

- k. Any and all statements which imply that considerations of legality absolve anybody for the incompetence displayed in the silly formal lawn which was created and which is now washing into the Charles, in a location that formerly was a viable, balanced ecosystem.
 - l. Any and all statements that Boston University had nothing to do with the destruction of the Goose Meadow.
 - m. Any and all statements that imply some sort of independence to statements from fake group(s) which are dominated by developer types.
2. The near secret destruction of the Goose Meadow is not at all an isolated matter and most definitely originates in the City of Cambridge.

- a. Description of the attacks on the destroyed area as attacks originating in the MDC is outrageous.

The first plans for construction were presented by the City Manager at the Howard Johnson's Hotel in September - October 1997. Copies of these plans, as modified by the MDC, have been provided by me to the Cambridge City Council. Statements by the City of Cambridge, the Metropolitan District Commission or Boston University which are contrary to the existence of these consolidated plans are false.

The plans which I transmitted to the Cambridge City Council were received by me in hand in August 1999 from the Director of Planning of the MDC. They are enclosed.

When I received those plans from the Director of Planning, she pointed out the one major difference from the City Manager's plans. I repeat, SHE POINTED OUT THE ONE MAJOR DIFFERENCE FROM THE CITY MANAGER'S PLANS.

- b. The one major change in the plans from the City Manager's plans is that the plans are more destructive to the Charles River White Geese. The plans include a walkway in the heart of the Charles River White Geese' sleeping area nine months of the year, between the pollution plant and the Charles River. This is a change from the City Manager's plans which put the walkway in the river next to the sleeping area.

This proposed walkway is highly dangerous to pedestrians. Its isolated location comports to a walkway on the Boston side which is a major problem for assaults because it is so isolated.

The presence of this dangerous walkway in those plans, in itself demonstrates the lack of concern for safety in the City of Cambridge / MDC. Contrary statements are nonsense.

This is part of Phase 3 of the planned attacks on the Charles River White Geese.

- c. In accordance with the city manager / MDC plans, the City Manager has announced intention to destroy the Charles River White Geese' living room nine months of the year. This is in accordance with funding voted by the City Council in December 1999. The City Manager would needlessly tear up the perfectly good softball fields at Magazine Beach and destroy a number of trees.

The City Manager provided his schedule for this attack to the City Council at the beginning of May 2000. He has stated that destruction will commence in May 2001.

This is Phase 2 of the attacks on the Charles River White Geese.

- d. Also shown on these plans is destruction of the balance of the Goose Meadow, within the 25 foot line connecting to the sewage plant area by a walkway under the BU Bridge, in accordance with the City Manager's plans.

This is the balance of Phase 3 of the attacks on the Charles River White Geese.

- e. Also involved are the City Manager's open space plans. These plans clearly show a connector to the destroyed Goose Meadow, moving north in a broken line. This is a pathway connecting to the series of pathways shown on the City Manager / MDC plans. They are enclosed.

This is Phase 4 of the attacks on the Charles River White Geese, and the only phase not showing on the MDC / City Manager plans mentioned above.

- f. Key to the plans are the two alternate Charles River Crossings being considered by the MBTA for a new rapid transit line. Maps from the MBTA for the two alternate Charles River Crossings have been provided to the city council. The City Manager has been fighting for a Regatta Subway station which would be near the Goose Meadow on the other side of Memorial Drive.

The combination of walkways connects the gentrified Magazine Beach to the proposed subway station and clearly makes that proposed gentrification a selling point for the subway station. The crossing of the Charles required for that subway station is far inferior from a transportation point of view to the alternate crossing.

- 3. The "safety" argument is outrageous.

Under the City Manager / MDC definition of "safety," no free animals would be allowed in the City of Cambridge. All of their habitats would be destroyed to be replaced with planned areas unliveable by free things. The "safety" argument is nothing less than a direct attack on the lives of any and all animals living in the city which are not controlled by human beings.

- 4. Your description of the Goose Meadow is outrageous. The truth is that it contained the following:

In addition to being the nesting area for the Charles River White Geese, this was also the nesting area for a pair of red-tailed hawks, a place where herons once stayed in the old dead trees. There was a lush little lawn of brilliant green grass. Wild strawberries, blackberries, apple trees, sumacs, and wild flowers like Queen Anne's lace, mullein, butter-and-eggs, ladies' thumb, evening primrose, and yellow hawkweed bloomed and provided food and cover for other birds and animals.

Marilyn Wellons provided a very detailed description to the Cambridge City Council on June 19.

- 5. To the extent it has any relationship to the very real issue of severe incompetence, the Cambridge Conservation Commission determined and informed the Cambridge City Council that their order was violated by the actions of your employees.
- 6. Finally, this letter strikes me as an abdication of responsibility by you.

Your basic concept is severely out of connection with reality.

You do not create the thriving ecosystem which was in existence near the B.U. Bridge by planning. You do not get living, beautiful beings independent of human control by planning.

You have a planning office which places no value on beauty which has not been created by people with degrees. As such your planning office has destroyed and continues to destroy something of incredible value which may not be mendable and certainly is not replaceable.

"Meetings" to decide the future through artificial interference have no relevance with regard to a thriving, valuable ecosystem which has so irresponsibly been destroyed.

You used the word "native" without understanding of its meaning. "Native" is intended to describe a thriving ecosystem which has not been destroyed by man. "Native" is not a formal lawn devoid of living, breathing, beautiful animals independent of human control.

"Native" is not the Boston University Boat House and is not pathways imposed on naturally occurring vegetation.

"Native" is not a monolithic imposed, artificial environment which cannot live without control by human beings.

"Native" is what you just destroyed and you are planning to continue to destroy.

Except for item 5, which occurred after my letter, and item 6, I have provided in great detail, all these matters in my letter to the Cambridge City Council delivered to them on June 4.

All of these documents are available and have been delivered or offered to the people making these outrageous claims.

We can also provide an artist's rendition of the situation in the meadow.

We will be pleased to provide these documents, once again, to anybody who requests them.

Sincerely,

Robert J. La Trémouille

p.s. Statements of timing with regard to the Conservation Commission meeting have equal lack of value. I issued a press release on the Internet objecting to the initial commencement of construction. That press release was issued on the day of the Conservation Commission meeting, before the Commission met.

cc w/ stated encl:

Governor Cellucci
MWRA Commissioner
Cambridge City Council, c/o City Clerk
Boston University President


Encl:


1. City of Cambridge / MDC Plans.
2. City of Cambridge Open Space Plans, not approved by the Cambridge City Council as of this writing.


DRAFT

1

0 20 40 60
NORTH







Robert J. La Trémouille

875 Massachusetts Avenue, #31
Post Office Box 391412
Cambridge, MA 02139-0015
Telephone: 617-491-7181 / 617-576-9780

July 4, 2000


David B. Balfour, Jr.
Commissioner
Metropolitan District Commission
20 Somerset Street
Boston, MA 02108

RE: Destruction of the Nesting Area of the Charles River White Geese

Dear Commissioner:

This is in response to your letter of May 12, 2000. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

1. First of all, we get extremely tired of responding time after time to the same false statements. These include the following:
 - a. Any and all statements which, in any way imply that the destruction of the beautiful, ecologically balanced area beloved by the Charles River White Geese as their nesting area and its replacement with an environmentally stupid formal lawn that is now washing into the Charles River was anything other than a fireable action of incompetence by the Cambridge City Manager, by the Director of Planning of the Metropolitan District Commission and by that Boston University official whom the President of Boston University says does not exist.
 - b. Any and all statements which, in any way imply that it is other than fireable incompetence to take actions on the Charles River which negatively impact Cambridge and the Commonwealth's most valuable asset on the Charles, the Charles River White Geese.
 - c. Any and all statements that destruction of the Goose Meadow originated in the Metropolitan District Commission or in some public review process.
 - d. Any and all statements that imply that the Goose Meadow was destroyed solely because of characteristics particular to the Goose Meadow.
 - e. Any and all statements which imply that the Goose Meadow was not destroyed as part of a larger plan.
 - f. Any and all statements which imply that the Charles River White Geese will not be subjected to additional attacks.
 - g. Any and all statements which imply that the Goose Meadow contained nothing but worthless weeds.
 - h. Any and all statements which imply that some sort of bizarre safety considerations were the reason for the destruction of the Goose Meadow.
 - i. Any and all statements which imply that the destruction of the Goose Meadow was fully legal and fully in compliance with all orders of all reviewing agencies.
 - j. Any and all statements which imply that considerations of legality absolve anybody for the incompetence displayed in the destruction of the Goose Meadow.



A communication was received from Robert J. LaTremouille, relative to the destruction of the Nesting Area of the Charles River White Geese.

In City Council July 31, 2000

PLACED ON FILE