary review of the materials produced and on January 19, 2026, submitted a second formal inquiry requesting access to non-redacted records. On January 27, 2026, LCG consulted with Town Counsel, KP Law P.C., regarding the scope and appropriateness of redactions. Following that consultation, the Town provided supplemental production of non-redacted materials on January 29, 2026.

A secondary, more comprehensive review of the expanded record set commenced on February 2, 2026. Between February 9 and February 25, 2026, LCG engaged in a series of follow-up communications with Town officials and legal counsel to request and obtain additional materials and clarification related to departmental policies, staffing levels, operational context, and case activity during the relevant time period.

All findings and assessments contained in this report are grounded exclusively in materials provided by the Town of Nantucket, the Nantucket Police Department, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the District Attorney Cape & Island District, and the Massachusetts Office of Attorney General, in accordance with applicable departmental policy and Massachusetts law in effect at the time of the incident.

In addition to materials obtained, LCG submitted formal public records requests to the Massachusetts State Police, as of the date of this report, those requests remain pending and responsive records have not been produced. Accordingly, the information contained herein is based on the materials currently available.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

MATERIALS REVIEWED

This assessment is based on materials provided by the Town of Nantucket, the Nantucket Police Department, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the District Attorney, Cape & Island District, and the Massachusetts Office of Attorney General in response to formal and supplemental records requests filed between November 4th, 2025, through March 31st, 2026. The materials provided consisted of the following:

The complete Nantucket Police Department (NPD) investigative record, both redacted and unredacted, concerning the March 2018 vandalism of the African Meeting House (AMH) including:

- 77 Audio Files.
- 11 Video Files.
- Dispatch logs of officer involvement and neighborhood canvasses, efforts and results.
- 24 Officer Investigative reports.
- 1 Property Room Report w/ 4 images.
- 1 Email from NPD School Resource Officer to NPD Detective.
- 7 Executed Notice and Waiver of Rights (Miranda Warnings).

Written Documentation/Evidence

- Email from an NPD dedicated Crime Tip account discussing a social media post and image of the event, including the vandalism and screen shoots of the conversation between individuals.
- NPD Preservation letter to Instagram Social Media Account, associated image and response.
- NPD Preservation email to Facebook, and response.
- NPD Preservation email to Google ref. Nest Lab camera retention and response.
- NPD Preservation letter to Nantucket Bank Security Department (hand delivered).
- Receipt from Lola Burgers ref.# JSKJ9BL.

- Receipt from Hy-Line Cruises for Monday March 12, 2018, booked March 11, 2018, Departure Nantucket 10:30 am, arrival Hyannis 11:30 am.
- Screenshot of communication between Detective Witherell and an individual discussing routes of travel.
- 9 Images of the front of the AMH crime scene.
- 8 Images of footprints in the soil from the crime scene.
- 1 digital image of the sole of a pair of shoes.
- 2 Images of the front of the Seneca Boston-Florence residence, 27 York Street, Nantucket MA
- 4 Images of the interior of the Seneca Boston-Florence residence, with footprint comparison of interior and exterior footprints.
- 1 Image of a can of Krylon “Mark-it” spray paint.
- 1 Image of a glass cookie jar with US currency.
- Letter dated November 19th, 2018 (hand delivered) authored by a Nantucket Citizen listing conditions of his participation in an interview.
- Letter dated December (day omitted) 2018, stamped “received December 11, 2018”.
- Undated news article by reporter Peter Sutters.
- “Letterbag” Letter to Editor dated January 31, 2019, by Miguel “Mike” Lopes, of Chester VA (and other unrelated topics submitted featured in the same printing).
- Barros v. Nantucket Et al. Nantucket Superior Court CA No 2175CV0004 Timeline of Events.
- NPD Incident Report 15-007624, unrelated vandalism to vehicle at Surfside Beach (**redacted**).
- NPD Incident Report 15-007624, unrelated vandalism to vehicle at Surfside Beach (**unredacted**).

Audio Recordings

- AMH(Extraction_1.1)_03-11-18_07.11.16_Phone_(Disp_Pos_1).wav
 - NPD Dispatch’s Initial call to AMH Point of Contact advising of vandalism.
- (Extraction_1.1)_03-11-18_07.22.46_Phone_(Dis_Pos_1).wav:

- NPD Dispatch receiving call from AMH point of contact after her arrival to the scene. Caller indicates she is unable to cover up the vandalism and requests a police officer to assist and to file a report.
- (Extraction_1.3)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-03-21_11h21min01s000ms
redacted:
 - Citizen report of “racial driven graffiti” at the AMH.
- (Extraction_1.2)_2018031107102021826.wav:
 - Citizen report of vandalism to AMH.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031107462784333.wav:
 - Dispatch leaving a message requesting an officer to respond to 29 York Street.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031107462784333.wav:
 - Dispatch leaving a message to report a full mailbox for an officer.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031109001701535.wav:
 - Radio traffic indicating the caretaker for the building is on their way down.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031109313323188.wav
 - Radio traffic **redacted**, unit indicated that DPW was contacted to respond by the Assistant Town Manager to take off the writing.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031109583720838.wav:
 - Radio **redacted**. First 20 seconds redacted, begins, with “I spoke with him, regarding incident last night, state being (dog barking) left home at 11 pm, didn’t see anything on the door at that time.” Dispatcher acknowledges, “Received”.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110043748607.wav:
 - Nearly fully **redacted**: “Can you add...” dispatcher acknowledges, “received”.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110094455149.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110120264058.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110195348767.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110201866570.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.

- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110230729724.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110244883761.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110264106064.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110332462770.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110344304598.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110371865505.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110460423994.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110485786731.wav:
 - Radio traffic, units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110491468339.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110540229444.wav:
 - Reporter from NBC Boston inquiring about vandalism based on viewer tip.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110551937271.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031110580228073.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111020752220.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111051418412.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111071698545.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.

- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111131199754.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111205343460.wav:
 - Radio traffic unit requesting dispatch to call a resident to inquire about possible witness activity.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111220606863.wav:
 - Telephone call to resident's message left reference to previous request in audio file (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111205343460.wav.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111234537740.wav:
 - Dispatch providing update to officer in pervious requests of (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111220606863.
- (Extraction_1.1)_2018031111570080857.wav:
 - Boston Globe Reporter calling to make inquiry into the vandalism. Call transferred to the Chief of Police voice mail.
- (Extraction_1.1)_20180311112564197674.wav:
 - Female caller asking to speak with Officer, after a message was left regarding possible witness activity.
- (Extraction_1.1)_20180311115063785529.wav:
 - WGBH Boston Reporter calling to make inquiry into the vandalism, call transferred.
- (Extraction_1.1)_20180311116154344133.wav:
 - Caller form Media Relations for Museum for African American History, requesting copy of a press release. Referred to social media Facebook and Twitter.
- (Extraction_1.1)_20180311116322761246.wav:
 - Reporter from the Associated Press calling to make inquiry into the vandalism, called transferred to Chief of Police.
- (Extraction_1.2)_20180311110363406939.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_1.2)_20180311110513911509.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- (Extraction_2.1)_20180311110344304598.wav:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- 03-11-18_07.11.25_Phone_(Disp_Pos_2):
 - Internal call of dispatcher informing officer of caller reference the vandalism.

- 03-11-18_07.12.18_Phone_(Disp_Pos_1):
 - Internal call of dispatcher providing a telephone number to an individual.
- 2018031107295289141:
 - Radio traffic advising an officer on scene.
- 2018031107443208100:
 - Internal communication requesting Detective Witherell to respond to the AMH.
- 2018031107490050396:
 - Internal communication, dispatch directing additional resources to the AMH, 3 officers already on scene.
- 2018031107491384068:
 - Internal communications discussing resources dispatched to the AMH.
- 2018031107491384068:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and officer coordinating resources.
- 2018031108001294504:
 - Radio traffic, communications between officers confirming color of paint discovered at scene.
- 2018031108155760329:
 - Radio traffic units broadcast radio updates concerning neighborhood canvass findings.
- 2018031108381437515:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and officer requesting an update to the Chief, requesting additional officers for resources.
- 2019031108442732054:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and officer directing and officer's response, requesting additional resources.
- 2018031108450856115:
 - Internal communications, dispatcher leaving a message to an off-duty officer requesting his presence for additional resources to respond.
- 2018031108521556586:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and off duty officer responding to a message and calling for additional resources to respond.
- 2018031108522822718:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and off-duty officer responding to message for call of additional resources, Radio traffic between unit on scene, requesting a case number.

- 2018031108581706883:
 - Radio traffic, officer requesting the AMH caretaker to respond to the scene.
- 2018031108591060874:
 - Radio traffic, dispatcher confirming a single address for the AMH Campus.
- 2018031109174683369:
 - Radio traffic between officers coordinating location.
- 2018-03110928150891:
 - Radio traffic, officer alerting dispatch he is on duty and enroute to the AMH.
- 2019031109324024770:
 - Internal communications between officer and command staff, discussing Town Administration on site, and the chain of command as the Chief was off island.
- 2018032209330230796:
 - Internal communications between command staff and officer coordinating and requesting a press release via social media to update the community.
- 2018031109332490814:
 - Internal communications between officers discussing the presence of DPW, the desire to remove the graffiti, discussion of a resource tool, and caution about the removal until the matter is investigated. The second officer informs the first, ““It’s investigated, it’s all done.” The second asks, “Do we know who did it?” “No” was the reply. “That’s why, hence the canvass.”
- 201803110951428899:
 - Internal communication between officers, establishing command and discussing the coordination of resources, who is on scene and the necessity to log all activity with dispatch during the canvass.
- 201803220951527181:
 - Radio traffic, officer indicating he is enroute to the scene.
- 2018031110402237166:
 - Radio traffic, requesting DPW to come to the scene.
- 2018031110454263604:
 - Radio traffic, informing dispatch of his efforts during the neighborhood canvass, Five Corners to Cherry to Westover Streets.
- 2018031110501224482:
 - Male caller offering assistance to power wash the graffiti after seeing the social media post.
- 2018031110544475717:

- Radio traffic between dispatch and officer asking where to send media inquiries.
- 2018031111475427271:
 - Radio traffic of officer clearing from the scene, alerting of other officers remaining for security purposes.
- 2018031111513339572:
 - Internal communications between dispatch and an officer, coordinating media inquiries directed at the Chief, informing the Chief has been briefed and is on island, returning to the station.
- 2018031113333709301:
 - News Reporter, seeking the public information officer, transferred to the Chief of Police, discussion between the dispatcher and the Chief, he informing he is back in the office.
- 2018031115082401580:
 - News Reporter from WBGH Boston seeking information regarding information. Instructions provided to contact the Chief of Police.
- 201803115165614227:
 - Male caller indicating he observed the social media post, indicating he resides diagonally across from the AMH and offered to allow a camera to be placed on his property to monitor the site. He was transferred to the detectives.
- 2018031118164192579:
 - Male caller providing a timeline, explaining he passed the AMH at 5:00 pm the previous evening and did not see the graffiti.
- 2018031119580383020:
 - Radio traffic of an officer logging an extra patrol check of the AMH.
- 2018031120400909933:
 - Female caller inquiring if a suspect had been developed / identified.

Video Files

- (Extraction_1.1)_3118_11am_Exit **Redacted**:
 - 38 second video depicting the interior of a building. An individual can be seen holding a door open for 5 people exiting. Moments later, an additional 3 people exit. 6 individuals remain within the inside of the establishment.
- (Extraction_1.1)_3118_1241am_Exit **Redacted**:
 - 25 second video depicting the same view of the previous video, an interior of a building with individuals standing about, and one individual exiting the establishment.

- (Extraction_1.1)_31118_1241am_Smoking_Deck_**Redacted**:
 - 1 minute 2 second video depicting what appears to be a smoking area of a bar, where a number of individuals are present and filtering out of the room. Possibly 8 individuals are depicted, however, the blurring of faces causes distortion for a clear view on the perimeter of the room. Individuals appear to be holding bottles. 3 individuals leave the area through a door which opens inward, leaving 5 behind. Shortly after the initial 3 leave, a 4th leaves holding a bottle in his hand, 4 individuals to remain in the space.
- (Extraction_1.3)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-0319_16h40min45s000ms **Redacted**
 - 14 minutes 52 seconds depicting an interview within the NPD\, by two Detectives of an individual who explained his initial discovery of the event through a social media site, Nantucket Year-Round Community. He relayed his activities of the night prior and stated he was home by 10:30 pm. He identified whom he was with and where they were, and when asked, believes the responsible party should be made to “fix it” and continue with any other observed necessary repairs. He expressed a willingness to cooperate should he learn any information. Detectives asked about a specific individual, to which the interviewee stated they briefly had met, but he was aware of the vehicle this person operates and a description was provided.
- (Extraction_1.2)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-03-20_15h00min22s000ms **Redacted**:
 - 17-minute video depicting an interview within the NPD, by two Detectives, with an individual relaying his evening and providing the identity of those whom he was with at the Chickenbox, and private gathering thereafter. The individual expressed concern for reputational harm at having been accused and expressed the necessity of consequence of the party responsible.
- (Extraction_1.2)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-0320_16h34min14s000ms **Redacted**:
 - 10 minute 33 second video depicting an interview within the NPD by a sole Detective, with an individual who explained his initial discovery of the event through social media site, Nantucket Year Round Community, relaying his evening on the night in question, providing the identity of those whom he was with, and denying involvement, stating he had no first-hand knowledge. The individual expressed that the responsible party should be banished from the Island. The Detective questioned why the individual might have been named? The individual speculated due to his support of President Trump.

- (Extraction_1.2)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-03-30_13h57min50s000ms_
Redacted:
 - 29 minute 39 second video, depicting an interview with 2 NPD Detectives and an individual. The individual explained his initial discovery through a social media site and was unable to recall specifics of the evening and given his recent return to the island after having been away to college, he could not reconcile why his name would have been provided. He believed counseling and rehabilitation would be an appropriate consequence as he characterized the event as an act of intoxicated immaturity and questioned the motivation. He expressed concern for reputational harm as having been named.
- (Extraction_1.3)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-03-21_11h21min01s000ms_
Redacted:
 - 25 minute 42 second video, depicting an interview with 2 NPD Detectives and an individual. This person speculated he was named given his political support of President Trump. He places himself within proximity of the AMH after describing his route of travel after leaving the Chickenbox. He admits to being “A little racist I guess” but denied involvement. He was confronted over his Instagram account name to which the individual stated that it was old but believed the name to be, “clever.” He believed he was named due to personal issues with several other people and his use of the racial slur, “Nigger.” He believed the consequence should be, “Community service or something” and continued by saying, “To me it ain’t a big deal, I don’t think it’s a huge deal, I think it’s’ kids being fucking punks.”
- (Extraction_1.3)_Interview_Room_Public_2_A112_163-2018-03-21_11h21min01s000ms_
Redacted:
 - 23 minutes 11 second video depicting an interview with 2 NPD Detectives and an individual. This person was aware of the why he was named after admitting to making a “joke” on Instagram, posting, “Did this last night, got drunk last night, and did this” days after the event. He attempted to voluntarily show the Instagram post. He provided a description of his evening remaining inside playing video games with his brother. He admitted to being sarcastic and writing a “stupid” but incriminating statement associated with the post. When asked about motivation he stated, “Because I jokingly do racist stuff, like in banter,” and but denied involvement.
- (Extraction_1.1)_Interview_Detective_Observation_220_-_A223-2018-06-25_13h11min50s000ms_1_
Redacted:

- 8 minute 30 second video entirely **redacted** holding no material value for review or analysis.

Nantucket Department Policies in effect at the time of the incident to include:

- Directive 301 – Follow-Up Investigations (issued July 7, 2011, effective July 15, 2011).
- Directive 302 – Use of Confidential Informants (revised July 6, 2011).
- Directive 306 – Bias Crimes (issued January 7, 2015).
- Directive 601 – Collection and Preservation of Evidence (issued February 5, 2016).
- Directive 101 – Rules of Conduct (effective February 19, 2016).
- Statutory Ethics and Conflict-of-Interest Guidance.

Summary of the Massachusetts Conflict of Interest Law (G.L. c. 268A)¹

Nantucket Police Department Records Management System (RMS) and Part 1² Uniformed Crime Reporting (UCR³) Offense Data: January 1, 2018- June 30, 2018.

Municipal Administrative Records:

Records associated with municipal governance, including 39 publicly available Select Board meeting minutes and related material were reviewed solely for contextual understanding of how investigative updates were communicated to the public. These records also provided insight into the Town's response and the public discussion surrounding the incident during the relevant period. between March 21st, 2018 – December 2025

- March 21, 2018
- September 19, 2018

¹Massachusetts Conflict of Interest Law (G.L. c. 268A) This document outlines statutory restrictions applicable to municipal employees concerning misuse of official position, acceptance of gifts or gratuities, divided loyalties, improper influence, and appearance-of-conflict standards. It was reviewed for contextual evaluation of supervisory obligations and public-trust considerations where applicable.

² The FBI traditionally classifies the following offenses as Part 1 Crimes: Aggravated assault, Arson, Burglary, Criminal Homicide (murder and non-negligent manslaughter), Larceny-theft, Motor vehicle theft, Rape, Robbery.

³ UCR Part 1 Crimes are the most serious criminal offenses identified by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program for national crime tracking and statistical reporting purposes. These offenses are considered major indicators of crime trends because of their severity and frequency.

- October 02, 2018
- December 19, 2018
- January 19, 2019
- January 23, 2019
- June 19, 2019
- December 19, 2019
- March 04, 2020
- March 11, 2020
- June 03, 2020
- June 17, 2020
- March 10, 2021
- May 26, 2021
- June 08, 2022
- June 26, 2024
- July 10, 2024
- August 21, 2024
- October 02, 2024
- October 16, 2024
- November 06, 2024
- January 19, 2024
- February 05, 2025
- February 12, 2025
- March 05, 2025
- March 12, 2025
- March 19, 2025
- April 02, 2025
- May 21, 2025

- June 04, 2025
- June 11, 2025
- July 09, 2025
- August 29, 2025
- September 10, 2025
- November 05, 2025
- November 12, 2025
- November 19, 2025
- December 03, 2025
- December 10, 2025

INVESTIGATIVE REVIEW

This assessment evaluated the investigative response against generally accepted law enforcement investigative practices, applicable Nantucket Police Department directives, Massachusetts statutory requirements, and recognized professional standards governing investigation, evidence preservation, bias-motivated crime response, and supervisory oversight.

The review considered investigative actions within the operational realities existing at the time of the incident, including available staffing, emergent public attention, time-sensitive evidentiary considerations, and the evolving nature of information available to investigators during the early stages of the response.. This assessment does not apply a standard of investigative perfection or hindsight-based certainty. Rather, the review evaluates whether the investigative actions documented within the available record were reasonable, proportionate, appropriately prioritized, and generally consistent with accepted professional investigative practices under the circumstances then known to investigators.

In conducting this review, consideration was given to generally accepted investigative principles including:

- Timely response, scene security and preservation;
- Identification, Preservation and Review of evidence;
- Witness identification and canvass procedures;
- Corroboration of investigative leads and alibis;

- Documentation of investigative decision-making;
- Supervisory oversight and resource deployment;
- Appropriate escalation of bias-motivated or community-impact investigations.

Where the investigative record affirmatively documented actions taken, those actions were evaluated on the basis of the information reasonably available at the time. Where the record was silent or incomplete, this report does not assume misconduct, inaction, or failure to take the correct action beyond what can reasonably be inferred from the available documentation. However, because investigative documentation itself constitutes a core component of professional investigative practice, the absence of documentation may limit the ability to independently verify whether particular investigative steps did or did not occur.

Accordingly, findings contained within this report distinguish between:

- Investigative actions that were affirmatively documented;
- Investigative steps that could not be verified from the available record; and
- Investigative deficiencies materially affecting evidentiary preservation, corroboration, or investigative completeness.

DOCUMENT AUTHENTICATION AND CHRONOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

All materials provided were catalogued and reviewed for completeness. A chronological reconstruction of investigative actions was developed, beginning with the initial dispatch call and extending through subsequent investigative steps and the referral by the Nantucket Police Department to the Cape and Island District Attorney Office, and Massachusetts State Police. This reconstruction allowed for:

- Sequencing investigative actions
- Identification of timing gaps
- Assessment of decision points
- Comparison between reported actions and documented evidence

To assist in evaluating investigative sequencing, evidence preservation, witness follow-up, and resource deployment, a chronological reconstruction of documented investigative activity was prepared from police reports, supplemental narratives, witness interviews, canvass reports, and investigative memoranda contained within the case file. *See Appendix A.*

POLICY COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS

Each major investigative action was evaluated against Nantucket Police Department directives in effect at the time of the incident. This included assessment of:

- Scene security and preservation.
- Evidence collection.
- Follow-up investigative obligations.
- Supervisory oversight.
- Escalation standards based on the seriousness of the offense.

BIAS-MOTIVATED CRIME FRAMEWORK REVIEW

Because the vandalism included explicit racial language directed at a historic African American landmark, the incident was evaluated within the statutory framework governing bias-motivated offenses under Massachusetts law. Accordingly, the review assessed whether:

- The seriousness of the offense was reflected in investigative prioritization.
- Scene preservation and forensic measures were commensurate with a civil-rights violation.
- Time-sensitive evidence (e.g., surveillance video) was pursued with appropriate urgency.
- Resource deployment reflected the gravity of the offense.

ASSESSMENT OF CORROBORATION AND INVESTIGATIVE RIGOR

This portion of the review assessed whether information developed during the investigation was evaluated through objective corroboration, documented follow up, and reasonable reconciliation of material inconsistencies. Because the investigative record included witness statements, subject interviews, alibi claims, anonymous tips, social media references, and rumor-based allegations, the review focused on whether the available documentation reflected a consistent effort to distinguish verified information from uncorroborated assertions.

The purpose was to determine whether the investigative record documented reasonable efforts to confirm or exclude material claims through independent evidence, including witness follow up, surveillance

review, transactional records, digital evidence, travel documentation, or other objectively verifiable sources where such information was available or reasonably identifiable.

Statements, alibis, and rumor-based intelligence were evaluated for:

- Corroborative follow-up.
- Reconciliation of inconsistencies.
- Objective verification efforts.
- Analytical treatment and reliability assessment of hearsay.

LIMITATIONS

Although confidentiality provisions were embedded in the executed contract, the initial document production was heavily redacted, materially limiting meaningful evaluation of the investigative record and delaying the overall investigative assessment. Following concerns raised by LCG, Town Counsel conducted a legal review addressing privacy and personally identifiable information considerations. Upon confirmation that contractual safeguards were deemed sufficient, additional unredacted reports were provided for in-camera review.

A formal public records request was submitted through the Massachusetts State police records Portal under Request No. P002440-030326 seeking records relevant to this investigation. The Massachusetts State Police Public Records unit acknowledged receipt of the request and advised that, due to the scope of the request, it could not provide an estimated production timeline but stated it was working diligently to provide an official response. A follow-up inquiry regarding the status of the request was subsequently made; however, as of the submission of this report, the requested records had not been provided, and the request remains listed as pending within the MSP Records portal.

A formal public records request was submitted through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General, which was acknowledged via email response dated April 14, 2026. The response yielded no materially substantive information related to the investigation itself, consisting instead of administrative records documenting attorney appointments and swearing-in procedures, which offered little probative or investigative value. While grand jury secrecy constraints are understood, the production was largely non-substantive in nature.

The available record reflects that discussions occurred among responding personnel, supervisory personnel, and investigative personnel regarding scene conditions, cleanup activity, evidentiary concerns, and ongoing investigative response considerations. Although portions of the reviewed materials contained

redactions preventing reliable attribution of specific statements to identifiable individuals, the substance of the available communications reflects active investigative coordination and discussion regarding scene management, witness follow-up, and surveillance-related efforts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings summarized within this investigative review are based exclusively on documentation contained within the investigative record and related materials produced for review. This assessment does not constitute a re-investigation of the underlying criminal incident and does not attempt to determine criminal responsibility. Rather, the purpose of this review is to evaluate whether investigative actions reflected in the official record were consistent with applicable departmental policy, accepted policing and professional investigative standards, and governing law in effect at the time of the incident.

Although this review identifies several investigative deficiencies and missed evidentiary opportunities, the investigative record also reflects actions that were timely, organized, and consistent with accepted law enforcement investigative practice under the circumstances at that time.

The available documentation reflects that responding officers and supervisory personnel treated the incident as a serious and significant event from the outset. Patrol response was prompt and following initial notification, supervisory personnel also responded to the scene. Additional officers and detective resources were requested, and a coordinated neighborhood canvass was initiated shortly after discovery of the vandalism.

The investigative record further reflects that officers conducted extensive witness-contact efforts within the surrounding area known as “Five Corners,” documented multiple canvass updates over department radio traffic, photographed the crime scene and associated evidence, collected limited physical evidence, identified and pursued available surveillance opportunities, and conducted numerous follow-up interviews of individuals identified through witness information, community reporting, social media activity, and investigative leads. The record also identified that investigators issued preservation requests to digital and social media providers, coordinated with outside entities regarding potential surveillance evidence, and maintained continuing investigative activity following the initial incident response.

Additionally, the review recognizes the operational realities confronting investigators during the early stages of the incident, including substantial public attention, significant community concern, evolving information, media scrutiny, and the time-sensitive nature of potential digital and physical evidence.

Accordingly, this assessment recognizes that meaningful investigative efforts did occur. The documented record reflects that personnel took a number of appropriate and necessary investigative steps, including prompt response, scene documentation, supervisory involvement, witness canvassing, evidence

collection, follow up interviews, and continued investigative activity. The findings that follow should therefore be understood not as a conclusion that the investigation lacked effort, but as an assessment of specific areas where the documented response could have been more complete, more consistently corroborated, more thoroughly documented, or where additional investigative opportunities reasonably appear to have existed.

On May 13, 2026, LCG conducted an on-site assessment of the African Meeting House campus, including the African Meeting House, Visitor Center, and Seneca Boston–Florence Higginbotham House. The purpose of the site visit was to obtain contextual understanding of the property, evaluate current surveillance camera placement and fields of view, assess environmental factors relevant to the review, and document other observable conditions. The assessment was not intended to reconstruct or represent the physical conditions that existed at the time of the March 11, 2018, vandalism. Under current conditions, the campus was found to be protected by modern surveillance and intrusion detection systems providing generally comprehensive coverage. Several minor maintenance and security observations were documented; however, no significant vulnerabilities were identified that materially affected the overall conclusions of this independent review. *See Appendix G.*

INITIAL RESPONSE AND EARLY INVESTIGATIVE ACTIONS

On Sunday March 11th, 2018, at approximately 0653 hours, two members of the public separately reported to the Nantucket Police Department (NPD) “..some graffiti, some very racist graffiti at the African Meeting House.” (AMH) The dispatcher confirmed the address, then called the point of contact (POC) of the AMH alerting her to the vandalism. The POC responded to the location and called the Nantucket Police Department back requesting an officer’s presence, indicating, “...is horrible, there’s nothing I can do to cover this up, I have to have a police officer come up, like I said, I have to go off island momentarily.” A dispatched patrol unit arrived on scene at approximately 30 minutes after the initial call to the police department, at 0724 hours. The initial responding officer checked the perimeter of the building and notified his supervisor of the situation, who, in turn, called for additional resources, requesting a detective. Independently a second patrol officer arrived to assist.

When the detective arrived at 0750 hours, less than one hour after the initial call to the police department, he made observations of the spray-painted graffiti, checked the surrounding property for evidence of further crime, and discovered an open door to an adjacent building, which was a part of the overall AMH campus. He and the first responding officer conducted a search of the building ensuring a suspect was not inside. Additionally, the detective observed two separate sets of footprints outside of the building, one of which had a distinctive circular pattern.

Later, they met with the caretaker to determine if anything was missing, learning that nothing had been reported stolen. Given that no spray paint can was located at the scene, the detective noticed paint supplies and questioned the possibility that the spray paint may have been taken from the supplies he observed.

The detective photographed the crime scene, obtaining images of the graffiti on the face of the AMH, forensic samplings of paint scrapings for later possible analysis, and images of the footprints both on the exterior and interior of the adjacent building.

Supervisory staff coordinated a neighborhood canvass. Radio traffic indicates a total of 26 updates provided by patrol officers documenting their efforts.

Further resources were brought in to assist, as documented in audio files of dispatch calling off duty officers requesting their assistance, and command staff requested the presence of a specific detective. Ultimately, 2 supervisors, 1 detective, and 3 patrol officers were deployed in response to the incident, for a total of 6 officers. It was noted that the chief of police was off island at the time of the initial discovery but returned that day in response to the event.

During the response, the Detective interviewed 6 separate residents who lived in the near vicinity of the AMH, establishing a timeline prior to the discovery of vandalism in the morning. He also discovered a residential Nest⁴ surveillance camera, located approximately 75 yards to the west of the AMH, and met with the owner and obtained log-in information where he independently observed the field of vision. The Detective later confirmed, through an official letter of preservation inquiry with Nest Labs, Inc., that the camera did not have a retention paid subscription; only live stream capabilities. As a result, saved/stored video surveillance footage of the location was not possible to obtain from this source.

The detective met with the AMH caretaker and spouse and extended the offer of extra patrol presence at their residence, as well as the AMH campus, moving forward. At the conclusion of the initial response, an officer remained at the scene to maintain security.

As discussed, below, however, several subsequent investigative and forensic opportunities were either not documented, incompletely pursued, or overtaken by premature alteration of the scene prior to completion of full forensic processing.

⁴ On March 13th, NPD Detective requested records from Nest Labs, INC, subsequently confirming the Nest Camera video data is not retained past a user's scripition period, thus no evidentiary value existed

CRIME SCENE PRESERVATION AND FORENSIC PROCESSING

The graffiti was removed from the African Meeting House almost immediately after discovery, and members of the public and the Department of Public Works (DPW) were documented as present during the cleaning process.

(Extraction_1.1)_2018031109313323188.wav: The radio traffic unit indicated that DPW was contacted to respond by the Assistant Town Manager to take off the writing. Additionally, citizens called the department to offer help with the use of a power washer, as documented in audio file #2018031110501224482. The initial responding officer indicated that with permission of the Sergeant on scene, "The caretaker and bystanders began cleaning the paint from the doors and sanding it off of the sidewall."

Internal communication recordings indicated that specific caution was raised by command staff on the timing of the removal as documented in audio file 2018031109332490814. Instructions were given by command not to remove the graffiti until the matter was investigated. In that conversation a second officer informs the first, "It's investigated, it's all done." The second asks, "Do we know who did it?" "No" was the reply. "That's why, hence the canvas."

The investigative record does not document if latent fingerprint processing, or if DNA collection was attempted. It does, however, indicate that the detective did preserve and collect forensic evidence in the form of scrapings from the spray-painted surface as documented in evidence (property list 18-000175 / 1&&VAN).

The record also indicates that photographs of the crime scene were taken were to include the graffiti itself, the distinctive footprint shoe patterns on the exterior and interior of the buildings, and images of the adjacent building depicting the opened door discovered during the initial response and building search.

Further documentation depicts the aforementioned paint supplies, and an image depicting the following: A visible circular dust impression on a work surface, indicating that a cylindrical object, consistent in size and shape with a spray paint can, had been positioned at that location for a sufficient period of time to gather dust, prior to removal. The surrounding dust accumulation remained undisturbed, while the circular area beneath the object was shielded from dust accumulation, creating a distinct outline suggesting that a spray paint can (or similarly shaped item) had been in that location.

The following day on March 12th, at 1606 hours the NPD was alerted to the discovery of a discarded spray paint can on Pleasant Street (as documented in NPD 18-004589) approximately 0.34 of a mile southeast of the AMH. Officers responded, photographed the discovery and collected the can (identified as a Dupli-Color Rust Fix spray paint can) as documented in property list 18-000179 1&&EVD, indicating

it was placed into evidence locker 16, and referred to the detective bureau for further investigation. The record indicates that it was sent to the property room on “February 18, 2019, at 1055 hours.”

On March 19, 2018, detectives hand delivered a preservation letter to the Nantucket Bank Security Department as a follow up to the discovery of the paint can on March 12th by uniformed patrol. Included was a diagram showing the location of the discovery and requested video surveillance of this area.

What is unknown is if an analysis was conducted for comparison of the scrapings collected at the scene by the detective, to that of the spray paint can collected by uniformed patrol the following day on Pleasant Street 0.34 miles from the crime scene. Also unknown is if latent prints or trace DNA samples were taken from the spray paint can.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

These early-stage actions were generally consistent with Nantucket Police Department Directive 301 governing follow-up investigations and reflected recognition of the seriousness and community sensitivity associated with the incident.

Nantucket Police Department Directive 601, “Collection and Preservation of Evidence,” emphasizes scene preservation and methodical evidence processing. When efforts are evaluated against this directive, the documented sequence reflects that full forensic processing of the scene was not completed prior to alteration, as the record does not reflect attempted latent fingerprint or DNA collection before removal of the graffiti. The investigative response was otherwise consistent with several core components of Directive 601, including physical evidence recovery, initial crime-scene response, crime-scene processing, photographic documentation, collection of trace evidence, chain-of-custody procedures, and report documentation.

The documented initial response reflects several investigative actions that were consistent with accepted law enforcement response practices for a significant property crime and suspected bias-motivated offense. Responding personnel promptly secured the scene, initiated supervisory notification, deployed additional investigative resources, conducted an immediate neighborhood canvass, documented witness contacts, identified potential surveillance opportunities, documented and photographed the scene, and preserved limited physical evidence. The response further reflects active supervisory involvement during the initial operational period, including coordination of canvass assignments, resource deployment, and investigative direction.

Two potential forensic opportunities were missed with respect to latent fingerprint and DNA collection prior to removal of the graffiti. Additionally, the record does not reflect whether latent fingerprint or DNA processing was attempted following the recovery of the spray paint can on Pleasant Street the following day.

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND CANVASS

The investigative record reflects that officers conducted a comprehensive neighborhood canvass of the Five Corners and surrounding areas on the day of discovery. Officers were assigned defined geographic sectors by supervisory staff, and there were at minimum 26 documented radio notifications, reflecting efforts to locate witnesses and contact residents regarding suspicious activity and the presence of potential surveillance cameras, as documented throughout the supplemental reports.

Further, documentation shows that on the day of the initial response, one supervisor made 16 unsuccessful attempts to contact residents, and 6 successful attempts, for a total of 22 attempted witness-identifications. One patrol officer made 18 unsuccessful attempts, 11 successful attempts, for a total of 29 attempted witness-identifications. In total, a minimum of 18 independent individuals were interviewed, with 34 unsuccessful attempts.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

When evaluated against Nantucket Police Department Directive 301, "Follow-Up Investigations," the investigative record reflects substantial compliance with initial witness-identification and canvassing obligations during the early response phase of the investigation. Officers were assigned geographic sectors, conducted extensive neighborhood canvassing, documented attempted contacts, interviewed multiple residents, and sought information regarding suspicious activity and potential surveillance sources within the affected area.

The documented investigative response reflects organized initial deployment of personnel and reasonably prompt efforts to identify witnesses and preserve potentially time-sensitive information in the immediate aftermath of the incident.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, these documented actions are consistent with accepted practices for the initial response to a major crime investigation. Rapid neighborhood canvassing, prompt witness identification, documentation of contacts, and the immediate search for surveillance evidence are recognized components of competent investigative practice and are reflected in nationally accepted investigative methodologies.

However, while the initial canvass efforts were extensive, the record does not reflect documented follow-up attempts to re-contact residences or businesses where no initial contact was made, nor does it reflect subsequent re-canvassing following the emergence of additional suspect information that placed individuals within the downtown and Five Corners area during the relevant timeframe. Under generally accepted investigative practice, re-canvassing may provide investigative value in significant community-impact investigations where additional information, delayed recollections, or evolving suspect

information emerge following the initial response period. Although neither Nantucket Police Department Directive 301 nor generally accepted law enforcement standards require repeated canvassing in every investigation, re-canvassing is widely recognized as an investigative best practice under these circumstances.

This assessment is documentation-based and does not conclude that additional follow-up efforts definitively did not occur. Rather, the investigative record, as produced for review, does not contain sufficient documentation to confirm that subsequent canvass or re-contact efforts were systematically conducted or documented following the initial investigative phase.

SURVEILLANCE AND TIME-SENSITIVE EVIDENCE

Exterior surveillance footage was requested from a single financial institution approximately 7 days after the incident. The footage was not received until several weeks later and was not accessible until nearly 2 months after the vandalism due to password restrictions.

There is no indication that analytical review occurred of that footage or its integration into investigative decision-making. Furthermore, the results, if any, of that surveillance footage were not known during the interview of the main named suspect during his interview on March 21st, nor is it known if latent prints or DNA collection was attempted or recovered from a spray paint can recovered on March 12th prior to meeting with one of the suspects.

As previously noted above, detectives did in fact, issue preservation letters and follow up with potential surveillance data via Nest Labs Inc. Additionally, detectives issued preservation requests on March 21, 2018, to social media platform Instagram. No additional information was provided in the record, and it is not known if follow up legal process was served on those companies to actually obtain the information sought.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

When evaluated against Nantucket Police Department Directive 301, "Follow-Up Investigations," the record reflects that detectives undertook multiple efforts to identify and preserve potentially relevant surveillance and digital evidence, including neighborhood canvassing, preservation requests, and follow-up requests directed toward commercial and social-media platforms.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, these documented actions are consistent with accepted investigative practices requiring investigators to promptly identify, preserve, and secure potentially relevant surveillance and electronic evidence before such evidence is overwritten, deleted, or otherwise lost. The issuance of preservation requests and documented follow-up

efforts demonstrate compliance with the fundamental investigative obligation to preserve potentially probative digital evidence.

However, the record does not consistently reflect timely follow-up in relation to the preservation requests, actual retrieval of the preserved records, documented analytical review, or integration of surveillance evidence into investigative decision-making. Delays in obtaining and accessing surveillance footage, combined with the absence of documented follow-up analysis, reduced the ability to fully evaluate potentially time-sensitive digital evidence.

Although delays in obtaining surveillance footage are not always within the control of investigators and frequently depend upon third-party custodians, generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards contemplate that, once evidence is obtained, it should be reviewed in a timely manner, documented, and evaluated for investigative significance. Similarly, investigative decisions regarding the evidentiary value of recovered surveillance footage should be documented to demonstrate whether the material was determined to be relevant, of limited value, or not probative.

Accordingly, the efforts to identify and preserve surveillance evidence fall within accepted law enforcement investigative standards. However, the absence of documentation demonstrating timely analytical review and integration of available surveillance evidence represents a departure from recognized investigative best practices and limits the ability to independently assess whether all available digital evidence was fully exploited during the investigation.

This assessment is documentation-based and does not conclude that additional surveillance-related analysis did not occur. Rather, the investigative record does not contain sufficient documentation to confirm the extent to which available surveillance evidence was fully exploited or incorporated into subsequent investigative analysis.

INTERVIEW PRACTICES AND CORROBORATION

The investigative record reflects that numerous individuals were interviewed over the course of the investigation, including people identified through canvassing, social media leads, anonymous tips, and community-based allegations. Interviews were documented, and Miranda Warnings were provided where appropriate. Across multiple subjects, individuals provided specific placement claims, including assertions of being at home, at identifiable establishments, traveling off-island, or in the company of named individuals during the relevant timeframe.

The files reflect that associated individuals were sometimes interviewed in response to those claims. However, the record does not consistently reflect documented independent verification of objectively verifiable assertions through transactional records, digital platform history, cellular location data, or comprehensive surveillance review. Additionally, while digital device use was acknowledged by several

individuals during interviews, the record does not reflect documented efforts to obtain voluntary digital corroboration, limited device review, or device/data preservation corresponding to the relevant timeframe.

While interview documentation was generally thorough, the investigative record does not consistently reflect systematic objective corroboration of that which was claimed.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

When evaluated against Nantucket Police Department Directive 301, “Follow-Up Investigations”, the record reflects that numerous interviews were conducted and documented involving witnesses, persons of interest, and individuals identified through canvassing and social-media information.

The documented interview activity reflects substantial compliance with Directive 301's follow-up investigative responsibilities. Detectives identified, located, interviewed, and documented statements from numerous individuals throughout the course of the investigation, consistent with departmental expectations for witness development and investigative follow-up.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, conducting and documenting witness and suspect interviews, providing Miranda warnings when applicable, and pursuing investigative leads through interviews are consistent with accepted investigative practices. However, accepted investigative methodology also recognizes that objectively verifiable statements, such as travel claims, financial transactions, location data, digital communications, surveillance evidence, and other independently verifiable information, should be corroborated whenever reasonably feasible, particularly when those statements are material to establishing or eliminating investigative timelines or suspect involvement.

However, the record does not consistently reflect documented independent verification of subject claims through any other sources including transactional records, digital metadata, travel documentation, cellular records, or comprehensive surveillance review. Variations in timeline details are reflected in the record but are not consistently documented as reconciled through independently verifiable evidence.

Accordingly, the documented interview process falls within accepted law enforcement investigative standards and reflects substantial compliance with Nantucket Police Department Directive 301. However, the investigative record does not consistently demonstrate systematic objective corroboration of material statements through independent sources where such corroboration may have been reasonably available. While the absence of documented corroboration does not establish that such efforts were not undertaken, comprehensive corroboration of objectively verifiable statements is recognized as an investigative best practice because it strengthens the reliability of witness information, assists in resolving conflicting accounts, and provides independent support for investigative conclusions.

HANDLING OF RUMOR-BASED INTELLIGENCE

The investigative record reflects that multiple individuals were identified through community rumor, social media commentary, anonymous tips, and second-hand, third, and sometimes four times removed reporting. In several instances, these allegations prompted follow-up interviews or attempted contacts. The file reflects documentation of rumor-based leads and corresponding investigative activity. However, it does not consistently reflect structured documentation distinguishing first-hand information from multi-level hearsay or any grading of source reliability within the case file.

In certain instances, allegations appear in the investigative record without documented resolution indicating whether the information was independently corroborated, excluded, or deemed unsubstantiated. Examples include:

- Allegations circulated through multiple individuals regarding statements allegedly made at local bars following the vandalism, including information passed through several intermediary individuals without documented first-hand attribution.
- Community rumors and social-media commentary identifying potential suspects based on alleged post-incident statements or associations, where the investigative record reflects follow-up inquiry but does not consistently document whether the allegations were ultimately corroborated, disproven, or deemed unreliable.
- Multi-level hearsay allegations involving individuals reportedly claiming knowledge of the incident through conversations with third parties, where the record reflects attempted investigative follow-up but limited documented analytical resolution regarding source reliability or evidentiary value.
- Allegations involving individuals claiming knowledge of the incident through public statements, community discussion, or indirect communications, but who either declined formal interviews or limited cooperation with investigators, resulting in unresolved questions regarding the reliability, source, or evidentiary significance of the information asserted.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

When evaluated against Nantucket Police Department Directive 301, "Follow-Up Investigations" the record reflects that detectives documented and pursued numerous rumor-based and indirect-source allegations through interviews, attempted contacts, and follow-up inquiry.

The documented investigative activity reflects substantial compliance with Directive 301. Detectives appropriately treated community information, anonymous tips, social media commentary, and indirect

allegations as investigative leads requiring evaluation rather than as established facts. The decision to pursue potentially relevant information, regardless of its initial source, is consistent with the Department's follow-up investigative responsibilities.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, investigators are expected to receive, document, and assess information from a variety of sources, including anonymous tips, hearsay, community rumors, and social media. Standing alone, such information generally does not constitute reliable evidence. Accepted investigative practice requires that information of this nature be evaluated, corroborated where reasonably feasible, and weighed according to its demonstrated reliability before influencing investigative conclusions or prosecutorial decisions.

Accordingly, the documented decision to pursue rumor-based information falls within accepted law enforcement investigative standards and reflects substantial compliance with Nantucket Police Department Directive 301. The limitation reflected in the record is not that rumor based information was pursued, but that the investigative file does not consistently demonstrate structured differentiation between first-hand information and multi-level hearsay, formal source reliability assessment, or documented disposition of certain allegations following investigative review. As a result, the record does not consistently show whether certain allegations were ultimately corroborated, disproven, determined to be unreliable, or otherwise resolved.

While formal source reliability grading is not required in every criminal investigation, documenting the disposition of significant rumor-based allegations represents a recognized investigative best practice because it assists subsequent investigators, prosecutors, and independent reviewers in understanding how information was evaluated and why particular leads were pursued or discontinued.

BIAS-MOTIVATED CRIME ESCALATION AND RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT

The vandalism included explicit racial language directed at a historic African American landmark and therefore falls within the statutory framework governing bias-motivated civil-rights offenses under Massachusetts State criminal law. Such offenses carry heightened community impact and investigative significance beyond that of routine property damage. When evaluated within the context of a bias-motivated offense, the previously identified documentation gaps, particularly those relating to scene preservation, time-sensitive surveillance exploitation, and corroborative follow-up, assume heightened importance.

The file does not reflect documented consultation with specialized civil-rights or forensic resources; however, it does reflect additional resources brought to bear after the initial response by a patrol officer. As previously documented in the above Section detailing Initial Response and Early Investigative Actions, a total of 6 officers became involved in the investigation of the defacement. Forensic evidence was

collected, crime-scene imagery was documented, substantive neighborhood canvassing commenced, and independent video surveillance sources were identified. The department also offered increased patrol functions both at the caretaker's residence and at the African Meeting House campus.

Following the initial response, the detectives issued preservation requests for social media accounts and bank surveillance systems, collected additional potentially related evidence, conducted follow-up interviews, responded to crime tips, pursued rumor allegations, sought outside-agency assistance with suspect interviews, and attempted to interview individuals asserting knowledge of the event who ultimately declined participation. The department additionally encouraged members of the community to provide information through public meeting forums, on the agency's social media sites including outreach directing individuals to contact both the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office and the Massachusetts State Police.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

The Nantucket Police Department Policy 306, "Bias Crimes," addresses these types of offense investigations stating in part, "This policy is designed to assist officers in identifying crimes motivated by bias toward an individual's race, religion, ethnicity, handicap, sexual orientation or gender and to define appropriate steps for assisting victims and apprehending suspects." The African Meeting House is historically associated with the African American community and represents the history of racial inequality, segregation, exclusion, and the pursuit of civil rights on Nantucket. The placement of racial slurs and graffiti at this location is therefore consistent with the bias indicators identified under NPD Policy 306.A.2.F(2), which recognizes bias-related markings or graffiti directed at locations symbolically connected to a protected group. The policy further provides that bias crimes are to be treated as high-priority investigations and that the Department will use "every necessary resource rapidly and decisively" to identify offenders, apprehend suspects, and pursue prosecution.

The investigative record reflects substantial compliance with Policy 306. Following the initial patrol response, supervisory personnel, detectives, forensic personnel, and additional officers were assigned to the investigation. The record further reflects crime scene processing, forensic evidence collection, neighborhood canvassing, preservation requests for digital evidence, follow-up interviews, coordination with outside law enforcement agencies, public outreach, and increased patrol activity at both the African Meeting House and the caretaker's residence. These documented actions are consistent with the Department's policy requiring that bias-motivated offenses receive high investigative priority and appropriate resource deployment.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, bias-motivated crimes require prompt investigative response, comprehensive evidence collection, coordination with prosecutors and partner agencies, meaningful community engagement, and recognition of the heightened

impact these offenses have upon both the immediate victim and the broader protected community. The documented investigative response was generally consistent with these accepted standards through the deployment of additional personnel, forensic resources, interagency coordination, public outreach, and continued investigative follow-up.

Accordingly, the investigative response documented in the record falls within accepted law enforcement investigative standards and substantially complies with the requirements of Nantucket Police Department Policy 306. The documentation-related observations identified elsewhere in this report are more appropriately characterized as opportunities to strengthen investigative documentation and case management than as evidence of a failure to recognize or investigate this matter as a bias-motivated crime.

OPERATIONAL WORKLOAD AND PART I OFFENSE CONTEXT

This section is included to provide operational context for the investigative response under review at the time of this. The African Meeting House vandalism was a significant community impact incident with clear bias indicators and warranted careful investigative attention. At the same time, any assessment of investigative sequencing, resource deployment, supervisory oversight, and case progression should also consider the broader workload environment in which the Nantucket Police Department was operating during the relevant period.

The RMS and UCR Part I offense data for Nantucket were reviewed for this limited contextual purpose. This data was not used to diminish the seriousness of the African Meeting House incident or to excuse any documented investigative deficiencies. Rather, it provides an objective reference point for understanding concurrent investigative demands, staffing pressures, and competing case responsibilities during the months surrounding the March 2018 event.

The Nantucket Police Department Records Management System (RMS) report reflecting UCR Part I offenses from January 1, 2018, through June 30, 2018, was reviewed to assess the operational workload present at that time. During this six-month period, the RMS dataset reflects a total of 204 Part I offense entries. The category distribution was as follows:

Violent Offenses

- Sexual Assault / Offenses: 19
- Assault: 7
- Assault & Battery: 1
 - Total violent offenses: 27

Property-Related Offenses

- Property Stolen / Larceny-Theft: 77
- Breaking & Entering: 10
- Vandalism: 2
 - Total property-related offenses: 89

Other Major Investigative Categories

- Fraud: 63
- Liquor Law Violations: 10
- Missing Persons: 10
- Drug Offenses: 5
 - Total additional major categories: 88

The data reflects that during the relevant timeframe the department was actively investigating multiple serious offenses involving direct victims, including 27 violent crimes, of which 19 were incidents of sexual assault. Such offenses require sustained investigative efforts, departmental resources, extensive follow-up, victim services coordination, evidence collection, forensic processing, and supervisory oversight.

Property-related crimes comprised the largest aggregate category (43.6%), with larceny-theft representing the single highest-volume offense type (37.7% of total Part I entries). The crime at issue was one of two vandalism entries recorded during the six-month period, representing approximately 1.0% of total Part I offenses.

Under UCR standards, the AMH defacing was classified as malicious destruction of property and therefore recorded within the property crime category. However, UCR statistical classification does not capture the broader community impact, including the significance of the location and its historical and cultural importance. The vandalism involved explicit racial language directed at an historic African American landmark, elevating its statutory and community significance beyond that of routine property damage. At the same time, the RMS data reflects that the department was managing contemporaneous investigations involving violent crime, sexual assault, fraud, and other high-impact offenses requiring investigative and supervisory resources.

This operational context does not negate documented investigative deficiencies discussed elsewhere in this report. Rather, it provides objective perspective when evaluating resource deployment, prioritization decisions, and investigative sequencing reflected in the official record.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST/RECUSAL CONSIDERATIONS

On April 11, 2018, the record shows that Juvenile A was identified as a person with potential knowledge of the offense. Juvenile A was also the child of a supervisory command staff member of the Nantucket

Police Department. Records indicate that this command staff member was present during Juvenile A's interview, which was conducted by detectives who also fell under that command staff member's supervisory authority.

The record does not contain documentation of formal recusal, reassignment of investigative authority, written disclosure, or external review in connection with that interview. Nor does the record reflect a documented supervisory or command level discussion assessing whether recusal was warranted, whether the interview should be conducted by personnel outside the supervisory chain of command, or whether other safeguards were considered to address actual or perceived conflict of interest concerns. Likewise, the record does not document any stated rationale for proceeding without recusal, reassignment, written disclosure, or external review.

This report does not find that improper influence occurred, however, in matters involving immediate family members of supervisory personnel, best practice would ordinarily include documented recusal or external oversight to preserve investigative independence and public confidence.

POLICY/STANDARDS/LEGAL COMPLIANCE

Nantucket Police Department Directive 101 – "Rules of Conduct," requires officers to avoid conflicts of interest whether actual or apparent and mandates compliance with Massachusetts General Laws c. 268A. Under G.L. c. 268A §23(b)(3), a municipal employee may not act in a manner that would cause a reasonable person, having knowledge of the relevant circumstances, to conclude that the employee could be improperly influenced or would show favor due to kinship, rank, or position. This provision may be addressed through written disclosure or recusal.

The investigative record does not contain documentation reflecting a formal recusal, written disclosure, reassignment of supervisory responsibility, or other documented conflict-management measures associated with the interview of the supervisory official's immediate family member. However, neither Directive 101 nor G.L. c. 268A requires automatic recusal or mandatory reassignment under these circumstances. Accordingly, the investigative record does not establish a documented violation of Directive 101 or Massachusetts conflict-of-interest law.

From the perspective of generally accepted law enforcement investigative standards, however, investigations involving immediate family members of supervisory personnel are ordinarily expected to include documented measures demonstrating investigative independence and preserving public confidence in the integrity of the investigative process. Such measures may include written disclosure, documented supervisory recusal, reassignment of investigative oversight, or independent agency participation when appropriate. Where those measures are considered unnecessary, the investigative record should ordinarily reflect a documented decision-making process explaining the rationale for

proceeding without recusal, reassignment, written disclosure, or external review. Such documentation helps establish that potential actual or perceived conflict of interest concerns were recognized, evaluated, and addressed in a manner consistent with investigative integrity and public confidence.

The absence of documented safeguards may reasonably give rise to appearance of conflict concerns under §23(b)(3), irrespective of whether investigative decisions were substantively affected. Accordingly, while the documented actions fall within the minimum requirements of Directive 101 and G.L. c. 268A as reflected in the investigative record, the absence of documented conflict-management measures represents a departure from recognized investigative best practices designed to preserve transparency, investigative independence, and public confidence in the investigative process.

PROSECUTORIAL POSTURE AND CASE STATUS CONTEXT

Following the local investigation, the matter was referred to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the District Attorney Cape & Island District and the Massachusetts State Police.

A statewide grand jury was subsequently convened to hear evidence related to the investigation. Grand Jury procedures are confidential and not subjected to public disclosure. The most direct documented account of that proceeding appears in *Barros v. Ponce, Civil Action No. 2175CV00004 (Mass. Super. Ct. June 6, 2022)*, wherein the Court noted that although Mr. Ponce was identified as a target of the grand jury investigation and subpoenaed to testify, he invoked his Fifth Amendment privilege, and no indictment was returned against him.

In that same decision, the Superior Court found that... Dylan Ponce interfered or attempted to interfere with the secured rights of (two individuals) in violation of the MCRA, and that he “violated the MCRA when he painted racist graffiti on a place of public accommodation.”⁵

Specific to Prosecutorial Posture and Case status, no subsequent public announcement had been issued formally declaring the vandalism investigation closed, summarizing investigative findings, or announcing criminal charges associated with the underlying offense. While related proceedings occurred, including obstruction-related litigation, no publicly released prosecutorial statement was issued providing a formal disposition of the investigation itself.

Public reporting indicates that a grand jury returned an indictment against Jeffrey Sayle for misleading an investigation under G.L. c. 268, § 13B, and issued a “No Bill” with respect to another individual, (Ponce) indicating a finding of no probable cause to support criminal charges. According to contemporaneous reporting, Cape and Islands District Attorney Michael O’Keefe stated, “I felt there was sufficient evidence

⁵ *Barros v. Ponce, Civil Action No. 2175CV00004 (Mass. Super. Ct. June 6, 2022)*, Memorandum of Decision and Order on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment

to present to a grand jury... They chose to present a 'No Bill' and I have no quarrel with what the grand jury did."⁶

Under Massachusetts law, malicious destruction of property is generally subject to a six-year statute of limitations. The vandalism occurred in March 2018. Absent tolling or sealed proceedings not reflected in public records; the general limitations period would have ordinarily expired in or about March 2024.⁷ In response, during the course of this investigative review, a formal Public Information Request was made to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the District Attorney, Cape & Island District relating to the 2018 incident and investigation.

In response to this request, Attorney Robert J. Galibois provided a written statement dated, April 9, 2026, which read:

"During March 2026, in response to a request for records by James Brigham, a consultant retained by the Town of Nantucket, the Cape and Islands District Attorney's Office undertook a review of the files that the office holds related to the desecration of the African Meeting House on Nantucket that occurred in March of 2018."

The file review revealed that, on October 2, 2020, Jeffrey Sayle was indicted by a grand jury on one count of witness intimidation related to the investigation into the vandalism at the African Meeting House. That same grand jury heard evidence related to a second suspect but did not find enough probable cause or evidence to return other indictments, or issue charges against anyone else. On March 10, 2021, the Commonwealth entered a Nolle Prosequi on Jeffrey Sayle's case thus dismissing the witness intimidation charge.

These legal proceedings took place while the last District Attorney was in office. The prosecuting ADA who handled these cases no longer works for the Cape and Islands District Attorney's Office. As such, we cannot comment on the reasons behind the decisions and proceedings because we are simply not privy to that information.

The statute of limitations has run out on these crimes which precludes any further action being taken by the district Attorney's office."

⁶ Dean Geddes, "Indictment returned in African Meeting House vandalism investigation," Cape Cod Times, Oct. 15, 2020

⁷ This discussion is provided solely for contextual purposes and does not constitute a formal legal opinion regarding tolling, sealed grand jury actions, or prosecutorial discretion.

OVERALL INVESTIGATIVE ASSESSMENT

This overall investigative assessment is intended to synthesize the principal observations developed through the document-based review of the Nantucket Police Department's investigative response to the March 11, 2018, vandalism incident. It considers the totality of the documented record, including the initial response, crime scene preservation, witness canvassing, investigative follow up, interview practices, corroboration efforts, handling of rumor-based information, supervisory considerations, and policy compliance.

The assessment recognizes that the investigative record reflects meaningful and appropriate law enforcement activity. Officers responded promptly, supervisory and detective resources were deployed, the scene was photographed, limited physical evidence was collected, digital evidence was identified, witnesses were contacted, follow up interviews were conducted, and additional investigative leads were pursued over time. These actions demonstrate that the incident was not ignored and that investigative personnel undertook substantial efforts in response to a serious community impact event.

At the same time, the review identified several areas where the documentation does not consistently reflect the level of preservation, corroboration, supervisory documentation, or structured decision making expected in an investigation involving explicit racial language directed at a historic African American landmark. These observations do not establish that unrecorded actions did not occur, nor do they assign criminal responsibility or bad faith. Rather, they identify limitations in the documented record that affected the ability to independently verify certain investigative steps, evaluate decision making, and assess the completeness of the investigative response.

The table below summarizes the principal record-based observations reflected in the investigative record:

Investigative Area	Documentation Reflected in Record	Record Based Observation	Supporting Appendix
Crime Scene Processing	Scene photographed; paint scrapings collected	Graffiti removed prior to documented latent print, DNA, or advanced forensic processing	Appendix B
Surveillance Evidence	Initial neighborhood canvass conducted	Delayed request and limited documentation of surveillance preservation and analysis	Appendix C

Investigative Area	Documentation Reflected in Record	Record Based Observation	Supporting Appendix
Interview Corroboration	Multiple interviews conducted and documented	Limited systematic corroboration of verifiable claims (travel, digital activity, timeline placement)	Appendix D
Rumor-Based Allegations	Several allegations investigated through interviews	Limited documented analytical resolution regarding reliability or corroboration of rumor-based intelligence	Appendix D
Conflict-of-Interest Safeguards	Supervisory presence documented during interview of immediate family member	No documented recusal, reassignment, or disclosure addressing appearance-of-conflict considerations	Appendix E

The observations summarized above are addressed in greater detail in the appendices that follow. Appendix B provides the supporting analysis regarding scene preservation and forensic opportunity. Appendix C addresses investigative follow up, including surveillance and time sensitive digital evidence. Appendix D evaluates interview corroboration, statement reconciliation, and the handling of rumor-based information. Appendix E provides the policy compliance framework, including supervisory and appearance of conflict considerations. Together, these appendices provide the record-based support for the overall assessment and the forward-looking recommendations set forth in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROCEDURAL ENHANCEMENTS

The following recommendations are offered to support continued improvement in investigative documentation, evidence preservation, supervisory review, and procedural consistency in matters involving significant community impact or potential civil rights implications. These recommendations are forward-looking and are not intended to assign fault, determine criminal responsibility, or suggest that investigative personnel acted in bad faith. Rather, the recommendations are based on documentation-based observations identified during this review and are intended to strengthen future investigative practices where similar issues may arise. They focus on procedural safeguards that can improve clarity, preserve evidence, support supervisory oversight, and enhance public confidence in the investigative process.

SCENE PRESERVATION AND FORENSIC ESCALATION PROTOCOL

In investigations involving expressive vandalism, civil-rights implications, or heightened community impact, a structured evidence preservation checklist should be implemented prior to alteration of the scene.

Recommended procedural enhancements include:

- Documented consideration of latent fingerprint processing, DNA collection, and trace evidence recovery prior to scene alteration.
- Formal documentation of decisions regarding consultation with Massachusetts State Police Crime Scene Services or other specialized forensic resources.
- Supervisory sign-off confirming that forensic preservation considerations were evaluated prior to removal of expressive evidence.
- A standardized escalation checklist may help ensure consistent documentation in cases involving public institutions or bias indicators.

TIME-SENSITIVE DIGITAL EVIDENCE PRESERVATION

Investigations involving potential public or commercial surveillance systems may benefit from a documented time-sensitive digital evidence protocol. Recommended enhancements include:

- Immediate documentation of identified surveillance systems during initial canvass.
- Scheduled follow-up contact when initial canvass attempts are unsuccessful.
- Documentation of retention-cycle awareness for commercial digital systems.
- Logging of video review status and analytical integration into investigative decision-making.
- A structured digital preservation tracking log may assist in maintaining continuity in complex or prolonged investigations.

STRUCTURED CORROBORATION STANDARDS

To support objective investigative rigor, implementation of a structured corroboration documentation protocol is recommended. Enhancements may include:

- Documentation of verification efforts for location or timeline claims when evidence is available.
- Documentation of efforts to reconcile materially inconsistent statements.

- Documentation of corroboration of digital device evidence with relevant timelines.

A standardized corroboration worksheet may promote consistency in documenting follow-up investigative steps.

CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE RELIABILITY DOCUMENTATION

When confidential source information has an impact on investigative direction, a structured reliability assessment framework is recommended. Enhancements may include:

- Documentation of source history and prior reliability, where applicable (or application of hearsay standards).
- Structured grading of source credibility and corroboration level.
- Formal reassessment documentation when subsequent developments affect source credibility.
- A standardized confidential source evaluation form may assist in maintaining transparency and analytical clarity within the investigative record.

BIAS-CRIME ESCALATION FRAMEWORK

In matters involving bias indicators or civil-rights violations, formalized escalation documentation procedures may enhance clarity and community confidence.. Enhancements may include:

- Documented reassessment of investigative scope upon confirmation of bias indicators.
- Documentation of consideration of specialized civil-rights or forensic resources.
- Supervisory review notes reflecting evaluation of investigative deployment in relation to case seriousness.
- Formalizing escalation checkpoints may assist in ensuring consistent investigative posture in cases of significant public impact.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECUSAL DOCUMENTATION

In investigations involving an immediate family member, close personal relationship, supervisory relationship, or other circumstance that may create an actual or perceived conflict of interest, formal documentation of recusal considerations is recommended. Recommended enhancements may include:

- Written disclosure of any actual or potential conflict of interest involving department personnel, supervisory staff, witnesses, subjects, or persons of interest.

- Documented assessment of whether recusal, reassignment of investigative oversight, or external agency involvement is warranted.
- Documentation of the rationale for proceeding with or without recusal, reassignment, written disclosure, or independent review.
- Assignment of interviews or investigative decisions involving family members of supervisory personnel to uninvolved supervisory staff or an outside agency where appropriate.
- Maintenance of conflict assessment documentation within the investigative record to support transparency, supervisory accountability, and later review.

A standardized conflict of interest and recusal assessment form may assist in ensuring that actual or perceived conflicts are identified, evaluated, and resolved in a consistent and defensible manner

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the principal record-based observations summarized above, the review identified related procedural areas that may warrant consideration as part of future investigative practice. These areas are not presented as separate findings of investigative deficiency and are not intended to expand the scope of the overall assessment. Rather, they are included as forward looking recommendations that may assist in strengthening supervisory transparency, case review documentation, public communication practices, and case disposition clarity in matters involving significant community impact or heightened public concern.

SUPERVISORY DOCUMENTATION AND CASE REVIEW

Structured supervisory documentation protocols may further strengthen investigative transparency. Enhancements may include:

- Periodic documented supervisory case reviews in prolonged investigations.
- Documentation of investigative strategy reassessments when significant new information emerges.
- Logging of decisions not to pursue specific investigative avenues, where appropriate.
- Such documentation may assist future review and promote institutional clarity.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION AND CASE DISPOSITION TRANSPARENCY

In matters of substantial public concern, structured communication protocols may assist in maintaining community confidence. Enhancements may include:

- Formal public statements upon referral to prosecutorial authorities clarifying investigative posture.
- Public clarification when investigative status changes, where legally permissible.
- Documentation of referral outcomes within the investigative record.

This recommendation is forward-looking and recognizes that public communication decisions remain subject to prosecutorial discretion and legal constraints.

G O V



Supporting Appendices

G O V



APPENDICES

The following appendices provide supporting analysis for the findings and observations summarized in the body of this report. Each appendix is intended to organize the underlying documentation by subject area, including investigative chronology, scene preservation, investigative follow up, interview corroboration, policy compliance, and public meeting records. These appendices do not expand the scope of this review or constitute a separate criminal investigation. Rather, they provide the record based foundation for assessing whether documented investigative actions were consistent with applicable departmental directives, accepted policing and professional investigative standards, and governing law in effect at the time of the incident.

The appendices should be read together with the executive findings and recommendations. Where the investigative record affirmatively documents action taken, that action is identified and evaluated. Where the record is silent or incomplete, the appendices do not assume misconduct, inaction, or failure to take appropriate action beyond what can reasonably be inferred from the available documentation. The purpose of this structure is to distinguish documented investigative activity from areas where the record does not contain sufficient information to independently confirm additional action, analysis, or supervisory review.

- **Appendix A:** Investigative Chronology
- **Appendix B:** Scene Preservation and Forensic Opportunity Analysis
- **Appendix C:** Investigative Follow Up
- **Appendix D:** Interview Corroboration And Statement Reconciliation Analysis
- **Appendix E:** Policy Compliance Analysis
- **Appendix F:** Public Meeting Record Review / Town Administrative Response
- **Appendix G:** African Meeting House Site Visit Assessment

APPENDIX A: INVESTIGATIVE CHRONOLOGY

This appendix provides a chronological reconstruction of documented investigative activity derived from incident reports, supplemental reports, witness interviews, investigative correspondence, canvass documentation, evidentiary records, and related materials contained within the investigative record.

The chronology was prepared to assist in evaluating investigative sequencing, evidentiary preservation, witness follow-up, surveillance-related efforts, and the timing of documented investigative actions relative to the availability of potentially transient evidence and other time-sensitive investigative opportunities.

Portions of this report have been redacted or anonymized to preserve the identities and privacy of involved individuals, including residents, juveniles, persons determined through investigation not to have been involved in the incident, and individuals named through second and third-hand rumors or social media speculation. Where individuals are referenced, initials or descriptive titles may be used in place of full names. Any names appearing in this report were obtained from publicly available sources.

Date / Time	Investigative Event	Significance
03/10/2018 – approx. 4:00 PM	Caretaker last observed the African Meeting House without vandalism.	Establishes latest known undamaged condition of the property.
03/10/2018 – approx. 11:00 PM	Babysitter reported leaving the area and observing no vandalism at that time.	Narrows probable time window of offense occurrence.
03/11/2018 – approx. 1:00 AM	Witness walked home from the Chicken Box and reported seeing no suspicious persons or activity.	Further narrows potential offense timeline.
03/11/2018 – 6:53 AM	Nantucket Police received report of vandalism at 29 York Street. Incident officially logged as Case No. 18-004506.	Initial law enforcement notification.
03/11/2018 – approx. 7:24 AM	Officer dispatched to African Meeting House for reported vandalism.	Initial patrol response initiated.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Officers observed racist graffiti reading “Nigger Leave!” painted on the front doors and additional obscene imagery on the building exterior.	Confirmation of racially motivated vandalism and probable hate crime indicators.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Detective responded to assume investigative responsibilities.	Transition from patrol response to investigative phase.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Immediate neighborhood canvass initiated by multiple responding officers.	Early witness identification and evidence preservation effort.

Date / Time	Investigative Event	Significance
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Detectives identified neighboring renovation property at 27 York Street with partially open side door and paint supplies inside.	Potential source of spray paint and possible offender access point identified.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Detectives documented two sets of fresh footprints near 27 York Street. One print contained a distinct circular pattern. Photographs were taken.	Potential physical evidence linking movement patterns near scene.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Paint scrapings collected from vandalized door and secured into evidence for possible future testing.	Physical evidence preservation.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Officers identified a Nest camera at 32 York Street facing toward the Meeting House area. Investigation determined recording subscription was inactive and no footage existed.	Potential surveillance opportunity determined unavailable.
03/11/2018 – morning hours	Supervisor organized expanded neighborhood canvasses across York Street, Pleasant Street, Atlantic Avenue, and West Dover Street.	Broad area investigative sweep initiated.
03/11/2018 – approx. 9:30 AM	Supervisor II conducted supplemental canvass of Pleasant Street corridor.	Additional neighborhood witness development effort.
03/11/2018 – approx. 10:00 AM	Officer II conducted additional Atlantic Avenue canvass and resident interviews.	Expansion of investigative perimeter and witness contacts.
03/11/2018 – late morning	Graffiti was cleaned and sanded from the building with supervisory approval after assessment that damage could be removed without repainting.	Significant scene alteration occurred shortly after initial response.
03/11/2018 – scene clearance	Requests for extra patrol checks at both the Meeting House and caretaker residence were entered by detectives.	Ongoing security measures implemented.
03/13/2018	Police received information regarding Facebook comments posted by two individuals discussing the vandalism.	Social media lead development initiated.
03/13/2018	Nantucket detectives coordinated with Brewster and Yarmouth investigators regarding follow-up interviews and alibi verification of two individuals information.	Interagency investigative coordination.
03/14/2018	Anonymous student provided names of possible involved individuals, including Subject A & B.	Emergence of local suspect leads.
03/14/2018	Detective interviewed Subject B, a second individual and Subject C regarding activities on the night of the vandalism.	Initial suspect/witness interviews conducted.
03/15–03/16/2018	Detectives contacted Subject A by telephone while he was reportedly in Florida. Subject A admitted driving through the downtown/York Street area during the relevant timeframe but denied involvement.	Subject placed near incident area during probable offense window.

Date / Time	Investigative Event	Significance
03/20/2018 – 3:00 PM	Detectives conducted formal recorded interview of Subject B at Nantucket Police Department.	Formal custodial-style investigative interview conducted.
03/20/2018 – 4:34 PM	Detective interviewed Subject E regarding rumors, Snapchat activity, and possible suspects.	Follow-up intelligence and rumor verification effort.
Post-March 2018	Investigation remained open and ongoing according to supplementary reports.	No documented closure or prosecution reflected within reviewed excerpts.

The reconstructed chronology demonstrates that responding officers initiated a broad canvass effort and identified several investigative leads within the first 72 hours following the incident. However, the sequence and timing of evidence preservation decisions, scene processing actions, witness follow-up, and digital investigative measures are critical to evaluating overall investigative effectiveness and are examined in subsequent sections of this report.



APPENDIX B: SCENE PRESERVATION AND FORENSIC OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS

This appendix documents the sequence of events related to the discovery, processing, preservation, and alteration of the crime scene at the African Meeting House on March 11, 2018. It is included because crime scene preservation is a foundational investigative function, particularly where the incident involves potential bias motivated vandalism, public concern, and physical evidence that may be lost or compromised once the scene is altered.

The appendix evaluates the forensic processing efforts reflected in the investigative record before removal of the graffiti, including documented photography, collection of paint scrapings, observation of footprint evidence, and identification of potentially relevant physical evidence in the surrounding area. It also identifies areas where the record does not reflect additional forensic steps, such as latent fingerprint processing, DNA collection, advanced trace evidence recovery, or consultation with specialized crime scene resources before the scene was cleaned.

This analysis is based exclusively on the investigative record, dispatch audio, radio traffic, evidence documentation, and applicable Nantucket Police Department policy in effect at the time. The purpose is not to conclude that unrecorded actions did not occur, but to assess what the available documentation shows regarding scene preservation, forensic opportunity, and compliance with accepted evidence preservation practices..

INCIDENT DISCOVERY AND INITIAL RESPONSE TIMELINE

The following timeline is derived from dispatch logs, radio traffic, and officer reports contained in the investigative record.

- 06:48 hours – March 11, 2018
 - A caller reports racially offensive graffiti at the African Meeting House located at 29 York Street (Dispatch Audio Log, 03-11-18).
- 07:11–07:22 hours
 - Dispatch contacts the property caretaker, who confirms the vandalism and indicates she must leave the island. Police response is requested (Dispatch Audio Log, 03-11-18).
- 07:24 hours
 - Officer is dispatched and responds to the scene (Incident Report, 03-11-18).
- Approximately 08:00 hours
 - Radio traffic confirms officer presence and observation of black spray paint on the building (Radio Traffic Recording, 03-11-18).

- 08:38 hours
 - Radio traffic includes the statement:
 - *“Call them back, notify the Chief this is going to be a PR nightmare. I’m going to need a lot more officers to come on in.”*
 - (Radio Traffic Recording, 03-11-18, 08:38 hrs).
- 08:45–08:52 hours
 - Dispatch contacts off-duty officers for overtime response due to the vandalism (Dispatch Log, 03-11-18).
- 09:28–09:33 hours
 - Radio traffic indicates Department of Public Works personnel are being contacted. A statement is broadcast over the radio:
 - *“It’s investigated, it’s all done.”*
 - (Radio Traffic Recording, 03-11-18).
- Shortly thereafter (exact time not documented)
 - The property caretaker is granted permission by a supervising officer to remove the graffiti. The graffiti is cleaned from the building by the caretaker and bystanders (Supplemental Report Narrative, 03-11-18).
- Approximately 09:30 hours
 - Supervisor arrives on scene and a structured neighborhood canvass is initiated (Incident Report, 03-11-18).

DOCUMENTED SCENE CONDITIONS AND EVIDENCE HANDLING

The investigative record reflects the following documented actions prior to removal of the vandalism:

- Photographs of the graffiti and surrounding scene were taken by a detective (Incident Report Narrative, 03-11-18).
- Fresh footprints were observed on the exterior and interior in the dirt / dust and photographed (Incident Report, 03-11-18).
- Paint scrapings were collected from the building and entered into evidence (Evidence Log, 03-11-18).

The record does not contain documentation reflecting that the following forensic steps were attempted, or that their feasibility or evidentiary viability was assessed before the scene was altered:

- Latent fingerprint recovery attempts (dusting, chemical processing, alternate light source examination).
- DNA swabbing of the painted surface.

- Trace collection beyond paint scrapings (e.g., fiber, particulate recovery).
- Request for Massachusetts State Police Crime Scene Services assistance.

The record reflects that members of the public were present at the location during the initial response period and prior to removal of the graffiti (Incident Report Narrative, 03-11-18).

POLICY REFERENCE - DIRECTIVE 601 (COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE)

Directive 601 – Collection and Preservation of Evidence provides that officers shall:

- Protect and process the crime scene as appropriate.
- Properly collect, record, and preserve items recovered of potential evidentiary value.
- Remain vigilant to protect crime scenes from contamination.
- Utilize specialized forensic resources where appropriate to recover latent fingerprints, trace evidence, or biological material.

The policy emphasizes methodical processing to avoid contaminating, missing, or destroying evidence.

Policy Expectation (Directive 601)	Documented Action	Observed Gap
Protect and secure scene from contamination	Public present during response; cleaning permitted shortly after arrival	No documented perimeter control preventing contamination prior to cleaning
Preserve physical evidence prior to alteration	Photographs taken; paint scrapings collected	No documented latent print, DNA, or advanced trace processing prior to graffiti removal
Utilize specialized forensic resources when appropriate	No documented request for MSP Crime Scene Services	No documented evaluation of need for specialized forensic assistance
Methodical processing prior to destruction of evidence	Graffiti removed shortly after response	Forensic opportunities foreclosed by early alteration

SUMMARY

The record reflects prompt response and initial documentation of the graffiti, including photographs and collection of paint scrapings. However, the scene was altered through cleaning shortly after initial response, and prior to any documented feasibility assessment relating to latent fingerprint recovery, DNA collection, or advanced trace analysis.

No documentation reflects consideration or request for specialized forensic assistance prior to alteration of the scene. The presence of members of the public during the response period further increased the risk of contamination.

The removal of the graffiti resulted in permanent loss of potentially probative forensic and trace evidence. When evaluated against Directive 601's emphasis on scene protection, contamination avoidance, and methodical processing, the documented sequence reflects that full forensic opportunity was not preserved prior to alteration of the crime scene.

G O V

APPENDIX C: INVESTIGATIVE FOLLOW UP

This appendix summarizes documented investigative follow up activity related to surveillance identification, digital evidence preservation, receipt of requested media, and subsequent access to potentially relevant video material. The purpose of this appendix is to provide a focused chronology of follow up efforts that occurred after the initial response and to assess whether time sensitive investigative opportunities were documented, preserved, reviewed, and integrated into the investigative record.

Surveillance and digital evidence are included in this appendix because such evidence can be critical in corroborating witness statements, confirming or excluding the movement of persons of interest, narrowing timelines, and identifying potential travel routes before and after an offense. In investigations involving a significant community impact incident, especially one with potential bias motivated elements, the timely identification, preservation, retrieval, and review of surveillance material is an important component of accepted investigative practice.

This appendix does not assume that investigative actions did or did not occur where the record is silent. Rather, it identifies what the available documentation reflects, where follow up efforts were documented, and where the record does not contain sufficient information to confirm additional preservation, review, or analytical use of time sensitive digital evidence.

TIMELINE OF SURVEILLANCE INQUIRY AND REQUESTS

March 11, 2018 – Vandalism occurred during the overnight hours preceding March 11, 2018 (Incident Report, 03-11-18).

March 19, 2018 - The investigative record reflects that a request was made to Cape Cod Five Cents Savings Bank for exterior surveillance footage (Supplemental Report, 03-19-18).

The investigative record reflects that officers conducted an initial neighborhood canvass on March 11, 2018, including inquiries regarding potential surveillance systems (Incident Report, 03-11-18). The file documents contact with certain residences; however, it does not reflect documented follow-up contact with locations where no one answered, nor does it document a subsequent re-canvass focused on preservation of surveillance footage.

DIGITAL MEDIA RECEIPT AND ACCESS

April 25, 2018 - The investigative record reflects receipt of a thumb drive from Cape Cod Five Cents Savings Bank containing surveillance footage (Evidence Log Entry, 04-25-18).

May 5, 2018 - The record reflects that access to the surveillance footage was delayed due to password protection, and the video was not accessed until approximately May 5, 2018 (Supplemental Report, 05-05-18).

The file does not contain documentation summarizing analytical findings from review of the footage, nor does it reflect documented integration of the footage into investigative decision-making.

RETENTION AND PRESERVATION CONSIDERATIONS

Commercial surveillance systems commonly operate on limited digital retention cycles, often ranging from several days to several weeks depending on system capacity and overwrite configuration.

The investigative record does not contain documentation of emergency preservation requests issued within the first 24–48 hours following discovery of the vandalism. Nor does the file reflect documented follow-up to secure footage from additional businesses or residences along travel corridors identified in subsequent interviews.

POLICY REFERENCE – DIRECTIVE 301 (FOLLOW-UP INVESTIGATIONS)

Directive 301 requires that officers conduct thorough follow-up investigations and pursue reasonable investigative leads. The directive emphasizes documentation of investigative steps and supervisory oversight of case progression.

Time-sensitive digital evidence preservation falls within the scope of follow-up investigative obligations when such evidence may corroborate presence, movement, or timeline of persons of interest.

SUMMARY

The investigative record reflects that surveillance footage was requested from one financial institution approximately 8 days after the incident. The footage was received more than 1 month later and was not accessed until nearly 2 months after the vandalism due to password restrictions.

While an initial neighborhood canvass was conducted on the date of discovery, the file does not reflect documented, sustained video preservation efforts or expanded surveillance requests following the development of suspect placement information.

Given the time-sensitive nature of digital surveillance retention systems, delayed request, receipt, and access materially limited the potential evidentiary value of available video.

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW CORROBORATION AND STATEMENT RECONCILIATION ANALYSIS

This appendix evaluates the documented interviews conducted during the investigation and assesses whether the investigative record reflects corroborative follow up, reconciliation of material inconsistencies, and objective verification of statements, timelines, alibis, and rumor-based allegations. Interview documentation is a significant component of investigative review because witness and subject statements often require comparison against independent evidence before they can be relied upon to confirm, exclude, or prioritize investigative leads.

The purpose of this appendix is not to determine criminal responsibility or to make credibility findings in hindsight. Rather, it evaluates whether the available documentation reflects reasonable efforts to test material statements against independently verifiable information, including witness follow up, surveillance evidence, transactional records, travel records, digital activity, cellular or application-based data, and other objective sources where such information was reasonably identifiable.

For purposes of clarity, consistency, and privacy protection, individuals referenced in this appendix are identified using standardized anonymized designations rather than names or initials. Civilian subjects are identified as "Subject A" through "Subject [X]," juveniles as "Juvenile A," confidential informants or anonymous sources as "Confidential Source 1," and other non-public individuals by similarly descriptive identifiers where appropriate. Nantucket Police Department personnel are identified by functional role rather than by name, such as "Chief," "Command Staff," "Detective," or "Officer," unless a specific title is necessary for context. These conventions are intended to facilitate a clear understanding of investigative actions and decision-making while minimizing the unnecessary disclosure of personally identifying information, particularly for juveniles, witnesses, and individuals referenced through rumor, anonymous reporting, or secondhand information.

INVESTIGATIVE DEVELOPMENT CHRONOLOGY

Following the initial response and neighborhood canvass on March 11, 2018, persons of interest began to emerge through community tips, social media activity, school related information, and statements from individuals familiar with those later identified during the investigation.

On March 15, 2018, investigators documented a social media interaction between two off-island individuals referencing vandalism. Coordination occurred with outside agencies, including the Brewster Police Department and interviews were conducted. Alibi information was obtained from 1 individual through a third party.

On the same date, information was received from a school-related source indicating that 2 local individuals had been together on the evening in question based on social media activity. This information prompted follow-up interviews with multiple individuals associated with that group.

Between March 16 and March 23, 2018, detectives conducted interviews of individuals identified through peer association and rumor-based allegations.

On March 30, 2018, additional interviews were conducted following receipt of an anonymous tip.

In April 2018, further allegations arose through community rumors, prompting additional interviews and follow-up contacts.

In May 2018, another individual was interviewed after their name arose during the course of the investigation.

In June 2019, confidential source information was received alleging an admission of responsibility. Subsequent investigative activity followed.

SUBJECT A.

Entry into Investigation

The investigative record reflects that Subject A first entered the investigation on March 15, 2018, following information received from a school-related source indicating that he had been in the company of another individual during the evening preceding discovery of the vandalism. The information referenced social media activity suggesting that the two individuals were together during the relevant timeframe.

Subsequent interviews of associated individuals referenced Subject A's presence in the downtown area during the night in question.

Reported Location and Timeline

On March 15, 2018, a NPD Detective attempted to contact Subject A by cellular telephone after learning that he had recently traveled off-island. A voicemail message was left. On March 16, 2018, the Detective again attempted to contact Subject A and left a second voicemail. Subject A subsequently returned the call and participated in a voluntary telephone interview.

During the interview, Subject A stated that he had traveled to Florida on March 12, 2018, to visit his uncle. He reported that on the night of March 10 he arrived at the Chicken Box around midnight and left approximately thirty minutes later because, according to him, the establishment was playing rap music rather than hosting the advertised country music night. Subject A stated that he walked home, entered his

vehicle, and took what he described as a "quick cruise" to Madaket before driving back through the downtown area and north on York Street through Five Corners. He acknowledged driving past the African Meeting House but stated that he did not observe any graffiti, never exited his truck, and denied any involvement in the vandalism. When the Detective asked whether surveillance footage would show him getting out of his vehicle in front of the Meeting House, Subject A replied, "No."

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject A's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Surveillance footage from establishments and travel routes described.
- Transportation or travel documentation regarding off-island travel.
- Witness confirmation from individuals reportedly in his company.
- Digital location data from cellular devices or social media platforms acknowledged as in use that evening.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that interviews were conducted with certain individuals reportedly associated with Subject A on the evening in question. However, the record does not reflect documented verification of off-island travel through travel records or independent documentation. Within the file was a receipt from the Hyline Cruise (Island ferry service) dated March 11, 2018, for a 10:30 am departure from Nantucket arriving in Hyannis at 11:30 am. The document was redacted to any personal identifiable information, nowhere in the report is the significance of this receipt mentioned

The record also does not reflect documented review of cellular device location data, application-based metadata, or carrier-based location services associated with Subject A for the relevant timeframe.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of subject A's mobile device was requested or conducted, rather, during an in-person interview, Subject A stated he forgot to bring in his cellular phone and was not pressed for voluntary access.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The file reflects differences in detail between Subject A's initial telephone interview and subsequent in-person interview, particularly regarding timing and movement through specific downtown locations.

The record also reflects acknowledgment of alcohol consumption and impairment during the relevant timeframe, which may affect clarity of recollection.

The file does not contain documented reconciliation of these variations through objective verification measures.

Reconciliation and Supervisory Oversight

The record reflects that interviews were documented and follow-up contact occurred. However, the file does not reflect documented reconciliation of timeline inconsistencies through independent corroborative measures.

No documentation appears indicating supervisory directive to pursue additional digital or travel verification related to Subject A's stated movements.

Subsequent Allegations and Civil Proceedings

In June 2019, confidential source information was received alleging that Subject A had admitted responsibility for the defacing. The file reflects that this allegation prompted additional investigative activity by way of a follow-up interview with command staff, and referral to the detective unit, which, in turn, conducted an in-person interview.

Separately, public records show that Subject A was later found civilly responsible in related proceedings. Civil liability determinations are governed by a preponderance-of-the-evidence standard and are distinct from criminal prosecutorial standards.

This appendix does not render any opinion regarding criminal culpability.

Summary

The investigative record reflects that Subject A was interviewed and denied involvement. While certain follow-up interviews were conducted, the file does not reflect systematic objective corroboration of his stated movements, digital activity, or travel.

The absence of documented verification of potentially verifiable assertions limited the ability to objectively confirm or exclude Subject A based on independently established evidence.

SUBJECT B.

Entry into Investigation

Subject B entered the investigation on March 15, 2018, following information received from a school-related source indicating that he had been in the company of Subject A during the evening preceding discovery of vandalism. Based upon the report from the school source, social media activity suggested that the two individuals were together during the relevant timeframe.

Subject B was subsequently interviewed by investigators.

Reported Location and Timeline

During an initial interview, Subject B was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He acknowledged being in the downtown area on the night in question. He reported consuming alcohol and being impaired. He denied involvement in the vandalism and denied knowledge of who was responsible.

In a subsequent in-person interview conducted on March 23, 2018, Subject B provided additional clarification regarding his movements and reiterated that he and Subject A had been together but denied entering the Five Corners area or approaching the African Meeting House.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject B's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Surveillance footage from establishments and travel routes described.
- Witness confirmation from individuals reportedly in his company.
- Digital location data from cellular devices or social media platforms acknowledged as in use that evening.

Documented Verification Efforts

The record reflects that associated individuals were interviewed. However, the file does not reflect documented retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject B for the relevant timeframe.

The record does not reflect documented verification of Subject B's stated movements through surveillance footage beyond the limited request to a single financial institution described in Appendix C.

No documentation appears indicating that consent-based digital review of Subject B's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject B.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The investigative record reflects minor variations in the specificity of Subject B's timeline across interviews. The record also reflects acknowledgment of alcohol consumption and impairment during the relevant timeframe.

The file does not contain documented reconciliation of timeline variations through objective verification measures.

Reconciliation and Supervisory Oversight

The investigative record reflects that Subject B was interviewed more than once. However, the file does not reflect documented supervisory direction to pursue additional objective corroboration of his placement or digital activity.

Summary

The record reflects that Subject B was interviewed but denied involvement. While associated individuals were contacted, the file does not reflect systematic objective corroboration of his stated movements or digital activity.

As with Subject A, the absence of documented independent verification limited the ability to objectively confirm or exclude Subject B based on independently established evidence.

SUBJECT C.

Entry into Investigation

Subject C entered the investigation following information that he had been in the company of Subjects A and B during the evening preceding discovery of vandalism. His name arose during interviews conducted in response to information received linking that group to downtown activity.

He was subsequently interviewed by investigators.

Reported Location and Timeline

During his interview, Subject C was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He acknowledged being with Subjects A and B at various points during the evening in question. He described social activity, alcohol consumption, and movement within the downtown area. He denied involvement in or knowledge of the vandalism.

His statements provided contextual information regarding the group's movements but did not place himself or others at the African Meeting House.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject C's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Surveillance footage from establishments referenced.
- Digital location data from his cellular device or application-based activity.
- Cross-comparison of his timeline with those provided by Subjects A and B.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that Subject C was interviewed and that his statements were documented. However, the record does not reflect documented retrieval or review of digital location data associated with Subject C.

The file does not reflect documented reconciliation of his timeline against independently verified surveillance beyond the limited video request described in Appendix C.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Subject C's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject C.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The investigative record reflects variations between Subject C's timeline and those provided by other associated individuals regarding specific movements and timing during the evening.

The record does not contain documentation indicating that such variations were reconciled through objective verification measures.

Reconciliation and Supervisory Oversight

The investigative record reflects that Subject C's interview was documented and incorporated into the case file. However, no documentation appears reflecting supervisory direction to pursue additional corroboration of his placement through digital or surveillance verification.

Summary

The investigative record reflects that Subject C was interviewed and provided contextual information regarding the group's activities but denied involvement in the vandalism. While interviews were conducted, the file does not reflect systematic reconciliation of timeline variations between associated individuals through independently verifiable evidence.

SUBJECT D.

Entry into Investigation

Subject D entered the investigation on March 19, 2018, after his name arose during interviews conducted in connection with peer associations linked to the evening preceding discovery of the vandalism.

He voluntarily appeared at the police station and was subsequently interviewed by detectives.

Reported Location and Timeline

Subject D was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He stated that on the evening preceding discovery of the vandalism, he had been with Subject E. He reported that they were driving between their respective houses and that he was home by approximately 10:30 p.m. He stated they were not drinking.

Subject D indicated that he “wanted to say” they had also been with two other individuals earlier in the day and that they had gone to Cisco, though he described the day as “not memorable.”

He denied driving by the African Meeting House and denied knowledge of involvement in the vandalism.

Rumor Information Provided

Subject D stated that he had heard through “word of mouth” that Subject A and Subject B. had committed the vandalism. He characterized the information as coming from “kids at school” and described it as unreliable, stating, “reliability, your guess is as good as mine.” He acknowledged that he had no concrete information.

He further suggested that investigators might inquire at “the Auto Body” when asked if there was other information he knew of or any location, they might go for a better understanding to which he stated, “The Auto Body, because they are pretty notorious.”

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject D’s statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Verification of his placement with Subject E. during the relevant timeframe.
- Cross-comparison of his timeline with that of Subject E.
- Surveillance review along travel routes described (between residences).
- Digital or cellular location data corresponding to the timeframe.
- Attempts to identify other witnesses to Subject D’s activities

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that Subject E. was later interviewed. However, the file does not reflect documented retrieval or review of digital location data associated with Subject D.

The record does not reflect documented reconciliation of Subject D’s stated 10:30 p.m. home return time against independently verified surveillance evidence.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Subject D's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject D.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

Subject D's statement that he and Subject E were together all night until approximately 10:30 p.m. constitutes a verifiable alibi claim. The investigative record does not contain documentation reflecting objective confirmation of that timeline.

Additionally, while Subject D relayed rumor-based allegations concerning other individuals, the record reflects that he explicitly disclaimed reliability of that information.

Reconciliation and Supervisory Oversight

The investigative record reflects that Subject D was interviewed, however, the file does not reflect documented supervisory direction to pursue objective corroboration of his placement claim through digital or surveillance verification.

Summary

Subject D stated he was with another individual and home by approximately 10:30 p.m. While a follow-up interview of the associated individual occurred, the record does not reflect documented independent verification of Subject D's timeline through surveillance, digital evidence or other methods.

During his interview, Subject D identified additional individuals (including Subject E and a second individual) as having been present earlier in the day. The investigative record does not reflect documented interviews of those individuals. As a result, the record does not reflect independent corroboration or clarification of their potential relevance

Subject D also relayed rumor-based allegations but expressly characterized them as unreliable.

This assessment is confined to documentation contained within the investigative record.

SUBJECT E.

Entry into Investigation

Subject E entered the investigation after being identified by Subject D as having been with him during the evening preceding discovery of the vandalism. Subject D stated that he and Subject E were together driving between their residences and that Subject D returned home at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Subject E was subsequently interviewed by investigators.

Reported Location and Timeline

During his interview, Subject E was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He stated that he had been with Subject D during the evening in question. He described driving between residences and socializing but denied being present at the African Meeting House or participating in the vandalism.

Subject E did not place himself in the Five Corners area during the relevant timeframe.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject E's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Cross-verification of the shared timeline between Subject D and Subject E.
- Surveillance review along the routes described between residences.
- Digital or cellular location data corresponding to the timeframe.
- Attempts to identify other witnesses to Subject E's activities.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that both Subject D and Subject E were interviewed. However, the record does not reflect documented independent verification of their shared timeline through surveillance, digital metadata, other means.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Subject E's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject E.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The investigative record does not reflect major direct contradictions between Subject D's and Subject E's statements regarding their shared placement. However, the record does not reflect documented reconciliation of their timeline through objective verification measures.

Reconciliation and Supervisory Oversight

The investigative record reflects that Subject E's interview was documented and incorporated into the case file. The file does not reflect documented supervisory direction to pursue additional corroboration of the alibi claim through independent digital or surveillance verification.

Summary (Record-Based Assessment)

Subject E provided a placement claim consistent with that of Subject D. While interviews were conducted and documented, the record does not reflect systematic objective verification of the shared alibi through independently established evidence.

This assessment is confined to documentation contained within the investigative record.

SUBJECT F.

Entry into Investigation

Subject F entered the investigation on March 30, 2018, after investigators received an anonymous allegation stating that he and another individual were responsible for the vandalism. The anonymous source alleged that the vandalism began as drawing a penis and that Subject F escalated it to racial vandalism.

Subject F was subsequently interviewed.

Reported Location and Timeline

Subject F was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He stated that he was “more likely than not” at home during the night and early morning hours when the vandalism occurred. He stated that he was not hanging out with friends during that time. He indicated that his parents could support his statement that he remained home.

He denied involvement in the vandalism and denied being with Subject G that night, stating he had not recently spent time with him.

When informed of the anonymous allegation and its specifics, Subject F denied the accusation. The report notes that during questioning about the specifics of the allegation, Subject F appeared nervous and changed posture.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject F’s statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Confirmation from his parents regarding his presence at home.
- Surveillance review of the area near his residence.
- Digital or cellular location data corresponding to the timeframe.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that Subject F was interviewed and that the anonymous allegation was presented to him. The record does not reflect documented follow-up interviews with his parents to verify his placement claim.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Subject F's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject F.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The investigative record reflects that Subject F denied being with Subject G that evening and denied involvement. No direct contradictions are documented within his own statement.

The anonymous allegation included specific details regarding escalation of the vandalism; however, the file does not reflect documentation of independent corroboration of those details beyond the allegation itself.

Summary

Subject F denied involvement and provided a home-based alibi claim supported, according to him, by his parents. While the allegation was investigated through interview, the record does not reflect documentation of independent verification of his stated placement through third-party confirmation or digital evidence.

This assessment is confined to documentation contained within the investigative record.

SUBJECT G.

Entry into Investigation

Subject G entered the investigation on March 30, 2018, following the same anonymous allegation that named Subject F and Subject G as perpetrators of the vandalism.

He was subsequently interviewed.

Reported Location and Timeline

Subject G was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding of them, and executed a written waiver prior to questioning. He stated that he knew why he had been asked to come to the police station. He explained that he had sent a direct message on Instagram to a friend, which gave the impression of a personal basis of knowledge and asserting responsibility.

Subject G stated that this message was intended as a joke. He voluntarily showed investigators the message thread on his cellular phone, which was dated March 11, 2018, at 3:16 p.m.

Subject G denied involvement in the vandalism and stated that he had been playing video games in his room at home during the night and early morning hours of the incident. He indicated that his brother could verify his placement.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject G's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Verification of his presence at home by his brother.
- Digital metadata associated with the Instagram message.
- Cellular location data corresponding to the timeframe.
- Online video game or other console records.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that a detective contacted the recipient of the Instagram message, who confirmed receiving the message and stated that he understood it to be a joke. The recipient indicated he did not believe Subject G committed the vandalism.

The record does not reflect documented follow-up verification of Subject G's placement claim with his brother.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Subject G's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Subject G.

Inconsistencies Documented in the Record

The investigative record reflects that Subject G acknowledged sending the Instagram message containing a statement implying responsibility but characterized it as a joke. He denied involvement during questioning.

No additional contradictions are documented within his statement.

Summary

Subject G denied involvement and characterized his Instagram message as a joke. Investigators confirmed the existence of the message and contacted its recipient, who stated he understood it as a joke.

While the anonymous allegation was investigated through interview and confirmation of the message's authenticity, the record does not reflect independent verification of Subject G's stated placement at home through third-party confirmation or digital evidence.

This assessment is confined to documentation contained within the investigative record.

JUVENILE A

Entry into Investigation

Juvenile A entered the investigation in April 2018 after his name surfaced through community rumor. On April 13, 2018, investigators spoke with members of the American Legion who reported that "there was talk" of Juvenile A being involved. The individuals contacted were unable to identify who first raised his name or provide first-hand knowledge of involvement. As of May 1, 2018, no source had identified a specific originator of the allegation. Furthermore, detectives followed multiple rumor sources, as many as 4 times removed in efforts at identifying the original source of this information. No witnesses could name where the allegation originated from, other than "Bar talk."

The investigative record reflects that the rumor was not attributed to any named witness with direct knowledge.

Formal Interview

On June 25, 2018, Juvenile A was interviewed at the Nantucket Police Department in the presence of his father. He was advised of his Miranda rights, acknowledged understanding them, and signed a written waiver.

Juvenile A denied involvement in the vandalism. He stated that on the night of March 10 he went to Lola Burger at approximately 9:30 p.m., returned home, and watched Netflix with his mother. He stated that he did not leave his residence after returning home. He suggested that a credit card entry might confirm his visit to Lola Burger and that Netflix history could potentially reflect viewing activity.

He denied discussing the vandalism with others, denied knowledge of who committed the offense, and denied participating in related social media commentary.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Juvenile A's statements, potential objective corroboration opportunities included:

- Credit card transaction records for the reported Lola Burger visit
- Surveillance footage from Lola Burger

- Netflix account viewing history
- Parental confirmation of his presence at home
- Cellular device location data

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that Juvenile A's interview was conducted and documented. The record reflected that detectives were able to corroborate some of Juvenile A's assertions by obtaining a receipt from Lola Burger consistent with his statement of having been out to dinner with his parents. However, other verifiable opportunities existed such as Netflix viewing history, or independent verification of his placement claim through digital location data.

The record also does not reflect identification of the originator of the rumor that initially named him.

No documentation appears within the file indicating that limited consent-based digital review of Juvenile A's mobile device was requested or conducted or indicating retrieval or review of cellular device location data associated with Juvenile A.

Summary

Juvenile A was identified through rumor-based allegations that were not attributed to a named source with direct knowledge. Investigators conducted a formal interview and documented his denial and placement claim.

The investigative record does practically reflect independent verification of his stated whereabouts through transactional receipts.

Supervisory Presence and Appearance Considerations

The investigative record reflects that Juvenile A is the child of a command staff member of the Nantucket Police Department. The record further reflects that this command staff member was present during the interview conducted by detectives operating under his supervisory authority.. The file does not contain documentation reflecting supervisory recusal, written disclosure, or reassignment of investigative authority in connection with the interview of Juvenile A.

The presence of a supervising official during the interview of an immediate family member may demonstrate the appearance-of-conflict considerations under Massachusetts General Laws c. 268A, §23(b)(3), which addresses circumstances in which a reasonable person could conclude that kinship or personal relationships might improperly influence official action.

This assessment does not conclude that improper influence occurred. However, the investigative record does not reflect safeguards, such as recusal, reassignment, independent oversight, or written disclosure designed to mitigate appearance concerns and preserve investigative independence.

Additionally, Massachusetts law recognizes heightened procedural protections during custodial interviews of juveniles through the “interested adult” doctrine, which generally requires that a juvenile have the opportunity to consult with an adult acting in the juvenile’s interests prior to waiver of constitutional rights. While a parent may ordinarily satisfy that role, the simultaneous supervisory and familial relationship present here raises questions as to whether the adult present could reasonably be viewed as fully independent of the investigative process.

Best practices and arguably the more defensible course from an integrity and risk-management standpoint, would have included:

- Formal recusal of the command staff from any operational or supervisory involvement in the investigation involving his son;
- Assignment of investigative oversight and interview responsibility to an outside agency or uninvolved supervisory personnel;
- Removal of the command staff from the interview setting to avoid both actual and perceived coercive influence;
- Use of a more independent “interested adult,” such as another uninvolved guardian, counsel, or independent advocate; and
- Full written documentation of all recusals, reassignments, and procedural safeguards implemented to preserve investigative integrity and public confidence.

SUBJECT H.

Initial Contact and Disclosure

The investigative record reflects that in or about June 2019, Subject H met with a command staff member of police department and reported that Subject A had admitted responsibility for the vandalism of the African Meeting House.

The investigative record reflects that in or about June 2019, Subject H met with a command staff member of the Nantucket Police Department and reported that Subject A had admitted to him responsibility for the vandalism of the African Meeting House. According to the documented account, Subject A allegedly stated that he had become intoxicated while searching for a boat belonging to an individual who

purportedly owed him money and intended to vandalize that boat by spray-painting a derogatory term on it. After being unable to locate the boat, Subject A allegedly drove to the African Meeting House, stopped in front of the building, and spray-painted the racial slur. Subject H further reported that Subject A stated that if he were identified as the perpetrator, he intended to relocate to Kansas. The information was documented by the command staff member and subsequently referred to a Detective who memorialized the allegations in a Confidential Source (CS-1) report for investigative follow-up.

The record reflects that Subject H expressed a desire to remain anonymous at the time of the initial contact. The command staff member documented the information and reported the allegation through appropriate investigative channels.

The investigative record further reflects that the command staff member disclosed that Subject H was related to him by marriage. The matter was thereafter documented and referred for follow-up investigation by other officers.

Transition to Confidential Source Designation

Subsequent investigative reports reflect that the information provided by Subject H was documented as confidential source information (see Confidential Source 1 (CS-1) below). The substance of the confidential source report corresponds to the allegation initially conveyed by Subject H to the command staff member.

Investigators conducted follow-up investigative activity in response to the allegation.

Follow-Up Interview

The investigative record reflects that Subject H was later interviewed by detectives regarding the allegation. The interview documentation reflects that investigators sought to formalize and preserve his information within the investigative record.

The content of that interview is consistent with the previously documented confidential source allegation.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on Subject H's allegation that Subject A admitted responsibility, potential corroborative investigative avenues included:

- Independent verification of specific details allegedly disclosed during the admission, particularly facts not publicly known at the time. Such efforts could have included determining whether Subject A and the alleged owner of the intended target vessel had an existing dispute or financial disagreement, whether Subject A had previously expressed an intent to vandalize the vessel, whether the vessel was located where Subject A allegedly searched for it, and whether other

aspects of the reported sequence of events could be independently corroborated through witness statements, physical evidence, digital evidence, or other investigative means.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects that Subject H's allegation was promptly documented by a command staff member, who advised Subject H that confidentiality could not be guaranteed, disclosed the familial relationship, and referred the information to a detective for investigative follow-up. The detective subsequently documented the information in a Confidential Source (CS-1) report, and the allegation was incorporated into the ongoing investigation.

Subsequent Criminal Proceedings

Public records reflect that Subject H was later indicted by a grand jury on one count of witness intimidation under G.L. c. 268, § 13B, arising from the investigation into the African Meeting House vandalism. The Commonwealth subsequently entered a *Nolle Prosequi* on March 10, 2021, dismissing the charge. Because Massachusetts grand jury proceedings are generally confidential and not subject to public disclosure, the investigative basis supporting the indictment cannot be independently evaluated from the available record.

CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE 1 (CS-1)

Entry into Investigation

On or about June 17, 2019, the investigative record reflects that law enforcement received information from a confidential source alleging that Subject A had admitted responsibility for the vandalism of the African Meeting House.

This information surfaced more than one year after the March 2018 incident. Cross referencing shows that subject H and CS1 were one and the same.

Nature of Allegation

According to the confidential source, Subject A personally admitted committing the vandalism and provided details concerning the offense.

The record reflects that the allegation was not based on direct observation of the vandalism act itself, but rather on statements allegedly made by Subject A after the fact, constituting hearsay of a purported admission.

Investigative Response

The investigative record reflects that the confidential source information was documented and that follow-up investigative activity occurred. This included additional review of prior interviews and further contact efforts relating to Subject A and associated individuals.

The allegation was incorporated into the investigative record as a significant development.

Corroboration Opportunities Reflected in the Record

Based on the allegation that Subject A personally admitted responsibility to Subject H, potential corroborative investigative avenues included:

- Obtaining a contemporaneous recorded or signed statement from Subject H memorializing the reported admission.
- Independent corroboration of details allegedly disclosed by Subject A.
- Verification of non-public investigative details that would have been known only to the perpetrator or investigators.
- Recovery, preservation, and analysis of digital communications or other records that could corroborate or refute the reported admission.

Documented Verification Efforts

The investigative record reflects documentation of the confidential source allegation and associated follow-up activity. However, the record does not reflect independent corroboration of the alleged admission through other evidence.

The file does not reflect documentation of recovered contemporaneous recordings, preserved digital communications, or independently verified details uniquely attributable to the perpetrator beyond information already publicly available.

Reliability and Documentation Considerations

The investigative record reflects the confidential source allegation. The record does not contain a formalized reliability grading, source history summary, or structured credibility assessment within the investigative reports reviewed.

No documentation of analytical categorization of the source's reliability or corroboration status was present within the investigative record.

Summary

The confidential source information represented a late-stage development alleging an admission by Subject A. The allegation was documented and prompted additional investigative attention.

Based on the investigative record reviewed, independent corroboration of the alleged admission through objective evidence is not within the record.

CORROBORATIVE SUMMARY

The investigative record reflects that investigators conducted numerous interviews of witnesses, subjects, and individuals identified through social media activity, anonymous tips, community reports, and rumor-based allegations. The record further reflects that investigators documented many of those interviews, advised individuals of their rights where appropriate, pursued several follow up contacts, and made efforts to evaluate information developed during the course of the investigation.

At the same time, the record does not consistently reflect systematic corroboration of subjects' location, timeline, alibi, travel, or digital activity claims through independently verifiable evidence. In several instances, individuals provided statements that could potentially have been evaluated through supporting records, including surveillance footage, transactional receipts, travel documentation, cellular or application-based data, social media metadata, or additional witness confirmation. While some associated individuals were interviewed and certain claims were explored, the available documentation does not consistently show that these corroborative opportunities were fully pursued, obtained, or documented as unavailable.

The record also reflects that several investigative leads originated from rumor, anonymous information, or multi-level hearsay. Investigators did pursue a number of those leads through interviews and attempted contacts. However, the documentation does not consistently reflect a structured assessment of source reliability, a clear distinction between first-hand information and repeated rumor, or a documented disposition explaining whether specific allegations were corroborated, excluded, or deemed unsubstantiated.

Accordingly, Appendix D reflects that meaningful investigative follow up occurred, but that the investigative record does not consistently demonstrate a structured, objective, and fully documented corroboration process. These documentation gaps limited the ability to independently verify or exclude certain material claims and reduced the overall clarity of the investigative record.

APPENDIX E: POLICY COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS

This appendix evaluates investigative actions in the official record using relevant Nantucket Police Department directives and governing standards in effect at the time of the March 2018 incident, including:

- Directive 101 – Rules of Conduct
- Directive 301 – Follow-Up Investigations
- Directive 306 – Bias Crimes
- Directive 601 – Collection and Preservation of Evidence
- Massachusetts General Laws c. 268A – Conflict of Interest Law

Directive 101 incorporates compliance with Massachusetts General Laws c. 268A and establishes standards governing professional conduct, conflict-of-interest avoidance (actual and apparent), supervisory responsibilities, truthfulness in reporting, and preservation of public confidence in departmental integrity. Where state statutory standards are incorporated by departmental directive, those standards are evaluated as part of departmental compliance obligations.

The matrix below provides a structured comparison between policy requirements and the investigative record. It reflects documentation-based observations and does not assume the absence of actions not reflected in the file. The purpose of this Appendix is evaluative and forward-looking, identifying areas of documented compliance and areas where future investigations of similar seriousness may benefit from structured procedural reinforcement.

DIRECTIVE 101 – RULES OF CONDUCT & CONFLICT OF INTEREST STANDARDS

Policy Directive	Policy Requirement (Summary)	Record Reflects	Documentation-Based Observation
Directive 101 – Conflict of Interest; Conduct Unbecoming; Use of Official Position; G.L. c. 268A §23(b)(3)	Officers shall avoid conflicts of interest, whether actual or apparent. Employees shall not act in a manner that would cause a reasonable person, having knowledge of the relevant circumstances, to conclude that kinship, position, or undue influence could affect official action. Directive 101 incorporates compliance with Massachusetts General Laws	The investigative record reflects that a supervisory member of the Nantucket Police Department was present during the interview of an immediate family member, conducted by detectives under that supervisor's authority.	The investigative record does not contain documentation reflecting supervisory recusal, reassignment of investigative authority, written disclosure, or external review in connection with the interview. The absence of documented safeguards prevents confirmation of compliance with appearance-of-conflict standards under Directive 101 and G.L. c. 268A §23(b)(3). This observation does not constitute a finding that improper influence occurred but reflects an

Policy Directive	Policy Requirement (Summary)	Record Reflects	Documentation-Based Observation
	c. 268A. Where appearance concerns exist, written disclosure or recusal procedures are contemplated to preserve integrity and public confidence.		inability to confirm mitigation of conflict of interest concerns.

DIRECTIVE 301 – FOLLOW-UP INVESTIGATIONS

Policy Directive	Policy Requirement (Summary)	Record Reflects	Documentation-Based Observation
Directive 301 – Follow-Up Investigations	Investigators shall pursue additional leads, verify information obtained during interviews, reconcile inconsistencies, and document investigative decision-making. Objective corroboration of material claims is contemplated where feasible.	Multiple interviews conducted; associated individuals interviewed in several instances; supervisory presence documented during interviews.	The record does not consistently reflect independent verification of material claims regarding an individual's location, movements, or timeline through transactional records, digital metadata, travel documentation, or comprehensive surveillance review. Variations in timeline details are reflected in the record but are not consistently documented as reconciled through independently verifiable evidence.

DIRECTIVE 306 – BIAS CRIMES

Policy Directive	Policy Requirement (Summary)	Record Reflects	Documentation-Based Observation
Directive 306 – Bias Crimes	Bias-motivated offenses require recognition of heightened community impact, supervisory oversight, and investigative rigor commensurate with civil-rights violations. Consultation with specialized resources is encouraged when bias indicators are present.	Recognition of racial language; documentation of expressive content; supervisory personnel responded to the scene.	The record does not reflect documented consultation with specialized civil-rights or forensic resources or structured reassessment of investigative scope following recognition of bias indicators.

DIRECTIVE 601 – COLLECTION AND PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE

Policy Directive	Policy Requirement (Summary)	Record Reflects	Documentation-Based Observation
Directive 601 – Collection & Preservation of Evidence	Crime scenes shall be secured and preserved to protect the integrity of physical, trace, and forensic evidence prior to alteration. Consultation with specialized forensic resources should occur where appropriate.	Prompt response; photographs taken; paint scrapings collected; supervisory personnel present.	The record does not reflect documented latent fingerprint processing, DNA collection, advanced trace analysis, or consultation with State Police Crime Scene Services prior to removal of the graffiti.

DOCUMENTATION-BASED COMPLIANCE OBSERVATIONS

The foregoing matrix reflects areas of documented compliance as well as areas where the investigative record does not reflect alignment with applicable directives.

The investigative record demonstrates several foundational elements consistent with baseline procedural expectations. These include prompt initial response to the reported vandalism, supervisory presence at the scene, recognition and documentation of racially offensive graffiti, collection of physical paint evidence, and the conduct of multiple witness interviews over an extended investigative period, specifically:

- Under Directive 601 (Collection and Preservation of Evidence), while photographs and paint scrapings are documented, the file does not reflect latent fingerprint processing, DNA collection, advanced trace analysis, or consultation with State Police Crime Scene Services prior to alteration or removal of the graffiti.
- Under Directive 301 (Follow-Up Investigations), although interviews were conducted and investigative activity continued over time, the record does not consistently reflect independent verification of material placement claims through transactional records, digital metadata review, travel documentation, or comprehensive surveillance reconciliation. Variations in timeline details are reflected in the record but are not consistently documented as reconciled through independently verifiable evidence.
- Under Directive 306 (Bias Crimes), the racial nature of the graffiti was recognized and documented; however, the file does not reflect consultation with specialized civil-rights resources, structured escalation protocols, or formal reassessment of investigative scope following confirmation of bias indicators.
- Under Directive 101 (Rules of Conduct) and G.L. c. 268A §23(b)(3), the investigative record reflects that a supervisory member of the department was present during the interview of an

immediate family member conducted by detectives under that supervisor's authority. The file does not reflect supervisory recusal, reassignment of investigative authority, written disclosure, or other safeguards addressing conflict of interest considerations. This observation does not conclude that improper influence occurred. Rather, the available documentation does not clearly demonstrate what safeguards, if any, were implemented to address potential appearance-of-conflict concerns consistent with departmental policy and applicable standards.

OPERATIONAL AND STAFFING CONTEXT

The purpose of this section is not to alter the compliance analysis, excuse identified documentation limitations or diminish the seriousness of the African Meeting House vandalism. Rather, it provides additional perspective regarding the organizational structure, sworn staffing levels, investigative capacity, supervisory configuration, and workload conditions in place during the relevant period.

Because the timing and prioritization of investigative steps, resource allocation, supervisory review, and documentation practices may be affected by staffing levels and competing operational demands, this context is useful in evaluating the practical environment in which the Nantucket Police Department was operating at the time of the March 2018 incident. The information that follows should therefore be read as background context only, and not as a substitute for the policy compliance findings, investigative observations, or recommendations set forth in this report.

2018 Sworn Staffing Structure

Department records show that in early 2018 the Nantucket Police Department was funded for 41 sworn positions, structured as follows:

- 1 Chief
- 1 Deputy Chief
- 1 Lieutenant
- 10 Sergeants
- 20 Patrol Officers (inclusive of Patrol, Detectives, and School Resource Officers)
- 8 funded vacancies

At the time of the March 2018 incident, the Detective Unit consisted of:

- 1 Sergeant

- 2 Officers

Patrol staffing during March 2018 reflected:

- 8 Sergeants
- 16 Officers
- 2 School Resource Officers were assigned separately.
- 7 officers were in the police academy beginning in February 2018, reflecting active vacancy backfill during the relevant timeframe.

Detective Capacity and Case Load Implications

With 1 supervisory detective sergeant and 2 detectives assigned, the department's investigative unit operated with limited dedicated personnel. In agencies of this size, detectives routinely carry out multiple active investigations simultaneously, including felony-level and complex matters.

Supervisory Structure and Overlapping Roles

The department's supervisory structure reflects multiple sergeants assigned to patrol operations, with investigative supervision concentrated within a single detective sergeant. In smaller agencies, supervisory personnel may maintain both operational and administrative responsibilities.

Organizational Capacity Considerations

8 funded vacancies during the period in question, along with officers in academy status, indicate that the department was operating below authorized full staffing levels. Although patrol and detective staffing levels remained functional, vacant levels may affect workload distribution and supervisory bandwidth.

Investigative Workload Context

Operational workload during the relevant timeframe as previously noted reflects that between January 1, 2018, and June 30, 2018, the Department recorded 204 UCR Part I offenses, including 27 violent offenses, 19 of which were identified as sexual assault, as well as 89 property-related offenses.

The African Meeting House vandalism constituted 1 of 2 vandalism entries during that 6-month period. While UCR classification does not independently measure community impact or civil-rights implications, the data reflects that the Detective Unit and supervisory staff were managing multiple contemporaneous felony-level investigations during the relevant timeframe.

This workload data provides objective operational context when evaluating investigative bandwidth and documentation practices reflected in the record.

This contextual information does not modify the documentation-based observations previously noted rather, it provides structural perspective on investigative capacity, documentation culture, and supervisory configuration in place during the March 2018 investigation.

Summary

Viewed collectively, the staffing and operational data indicate that the Nantucket Police Department was conducting the March 2018 investigation with a relatively small detective unit, multiple vacancies, and supervisory personnel performing overlapping operational and administrative responsibilities. At the same time, the Department was actively investigating numerous serious offenses, including violent crimes and nineteen reported sexual assault investigations, each requiring substantial investigative attention, victim services, forensic processing, and prosecutorial coordination.

This operational context does not excuse or alter the documentation-based observations and findings identified elsewhere in this report. Rather, it provides relevant perspective when evaluating investigative workload, resource allocation, supervisory bandwidth, and documentation practices reflected in the investigative record. It also illustrates the practical realities faced by smaller law enforcement agencies, where limited investigative personnel are routinely required to manage multiple significant investigations simultaneously while maintaining patrol and other operational responsibilities.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY ASSESSMENT

This section evaluates public-facing communication reflected in the record concerning the March 2018 African Meeting House vandalism. The purpose of this assessment is not to critique messaging strategy in hindsight, but to review whether documented communications were consistent with the seriousness of the incident, and principles of public transparency.

Initial Public Acknowledgment

The investigative record reflects that the defacing was publicly acknowledged following its discovery, and that the presence of racially offensive graffiti was recognized. The incident was categorized under Uniform crime Reporting (UCR) standards as malicious destruction of property.

While UCR classification governs statistical reporting, bias-motivated vandalism involving racial language directed at a historic African American landmark carries heightened community impact beyond standard property crime categorization.

The record reviewed does not reflect a public explanation that, although the incident was classified as malicious destruction of property for statistical reporting purposes, it was simultaneously being investigated as a potential bias-motivated offense because of the racially offensive graffiti.

Communication of Investigative Status

The file reflects investigative activity over an extended period, including interviews and supervisory involvement. However, the record does not contain periodic public status updates, investigative milestones, or formal explanation of investigative decisions other than what was discussed during Town Select Board meetings.

The absence of such documentation does not establish that communication did not occur. It reflects that the investigative record, as produced for review, does not reflect ongoing public briefings or updates.

In high-visibility incidents involving racially offensive graffiti structured communication practices, including periodic updates affirming investigative continuation, can reinforce public confidence independent of investigative outcome.

Public Meeting Discussion and Community Concerns

Public records reflect that the vandalism and the status of the investigation were discussed during multiple meetings of the Nantucket Select Board following the March 2018 incident.. Meeting minutes and publicly recorded proceedings reflect that community members raised questions regarding investigative progress and accountability related to the vandalism. During certain meetings, representatives of the Nantucket Police Department and Town administration were present and responded to questions concerning the status of the investigation.

The discussion reflected sustained public concern regarding the incident and the broader implications associated with vandalism directed at a historic African American landmark. Over time, public commentary during those meetings reflected increasing frustration expressed by members of the public regarding the perceived pace and transparency of investigative progress.

A detailed review of relevant public meeting records is summarized in Appendix F of this report.

Transfer to External Agencies

The matter was later referred to the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office and the Massachusetts State Police. The investigative record and public meeting materials show that the referral itself was publicly acknowledged. However, the reviewed record does not clearly identify whether a specific public explanation was provided regarding the basis for the referral, such as investigative strategy, resource considerations, conflict-of-interest concerns, or prosecutorial coordination.

While law enforcement agencies are not obligated to publicly disclose investigative strategy, providing a general explanation for multi-agency involvement in matters of significant public interest can promote transparency and help the public understand the respective roles of participating agencies.

Appearance-of-Conflict Communication

This report identifies documentation limitations regarding recusal or conflict of interest mitigation measures. The investigative record does not reflect public-facing communication addressing supervisory involvement in interviews involving an immediate family member.

In matters where actual or perceived conflicts may arise, contemporaneous disclosure or explanation can serve as a confidence-preserving measure. The absence of documentation reflecting such communication limits the ability to assess whether appearance considerations were publicly addressed.

Transparency Observations

The investigative record reflects recognition of the seriousness of the vandalism and sustained investigative activity. However, documentation available for review does not reflect a structured public communication framework commensurate with the symbolic, historical, and civil-rights significance of the incident.

Summary

The investigative record reflects that the African Meeting House vandalism was publicly acknowledged, that the racially offensive nature of the graffiti was recognized, and that the matter was discussed during multiple public meetings. The record also reflects that investigative activity continued over time and that the matter was later referred to external agencies.

At the same time, the documentation reviewed does not reflect a structured public communication framework addressing the incident's heightened historical, symbolic, and civil rights significance. Specifically, the record does not consistently reflect public explanation regarding the distinction between UCR classification and potential bias motivation, periodic investigative status updates, the basis for external referral, or measures taken to address actual or perceived conflict of interest concerns.

These observations do not establish that additional communication did not occur. Rather, they identify limitations in the record regarding whether public facing communications were documented in a manner sufficient to reinforce transparency, explain investigative posture, and support community confidence during a matter of substantial public concern.

APPENDIX F: PUBLIC MEETING RECORD REVIEW / TOWN ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

This appendix summarizes references to the March 2018 vandalism of the African Meeting House and the status of the related investigation as reflected in publicly available records of Nantucket Select Board meetings.

The purpose of this review is to identify and document instances in which the incident, investigative actions, or subsequent municipal responses were discussed in public municipal meetings. This review is intended to provide contextual understanding of how the matter was publicly acknowledged, addressed, and revisited over time within the Town's formal governance process.

The review focuses on documented statements contained within official meeting minutes and does not attempt to interpret statements beyond the content reflected in the public record. Where references to the incident occurred, those references were categorized for clarity according to their general context, including investigative updates, public inquiries, community discussion, or municipal action related to the investigation.

This Appendix does not assess the accuracy of statements made during public meetings and does not substitute for or supplement the investigative record reviewed elsewhere in this report. Rather, it provides a chronological overview of how the incident and investigation were reflected in the public municipal record during the period following the March 2018 vandalism.

The information presented in this Appendix is intended to provide additional context regarding public awareness, municipal oversight, and community engagement related to the investigation.

Method

This review examined publicly available minutes of Nantucket Select Board meetings and related municipal records to identify documented references to the March 2018 vandalism of the African Meeting House and the status of the associated investigation.

Meeting minutes were reviewed from the period following the March 2018 incident through 2024, including meetings occurring during the active investigative period and subsequent municipal discussions regarding the matter. The review focused specifically on identifying references to the incident itself, investigative updates, public inquiries, community commentary, and municipal actions related to the investigation.

Each meeting record was evaluated to determine whether the African Meeting House vandalism or the status of the investigation was referenced in the documented proceedings. Where such references occurred, the meeting date, context of the discussion, and any law enforcement participation reflected in the minutes were noted. References were then categorized based on their general context, including:

- Investigative updates or status reports.
- Public inquiries or community commentary.
- Discussion of investigative transfer to external agencies.
- Anniversary acknowledgments or commemorative references.
- Municipal actions related to the authorization or implementation of an independent review of the investigation.

Meetings in which the African Meeting House vandalism or the related investigation were not referenced were not included in the chronological summary presented below. The review relied solely on the official written minutes of the meetings and did not attempt to interpret statements beyond what is reflected in the documented record.. The results of this review are summarized in the chronological table that follows.

For each meeting identified, the table records the meeting date, the governing body involved, the general context of the reference, whether participation by law enforcement officials was documented in the minutes, and a brief summary of the discussion reflected in the public record.

The purpose of this summary is to provide a chronological overview of how the incident and the status of the investigation were reflected within the Town's public meeting record over time. The summaries are drawn directly from the language contained in the official meeting minutes and do not interpret or expand upon statements beyond what is documented in those records.

Date	Meeting Body	Reference Type	Law Enforcement Participation	Summary
March 21, 2018	Select Board	Incident acknowledgment	None documented	The vandalism of the African Meeting House was referenced shortly after the incident occurred, with discussion including community response and support for repair of the historic structure.
September 19, 2018	Select Board	Community concern	None documented	Board members referenced public criticism and community concern

Date	Meeting Body	Reference Type	Law Enforcement Participation	Summary
				regarding the vandalism and the status of the investigation.
October 2, 2018	Select Board	Investigative update	Detective	Detectives reported investigative efforts including interviews, review of video evidence, and continued efforts to identify responsible individuals.
December 19, 2018	Select Board	Public inquiry	None documented	A member of the public asked the Board about the status of the investigation during public comment.
January 23, 2019	Select Board	Investigative briefing	Police Chief referenced	The Board referenced a police briefing regarding investigative activity related to the vandalism.
June 19, 2019	Select Board	Investigative transfer	Police Chief	The Police Chief announced that the investigation had been transferred to the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office and Massachusetts State Police for further review.
December 18, 2019	Select Board	Request for investigative update	None documented	A Select Board member requested that the Board receive an update from the District Attorney regarding the status of the investigation.
March 11, 2020	Select Board	Public allegations / community discussion	Police Chief	During public comments, allegations and rumors concerning the investigation were raised and addressed by the Police Chief.
June 3, 2020	Select Board	Investigative status update	Police Chief	The Police Chief stated that the investigation remained open and referenced involvement of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office
June 17, 2020	Select Board	Community response	None documented	The Town administration addressed public controversy and discussion surrounding prior statements made regarding the investigation.
March 10, 2021	Select Board	Anniversary acknowledgment	None documented	The Board noted the third anniversary of the vandalism and encouraged members of the public to contact law enforcement if they had information related to the incident.
October 2, 2024	Select Board	Municipal action – independent review	None documented	The Board referenced Article 36 of the 2024 Annual Town Meeting authorizing an independent review of the investigation.

Date	Meeting Body	Reference Type	Law Enforcement Participation	Summary
October 9, 2024	Select Board	Independent review procurement	Police Chief referenced	The Board discussed the process for selecting an independent firm to conduct a review of the investigation.
October 16, 2024	Select Board	Independent review procurement	Police Chief referenced	Continued discussion regarding responses received from firms and the selection process for the independent investigative review.
November 6, 2024	Select Board	Independent review procurement	Police Chief referenced	The Board reviewed materials related to the independent review and continued consideration of proposals from responding firms.

Summary

The review of Select Board meeting minutes reflects that the March 2018 vandalism of the African Meeting House and the status of the related investigation were referenced periodically in public municipal meetings over multiple years following the incident.

Early references occurred during 2018 and generally involved acknowledgment of the incident and discussion of the community response. Subsequent meetings reflected requests from members of the public and Select Board members regarding the status of the investigation. The meeting record reflects that representatives of the Nantucket Police Department appeared at multiple Select Board meetings and, when questions were raised in public sessions, provided limited updates concerning investigative activity and jurisdictional developments. As reflected in the meeting minutes, those updates generally confirmed investigative efforts, including interviews and review of available video evidence, while detailed investigative information remained limited due to the ongoing nature of the investigation and the subsequent involvement of external investigative authorities.

By mid-2019, the public record reflects that the investigation had been transferred to the Cape & Islands District Attorney's Office and the Massachusetts State Police. Following that transfer, references to the matter in Select Board meetings primarily involved requests for status updates or public commentary regarding the investigation rather than detailed investigative briefings.

Several meetings during 2020 reflect heightened public concern and discussion surrounding the investigation, including instances in which allegations or rumors regarding the matter were raised during public comment. The minutes reflect that law enforcement representatives addressed certain questions during those meetings while noting the involvement of external investigative authorities.

Subsequent references in later years occurred less frequently and included anniversary acknowledgments of the incident and public appeals encouraging individuals with information to contact investigative authorities.

In 2024, the Select Board minutes reflect discussion of Article 36 of the 2024 Annual Town Meeting, which authorized a non-binding appropriation for an independent review of the investigative response to the vandalism. Multiple meetings during October and November 2024 document the Board's consideration of proposals from firms responding to the Town's request for an independent review of the investigation.

Taken together, the public meeting record reflects that the incident remained a matter of community concern for several years following the vandalism and that the Select Board periodically addressed questions regarding the investigation within the context of its public meetings. The 2024 Town Meeting vote and subsequent Select Board discussions ultimately resulted in the commissioning of the independent review that forms the basis of this report.

APPENDIX G: SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT AND OBSERVATIONS

Consistent with the Scope of Work outlined in Request for Proposals No. 2025-TA-0428, a site visit was conducted on May 13, 2026, at the African Meeting House campus to observe the physical location of the incident, assess environmental conditions, evaluate camera placement for potential surveillance limitations and blind spots, and document other relevant observations. This assessment was conducted as part of the overall review of the 2018 African Meeting House investigation and is not intended to constitute a comprehensive physical security assessment or Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) study.

The assessment included the African Meeting House, the Visitor Center, and the Seneca Boston–Florence Higginbotham House, located at 27 York Street.

GENERAL SITE OBSERVATIONS

The African Meeting House campus is situated within a residential area with multiple pedestrian and vehicular approaches. The location contains a combination of public roadways, sidewalks, landscaped areas, neighboring structures, and open spaces that provide numerous access points to the campus. While the buildings benefit from modern surveillance systems, the physical layout of the surrounding neighborhood creates areas where individuals may move between properties or approach structures without remaining continuously visible from a single camera position.

A review of camera locations and fields of view found surveillance coverage to be generally comprehensive throughout the campus. While some limited areas outside direct camera observation exist, no significant blind spots were identified that would materially diminish the overall effectiveness of the current surveillance systems.

African Meeting House

The African Meeting House is a historic structure located at 29 York Street and serves as a museum and educational facility preserving the history of Nantucket's African American community.

The building was observed to be protected by professionally monitored intrusion detection and video surveillance systems. Interior and exterior protective measures appeared appropriate for the building's size and use and provided multiple layers of detection and deterrence against unauthorized entry.

At the time of the assessment, foundation repair and stone wall construction activities were occurring adjacent to portions of the property. Temporary construction materials present on site could potentially increase opportunities for vandalism or unauthorized activity; however, the overall security measures observed appeared sufficient to mitigate those risks.

Inspection of life-safety equipment indicated that certain fire extinguishers displayed inspection tags suggesting maintenance should be reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable inspection requirements.

No significant security vulnerabilities were identified at the African Meeting House.

Visitor Center

The Visitor Center is located adjacent to the African Meeting House and forms part of the overall campus.

The facility was observed to incorporate multiple physical security measures appropriate for its operational purpose, including intrusion detection and surveillance capabilities that provided layered protection against unauthorized entry.

Inspection of life-safety equipment similarly indicated that certain fire extinguishers should be reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable inspection and maintenance requirements.

No significant security deficiencies were identified within the Visitor Center.

No significant security deficiencies were observed within the Visitor Center.

Seneca Boston–Florence Higginbotham House

The Seneca Boston–Florence Higginbotham House was also included within the site assessment because of its proximity and relationship to the African Meeting House campus.

The building was observed to be protected by video surveillance, intrusion detection, and other physical security measures appropriate for its size and operational use. These systems appeared functional and provided multiple layers of protection and deterrence.

Inspection of life-safety equipment indicated that, as was the case at the rest of the campus, certain fire extinguishers should be evaluated to ensure compliance with applicable inspection and maintenance requirements.

During the assessment, one minor physical security issue involving an ancillary building system was observed. While presenting only a low-risk opportunity for unauthorized tampering, the condition should be corrected as part of routine facility maintenance.

Other than these minor maintenance-related observations, no significant security concerns were identified.

SITE ACCESS AND SAFETY OBSERVATIONS

A vehicle parked adjacent to the property was observed obstructing a public sidewalk, creating potential ADA accessibility and emergency access concerns. The vehicle should be relocated in accordance with applicable parking regulations to restore unobstructed pedestrian and emergency access.

FINDINGS

- The African Meeting House campus is protected by modern surveillance, intrusion detection, and alarm monitoring systems that appeared appropriate for the facilities inspected.
- Overall security coverage appeared effective, and no significant deficiencies were observed that would materially reduce the effectiveness of the campus's protective measures.
- Certain life-safety equipment should be reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable inspection and maintenance requirements.
- One minor maintenance-related physical security observation was identified and should be corrected to reduce opportunities for unauthorized tampering.

CONCLUSION

The site visit revealed that the African Meeting House campus is presently protected by modern physical security measures that appeared generally appropriate for the facilities inspected. Overall, no significant security vulnerabilities were identified during the assessment.

Several minor maintenance and operational observations were noted, including life-safety equipment requiring inspection, a minor physical security maintenance issue, and a vehicle that temporarily obstructed a public pedestrian pathway. These observations do not represent significant security deficiencies but should be addressed as part of routine facility maintenance and operational stewardship.

Overall, the security posture of the African Meeting House campus appeared consistent with the operational needs of the site and reflects ongoing attention to the preservation and protection of these historically significant properties.

Limitations

The observations and findings documented in this site assessment reflect conditions that existed at the time of the site visit conducted on May 13, 2026. Security systems, surveillance equipment, alarm components, physical infrastructure, and site conditions may have been modified, upgraded, repaired, replaced, or otherwise altered since the March 2018 incident. Accordingly, the observations contained herein represent the current security posture, surveillance capabilities, and physical conditions at the AMH

location, not those that may have existed at the time of the original vandalism incident. These observations are intended to provide current contextual information regarding the property and to satisfy the site inspection component of the Scope of Work.

G O V