



City of Cambridge

R-46.

IN CITY COUNCIL

February 5, 2001

COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN
COUNCILLOR BORN
COUNCILLOR BRAUDE
COUNCILLOR DAVIS
COUNCILLOR DECKER
MAYOR GALLUCCIO
VICE MAYOR MAHER
COUNCILLOR REEVES
COUNCILLOR TOOMEY

RESOLVED: That the Assistant to the City Council develop a plan for providing refreshments to persons attending the City Council meeting.

In City Council February 5, 2001.

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Attest:- D. Margaret Drury, City Clerk.

A true copy;

ATTEST:- *D. Margaret Drury*

D. Margaret Drury
City Clerk

MS_{all}

4/6

Resolved.

That the Exec to the City Council
develop a plan for providing
refreshments to persons attending
the City Council Meeting.

VUG

VUG.

vulnerable to the blandishments of big money and protects their seats from voter response to their positions — the positions are not public.

The Council meeting of February 5th is the last opportunity for City Councillors to publicly make amendments to the Petition in a manner that allows for public response on the part of their fellow Councillors, voting amendments up or down, without delay, without the last-minute pressure of the February 12 midnight deadline. There should be no concealed horse-trading in a matter so serious for the future of Cambridge. Let all negotiation be done under public scrutiny where questions can be asked, and cheating (calculated circulation of false rumors, preferences masked as purported legal requirements, scaring ignorant people with meaningless threats in order to then use the fear one has excited as a reason for ones vote) can be observed. The false rumors about the permanent consequences of the Citywide Rezoning cannot be laid to rest without a public airing. There will be defects in the details of any citywide rezoning. That is why more than three full months were given to getting rid of as many defects as possible. The Planning Board acted on the full knowledge that future studies would be needed after the Citywide Rezoning was enacted (Cf. September 5, 2000 letter to the City Council by Larissa Brown, Chair of Planning Committee).

Many of our City Councillors are confused about the will of the voters and its significance in representative legislative bodies. Some of them do not know who they represent. At least one or two Councillors believe that acting for the 'public good,' by 'representing' the interests of private corporations, is equivalent to representing the citizen interest. To some Councillors a statement such as "We depend on trucks to bring us our food." means that the regulations controlling the size of the trucks, limiting the air pollution they produce, regulating hours of delivery, the imposition of any controls that might cause them to leave the city or file lawsuits, are detrimental to the public interest.

It is true that we expect our elected Councillors to be sensitive to our economic goals, to assist with legislation that will encourage desirable growth. It is also true that the taxpayers — citizen and non-citizen alike — are happy to support the bureaucracy and work force needed to maintain and develop the infrastructure on which we all depend, and pay for the expertise that can plan for the City's future. In representing the citizens — those natural persons who live or vote in Cambridge elections — the City Councillors have a great deal of paid professional advice about highly technical matters such as those involved in rezoning. They have had plenty of time to allow those experts to address the valid concerns of non-citizen corporate interests — taxed and untaxed alike — and those experts have done so. Having spent well over 3 million dollars of tax monies to determine what is best for the city, some Councillors may decide that they do not wish to represent the citizen interest as a whole; and that they can define and please a small self-serving constituency sufficient to elect them, if someone gives them the money to do it.

Every Councillor who does this, is pouring more than seven years of work is down the drain. Please allow the public to hear your views. Discuss them publicly and devote this meeting on February 5, to drafting the final version of the Citywide Rezoning where we all can see what each is saying and doing.

Elie Yarden
5 February 2001

To: The Cambridge City Council

Date: February 5, 2001

Subject: Planning Board Recommendations on Citywide Rezoning Petition

From: Elie Yarden, 143 Pleasant St. Cambridge MA 02139

Passage of the Citywide Rezoning Petition by the Cambridge City Council requires the attention and participation of concerned citizens. The Petition submitted by the Planning Board on September 5, 2000 comes up for adoption on or before February 12, 2001; the vote must be taken by midnight for the Citywide Rezoning to become law. The hearings conducted by the Ordinance Committee, a committee of the whole, were poorly attended by the Councillors who are its members, and many Councillors are ill-informed about the extent to which the language of the Planning Board recommendations meet the objections that had been raised by corporate property interests.

The objections to parts of the Citywide Rezoning by representatives of corporate property owners — real estate development corporations, biotech industry, and universities — have been heard. It should be understood that many of the special interests represented at the hearings, were fully represented in the 15 person Citywide Growth Management Advisory Committee (CGMAC). The work of the CGMAC — with the invaluable assistance of the staff of the Community Development Department and the professional consultants employed by the City who participated in the research, study and public process — gave full opportunity for special interests to place objections to any of the proposals, to substitute one scheme for another, to propose solutions for problems different from those before us. They either failed to do so, preferring to rely on their financial power to prevent the passage of any rezoning, or their alternative solutions to the problems that the rezoning was designed to address, were judged to be wanting or destructive of the goals of the rezoning.

The City Council referred the rezoning petition submitted to it by the Planning Board on September 5, 2000 back to the Planning Board to conduct hearings and make its recommendations to the City Council at the end of its public deliberations. The same representations of corporate property interests as were heard at the Ordinance Committee meetings were heard by the Planning Board. In response to these representations the Planning Board made whatever modifications in the rezoning plan that could be made to meet these representations — weakening the devices designed to achieve sustainable development — without completely gutting the declared commitment of citywide rezoning, which the City Council had voted to undertake in its decision of September 29, 1997 by a vote of 8 yeas and 1 nay.

The language detailing those amendments to the Citywide Rezoning Petition has been available to the Councillors for more than a week. Yet there has been no public discussion or debate of the currently amended plan by the City Council. In the absence of such discussion the uninformed citizen — the citizen who received and read the promise for the future described in The Citywide Rezoning Bulletin sent out by the CDD in Fall, 2000 — is lulled into believing that the City Council may be on its way to enacting the citywide rezoning. The absence of discussion and debate conceals the disagreements among the elected Councillors from the public at large, contributes little to resolve them, leaves individual Councillors



City of Cambridge

R-46.

IN CITY COUNCIL

February 5, 2001

COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN
COUNCILLOR BORN
COUNCILLOR BRAUDE
COUNCILLOR DAVIS
COUNCILLOR DECKER
MAYOR GALLUCCIO
VICE MAYOR MAHER
COUNCILLOR REEVES
COUNCILLOR TOOMEY

RESOLVED: That the Assistant to the City Council develop a plan for providing refreshments to persons attending the City Council meeting.

In City Council February 5, 2001.

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Attest:- D. Margaret Drury, City Clerk.

A true copy;

ATTEST:-

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "D. Margaret Drury". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, flowing "D" and "M".

D. Margaret Drury
City Clerk

229 R

Resolution #46

Resolution on providing
refreshments to persons attending
the City Council meetings.

**Councillor Sullivan and entire
membership**

In City Council February 5, 2001

ORDER ADOPTED