

---

---

# Cambridge Civic Journal

---

---

Volume 1 Issue 5

12 February 1998

---

---

## LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY ISSUE

---

### Contents:

- 0) Introduction
- 1) Report of Feb 2 City Council Meeting
- 2) Feb 3 Planning Board Meeting
- 3) Central Square in Chains - by Peter Bruckner
- 4) The Advent of PR in Cambridge - by David Goode
- 5) Report of Feb 9 City Council Meeting
- 6) 1997 Election Campaign Finance Reports
- 7) Calendar

### 0) Introduction

There is now a web site where you can read this Journal with any web browser and where you can download a Word document of the Journal so that you can print out your own copy with all the formats as intended. The web site is the Porter Square Neighbors Association site (<http://www.channel1.com/users/psna>) and I have to thank PSNA President Paul Myers for offering this service as an interim way for me to put these ramblings on the web. It is also, and primarily, a good place to find out about all the exciting things that are happening these days in the Porter Square neighborhood and the good work of the PSNA.

### 1) Report of Feb 2 City Council Meeting

In spite of several substantial reports that could have led to significant debate on matters of importance to the City of Cambridge, this meeting was little more than a parade of monumental egos and sour grapes. At issue was a motion to reconsider the mayoral vote of the previous week in which Francis Duehay was elected Mayor of Cambridge. A legal opinion requested by the City Clerk stated clearly that while a vote on a "question" may be reconsidered, an election is not a question and is not subject to any provision for reconsideration. An election is considered final if the elected individual is present and willing to accept the election, takes the oath of office, and carries out any official duties in the role to which he was elected.

Mayor Duehay made a ruling that the motion to reconsider was not properly before the Council. Councillor Toomey then challenged the ruling of the Chair. This led to several speeches on the issue, but in the end there were five votes to support the ruling of the Chair, the same five votes that elected Frank Duehay as mayor the week before. This was largely a formality since the legal opinion was rather clear-cut and the mayoral vote would not have changed even if reconsideration were a possibility.

Highlighting all the action were the speeches by Councillor Kenneth E. Reeves in which he accused other of City Council members of deceit, dishonesty, and treachery because of their switching of votes from Katherine Triantafillou to Frank Duehay.

The way I understand the events that led to the mayoral election, Frank Duehay, Kathy Born, and Henrietta Davis had made clear to Katherine Triantafillou and others that she was not their first choice and was at best their fourth choice. This hardly constituted a groundswell of support for Triantafillou. The problem was that Reeves came out early in support for Triantafillou and would not vote for Duehay. This led to inconclusive ballots on Inauguration Day.

During the weeks following the inauguration, and especially during the days leading to the final vote, Councillor Reeves let it be known that if the votes were not there for Triantafillou he would deliver his vote to Michael Sullivan and that this would provide the fifth vote necessary to elect Sullivan as mayor. This put the CCA-backed councillors into a bind, partly due to the fact that Councillors Duehay and Born had played the pivotal role in electing Independent councillor Sheila Russell as Mayor the previous term. This was the context in which the CCA councillors begrudgingly agreed to apparently yield to Reeves strategy to elect Triantafillou. However, there was always the possibility that two or more of the Independent councillors would cross over to elect Duehay rather than Triantafillou and everyone knew this.

Had the five councillors who eventually voted for Duehay been public about their intentions, this would likely have led to Reeves announcing that he would vote for Sullivan. This would have caused both Russell and Galluccio to strongly consider switching back to Sullivan to elect an Independent mayor. The best way for the majority of CCA-backed councillors to ensure that their top choice was elected was to push the decision to the brink and to force Reeves to make the last second switch to Sullivan. That would put Reeves in the position of having to vote against a "progressive" in favor of a "conservative" and to take the heat for electing Sullivan over Duehay. Not until the vote was finalized was it clear that Reeves was not going to switch to Sullivan.

The competition here was not really one of Triantafillou vs. Duehay. It was yet another attempt by Reeves to be the kingmaker and Reeves lost. This is, in my opinion, the reason and sole explanation for his rage on the floor of the City Council on February 2. We may never know what role Triantafillou played in this game of strategy, but it seems unlikely that she could not have known every aspect of this game of strategy. It was a very good strategy and it almost worked. Independent councillors also played their hand well, giving it their best shot at electing an Independent mayor (Sullivan) and eventually playing the pivotal role in electing a CCA councillor with whom they could work.

Vice-Mayor Galluccio and Councillor Kathy Born spoke at length in support of their vote and in marked disagreement with Reeves' account of the events of the previous week. Particularly noteworthy was Born's statement: "I understand something about winning and losing in politics.... You win sometimes and you lose sometimes. I came to the last election (where she was elected Vice-Mayor) with only my husband and no one else because I didn't know how it would turn out. If I lost, I wasn't going to blame it on anyone."

There actually was a regular City Council meeting that took place after all the furor passed. A communication from the Community Development Dept. (CDD) on methods for maintaining and fostering new small businesses in Cambridge was referred to the Economic Development Committee and to the Housing and Community Development Committee. The report on impacts from the termination of rent control was also referred to the Housing and Community Development Committee. The chairs and members of the various Council committees will be chosen by Mayor Duehay once all the councillors have submitted their requests.

There was a discussion on Order #104, an Order resubmitted by Councillor Triantafyllou on exploring other methods for electing a mayor. She and Councillors Galluccio, Davis, Reeves, Russell, and Duehay joined in the debate. Coupled with numerous speakers during the Public Comment portion of the meeting, it would seem that future discussions about mayoral selection processes and charter reform may be inevitable. We can only hope that people will separate out the recent acrimony from the serious questions of governmental structure as encompassed in a charter. The answers to these important questions should not be influenced by conflicts between personalities.

## 2) Feb 3 Planning Board Meeting

The Planning Board had three controversial items on its plate for this meeting. On the first of these, the Board voted 5-2 in favor of allowing the construction of a 52,000 sq. ft. office building at Zero Arrow Street at the eastern end of the Harvard Square area.

In the second item, the Board approved the Cornerstone Cohousing project for Harvey Street in North Cambridge. Following the vote, N. Cambridge activist Joe Joseph launched into a scathing criticism of the Planning Board for voting to approve this housing.

The principal reason for my attending this meeting was the third item - deliberation of the proposal by the Holmes Trust to redevelop their property in the middle of Central Square. This proposal has been generating controversy for almost a year now. Initial plans were presented to the Central Square Advisory Committee and were met with constructive criticism and storms of protest. After the architects revised their original plans, the Advisory Committee agreed in its report to the Planning Board that a new building on this site would be a positive change. It also supported the proposed mix of retail and commercial uses with housing. The Advisory Committee supported the proposed 15% affordable housing component of the project and commended the property owners for their efforts in relocating existing commercial tenants. There were still some reservations about the proposed design and such reservations were expressed at the Planning Board meeting as well.

My impression of the deliberations by the Planning Board were that they felt that the Holmes proposal was, for the most part, consistent with the goals and guidelines of the Central Square Action Plan, that the mix of residential and commercial uses was good, that the affordable housing component was good, but that there were several serious problems with the design.

Hugh Russell began what seemed to be a nearly unanimous disapproval of the proposed raised plaza that would sit between the two proposed buildings. Concerns about safety and security, especially in the Central Square area, were expressed in one form or another by most members of the Board. Numerous examples of plazas like this one that have failed were quoted and a convincing argument was presented on why this intriguing plan might not be such a good idea. The other chief concern was about how the proposed building would interact with Carl Barron Plaza. Hugh Russell presented a sketch of a possible alternate design that would have about the same density but which would concentrate all the retail on the first floor, would not have a raised internal plaza, and which would step back from CB Plaza. He referred to

this as a "River Court strategy". Another local architect, Brad Bellows, submitted sketches for a possible redesign.

Planning Board member Scott Lewis responded to public criticism about possible negative effects of this project on low income housing, questioning how this could possibly be the case when there is currently no housing on the site and no evidence to support the claim that building such housing would affect area housing costs. Florrie Darwin agreed, stating that she disagreed with the "domino theory of gentrification".

Assistant City Manager for Community Development Susan Schlesinger argued for the importance of building in demographic diversity into a project such as this and that demographic diversity will lead to a diversity in retail options.

It was agreed that representatives of the Comm. Development Department would continue to work with the property owners and architects over the next month to come up with an improved proposal that would address the concerns of the Planning Board. The next date for deliberation on the proposal will be March 3. From where I sit, it would seem that this next month will bring a new proposal which retains the proposed housing component and density but which reorganizes the massing of the building or buildings. The alternative is an "as of right" office building that provides neither housing nor any other significant public benefits.

## 3) Central Square in Chains - by Peter Bruckner

Can there be any doubt about it?

"The chains are coming, robbing us of our unique character and diversity. Soon, Central Square will be like anywhere else in this country, not at all the place I chose to live in....."

Before we get swept up in this mantra and start telling our neighbors where they should drink coffee or buy clothes, let's just take a longer view of the situation.

We have all seen the neighborhood druggist disappear from the corner pharmacy. Before that we saw the hardware store, general store, haberdashery and countless other examples of shopkeepers bow to new economies of scale, mass merchandising, and consumer choices.

We appreciate our CVS, but how many small drugstores found it impossible to compete with the buying power of the modern drugstore chain? The "five and dime" store similarly displaced the corner store as a source of everyday household items.

Interestingly, it was having the right chain stores that defined "Main Street" in this country. What would a traditional downtown be without its Woolworth, Rexall, or their equals?

When I came to Central Square in the early 60's, it included a Hayes-Bickford Cafeteria, Woolworth's, Corcoran's, Almy's, Cambridge Gas & Electric (major appliances), Rogers' Jewelers, Read Jewelers, two bowling alleys, Bakers Shoes, Harvard Bazaar, Cambridge Furniture, Central Square Cinema, Off-the-Wall Cinema.... In short, there were goods and services for people at all ends of the economic spectrum.

A number of ventures tried and failed during the intervening years. Hit or Miss made it for several years, giving way to BayBank and the 24-Hr store. Corcorans gave way to Rite-Aid, which in turn was swallowed by the Computer Processing Institute. Bookstores came and went.

Now for an irreverent observation: In the "better" stores, clothing items on sale are usually of better quality, and often

cheaper than items found in the "bargain" stores. The Galleria Mall has its share of Cambridge people from all walks of life who just can't find decent clothing in Central Square.

It is not hard to imagine the shouts of "Gentrification!" that would arise from the friendly picketers outside of Starbucks if even a Hit or Miss were to consider moving into the proposed new building across the street.

It's time to stop demonizing Starbucks (and vandalizing its store windows) for taking a small part of the "100 percent corner" of Central Square. (Is Starbucks really the symbol of a capitalist conspiracy - a harbinger of the invasion of the "Yuppie Chains"?) There are many small to medium restaurants and coffee shops along Mass. Ave. whose success depends more on the quality and uniqueness of food than economies of scale. Au Bon Pain is neither better nor worse than Starbucks, and nobody should need to justify their choice of a place to have coffee.

The viability of Central Square as a real commercial center for the surrounding neighborhoods may depend on attracting one or more chain stores that can offer the quality and range of merchandise not found in the specialty stores. This is a huge issue for the elderly and others who do not own automobiles. For the present, it doesn't seem to be happening at University Park, where a Comp-USA will take the largest (30,000 square feet) chunk of space to give MicroCenter some competition. (Not enough to turn it back to a Stop & Shop, alas.)

As more property gets subdivided or turned into office space, the possibility of any major chain coming here continues to diminish. Without chain stores that can function as the anchor or anchors which characterize a thriving town center, Central Square will continue to be less of a "downtown Cambridge" and more of a set of bargain and specialty stores reflecting our changing culture, but falling short of serving our everyday needs.

#### 4) The Advent of PR in Cambridge - by David Goode

The proportional representation (PR) election system used in Cambridge was first proposed in 1938. More than fifty years later, Cambridge remains the last municipality in the country to elect a City Council using PR. During its heyday, PR was used in 22 municipalities in the United States, including seven cities in Massachusetts.

Yet even at its peak of popularity, PR was never fully accepted by the American electorate. In the eyes of rank and file Americans, PR remained largely a reformers experiment. A relatively intricate system almost always championed by upper class interests, PR was never allowed to be judged on its own merits.

PR in American municipal elections was usually presented as an alternative to elections dominated by political machines. In cities where PR was adopted, these political machines often exacerbated the lingering doubt surrounding PR and worked diligently for its repeal. When asked what he thought of PR, then Governor Al Smith of New York said "of all the wild-eyed crazy, non-sensical things that have ever afflicted the City of New York, I certainly think there is nothing that equals PR."

Governor Smith's sentiment rang through most of the political machines affected by the spread of PR. With the publication of Professor Hermens book *Democracy or Anarchy?* in 1941, PR opponents found a champion that asserted a link between the use of PR and the rise of fascism in Europe, including the rise of

Hitler in Germany. While many of the PR systems examined by Professor Hermens resembled the systems used in American elections in name only, PR opponents began branding the fledgling election system as dangerously un-American.

In many cities, PR in the United States fell victim to the social ills that flared during the post World War II period. When a communist won a seat in a New York city PR election, the cold war mentality fostered arguments that PR represented a threat to democracy. When a second communist won a seat in New York the fate of PR was sealed. New York repealed PR in 1947.

The PR system in Cincinnati faced a similar fate due to racial intolerance. An informal tradition of PR elections in Cincinnati dictated that the City Council elect as Mayor the member receiving the largest number of first preference votes. When a black candidate named Ted Berry won the most first preference votes, growing concern over the increased representation of racial minorities peaked. Although Mr. Berry, an ardent supporter of PR, offered to accept the position of Vice Mayor in order to quell the growing opposition to PR, the city repealed its use in 1957. More than a decade later, Mr. Berry was elected Mayor under a plurality election. This hindsight shows PR did not "over-represent" minorities as many of its opponents argued. Rather, PR was used as a scapegoat for racial intolerance.

The City of Cambridge did not follow the path of other PR municipalities. Consequently, Cambridge provides the perfect case study to consider both the merits and failings of PR in the context it deserves. It is not necessary to repeat the almost universal conclusion that PR systems are better, fairer and more accurate than plurality systems. That point has been made repeatedly for more than a century and is presently being echoed in a contemporary resurgence of interest in PR.

#### The Advent of PR in Cambridge

Consider the strong feelings evidenced in Governor Al Smith's statement about PR. Even to those unfamiliar with the operations of PR or any other kind of voting system, it is quite clear that this issue is one of emotional intensity. Like New York City, the City of Cambridge experienced these high stakes confrontations during the battle to make proportional representation the official voting system for electing municipal representatives. It was, according to one key player in the debate, "one of the most thrilling political melodramas ever staged in Cambridge - a cliffhanger, a classic."

It is not necessary to understand the intricacies of voting systems to appreciate the climate that brought PR to Cambridge. Rather, it is important to understand the social dynamics of the Cambridge community in the years just prior to World War II. Although Cambridge has changed considerably in the past fifty years, the dynamics present at the beginning of PR's tenure in Cambridge still affect its operation today.

#### *The Right Plan:*

In Massachusetts, municipal voting systems are inextricably linked to the type of administration used in government. The administration of government was an important factor in the Cambridge PR debate.

Prior to June 1st, 1938, Massachusetts law allowed only four types of municipal government operation. These were, and are still, known as plans A, B, C, and D. All of these plans included some type of majority system voting. However, they differed in the operational aspects of government. Plans A-C designate the

Mayor as the Chief Executive Officer charged with the powers of administration as well as the responsibilities of representation. Plan D differed from these other options. Plan D allows a city council and ceremonial mayor to be elected while the operational aspects of the municipality are performed by an appointed City Manager. Thus, the City Manager is hired by the city council to act as Chief Executive Officer.

In 1938, Cambridge operated under Plan B. The city was governed by 15 City Councillors, 4 of whom were elected at large. In addition, the Mayor (CEO) was elected at large, bringing the total number of elected officials to 16.

On June 1st, 1938, Massachusetts Governor Charles Hurley signed a bill making a new form of government available to Massachusetts municipalities. This new form, known as Plan E, consisted of a City Manager as Chief Executive Officer with a city council elected at large by PR.

Shortly thereafter, the Cambridge Committee for Plan E was established. Headed by John Landis, Dean of the Harvard Law School, The Committee for Plan E received most of its support from the elite academic community that was, and remains, closely associated with Harvard University.

Opposition to the movement to change the city charter came from the city politicians and employees as well as the working class areas of the city. The roots of these communities reach back to the early and mid-19th century when Cambridge attracted immigrants and other working class families to the industrial boom of East Cambridge. They shared very little with the world class elite of Harvard University.

Feelings of resentment over the proposed charter change ran so strong that City Councillor John Toomey made national headlines when he introduced a proposal demanding that Harvard University be declared a separate city. His motion passed quickly through the City Council without opposition. With the lines clearly drawn, the showdown between the two opposing sides began in earnest. While the issue of Plan E also included a change to City Manager form of government, the initial battles centered entirely on the issue of proportional representation. Calling it the "fairest and most democratic form of voting known" the Committee for Plan E began to collect petition signatures to have the charter change question put on the ballot for the November, 1938 election.

The City Council turned up the heat on the issue when Council President Thomas McNamara initiated an investigation of the petition procedures used by the Committee for Plan E. Attorney George McLaughlin, a prominent Cambridge resident associated with Harvard University represented the Committee for Plan E and advised all committee members to refuse answers to questions posed by the City Council. Tempers flared when it was discovered that the Committee for Plan E had paid some people to collect petition signatures. In the end, George McLaughlin and the Committee for Plan E had the upper hand when McLaughlin proposed that the City Council had no power to investigate the issue. McLaughlin asserted that the authority to investigate was given solely to the State Ballot Law Commission, where protests against the Committee for Plan E's practices were eventually filed.

Time, however, was running out for the Committee For Plan E. While the City Clerk had certified more than the required number of signatures, the City Council refused to forward the petition to the Secretary of State's Office before the October 8th deadline

since there were protests still pending at the Ballot Law Commission. However, the Committee for Plan E had not yet exercised the full influence of its formidable power base.

When the Ballot Law Commission dismissed the last protests against the petition process at 9:30 AM October 8th, some impressive political maneuvering took place. Acting on the request of Committee for Plan E attorney McLaughlin, a State Supreme Court Justice ordered the Cambridge City Council to transmit the petition to the Secretary of State's Office by days end or appear at a Supreme Court hearing at 3:00 PM, October 8th. When the City Council refused to act on the petition, a summons was served and the Court again ordered the City Council to comply or face legal action. That evening the City Council voted to pass the petition to the Secretary of State without debate. Secretary of State Frederick W. Cook logged in the petition at 10.25 PM, October 8th, only one and a half hours before the deadline. It was never clearly explained who had convinced the Secretary of State to keep his office open late. In any case, the Boston Globe front page headline of October 9th read "Cambridge to Vote on Plan E."

For the month before election day, the battle focused entirely on the issue of PR. Interestingly, the only significant reference to the change to the City Manager form that accompanied Plan E was made by the Communist Party of Massachusetts. While they emphatically supported proportional representation, they denounced Plan E as a whole due to the City Manager stipulation. This was done much to the delight of the Committee for Plan E, which tried desperately to distance itself from association with the communists.

On election day 1938, the residents of Cambridge voted to oppose Plan E. 21,722 persons voted against it while 19,995 voted for its adoption, a margin of 1,767 votes.

#### *Plan E- The Sequel:*

Like many elite political organizations, the Committee for Plan E had no trouble retaining the resources needed to sustain its existence after defeat in 1938. Over the next two years, the Committee for Plan E continued to bring the issue to the people of Cambridge. However, by the time the 1940 election season approached, the tone of the campaign had changed dramatically compared to the turbulence and divisiveness of 1938.

For example, when Cambridge Mayor John Lyons invited Professor F. A. Hermens of Notre Dame to speak in Cambridge, John Landis, still Chairman of the Committee for Plan E, did not respond. In reference to the strong Irish heritage of the Cambridge working class, one advisor to the Committee for Plan E reportedly told John Landis not to challenge Professor Hermens. "This is Cambridge," he said, "and in Cambridge Notre Dame always beats Harvard 52 to nothing." The decision of the Committee for Plan E not to make proportional representation the major issue during the 1940 campaign would prove decisive.

#### *Fiscal Troubles:*

While Mayor Lyons may have been able to take the upper hand in the PR debate, he fell under attack for his budget policies. The Cambridge Tax Payers Association, an organization that found support in the well-to-do areas as well as some working class areas of Cambridge, worked to protest the budget Mayor Lyons proposed for 1940.

Several events contributed to the Mayor's problem. First, the budget was the largest in the city's history resulting in an unprecedented increase in the tax rate. Second, the budget was submitted without detailed allocations for each department, only lump sums were recorded. Commenting on the Mayor's budget, a Cambridge Chronicle-Sun editorial said that if the city officials could not hold the city tax rate down, they would have no one but themselves to blame if the city turned to Plan E as "the only way out."

Fiscal problems intensified when the Cambridge Tax Payers Association began its "Call to Arms" campaign. By jamming City Hall with supporters, the Association forced the City Council to reject the mayor's budget. In addition, State Senator Arthur Blanchard submitted a bill for a state commission to investigate Cambridge city affairs. Once again, the Cambridge Chronicle-Sun ran an editorial stating that the only way to fend off Plan E in the coming election was to hold down the city tax rate.

While public attention remained focused on the city's budget problems, the Committee for Plan E unceremoniously collected petition signatures for the coming 1940 election. In June, City Council, at odds with the mayor about the budget and weakened by public dissatisfaction passed the properly certified petition to the Secretary of State without incident.

While the issue of PR was debated as election day approached, the Committee for Plan E continued to emphasize that an experienced professional, not a politician, would be running the city under the Plan E. The new approach worked. On election day Plan E won by roughly 7,500 votes.

[This article is an excerpt of David Goode's thesis "The Quota Question", written as a master's thesis in Tufts Urban and Environmental Policy program. David credits Eliot Spalding, Editor Emeritus of the Cambridge Chronicle for much of the content. In particular, he refers to Spalding's articles "Plan E Debate Split the City in 1938" which appeared in the Chronicle on October 15, 1987 and "How City's Plan E System Came to Be" which appeared in the Chronicle on November 30, 1987.]

### 5) Report of Feb 9 City Council Meeting

This was a meeting which, by most accounts, should have been wrapped up in under two hours. It did, however, have some interesting moments. The meeting began with a wonderful public display of support for Cambridgeport School teacher Bela Bhasin who is seeking permanent resident status in this country.

There was an interesting portion of the regular meeting in which Deputy City Solicitor Don Drisdell explained the legal status of the land over the Cambridge St. tunnel between Harvard yard and the Harvard Science Center. Several weeks earlier, Kathy Born had introduced an order requesting clarification of the issue of ownership and Harvard's rights to install these kiosks. The interesting part of the discussion was the distinction between land held as an easement and land held "in fee simple". As Mr. Drisdell explained, most of the older streets in Cambridge are technically public ways held in easement and that this is a form of ownership. In the event that such a public way were to be discontinued, ownership would revert to the abutting property owners. According to Harvard, the status of this portion of Cambridge St. is that the City holds it in easement.

This is really something of an academic matter since the agreement drafted in 1965 when the plans were made to depress

Cambridge Street calls for Harvard to maintain the overpass as a pedestrian way for as long as the City wishes. As a public way, Harvard is required to seek permits for the display of signs or for the temporary erection of tents, such as what occurs each year at the Harvard graduation. Councillor Born remarked that she could not recall Harvard ever asking the City Council for such a permit.

Veterans of City Council affairs will recall times in the past when former City Councillor Al Vellucci would speak at length about having the residents Cambridge plant vegetable gardens on this land. Councillor Vellucci always had a card to play when dealing with Harvard University.

The other interesting portion of this meeting was the discussion on Reeves' Order regarding funds to enable the City Council to hire independent legal counsel. The purpose of the Order was to find out if this was even possible under the Plan E charter and, if so, how it might be structured. Tentative support for the idea was expressed by a number of councillors. Here's a portion of what the Plan E charter has to say:

*Mass. Gen'l Laws, Chap. 43: Sect. 104. Powers, rights and duties of city manager. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this chapter, it shall be the duty of the city manager to act as chief conservator of the peace within the city; to supervise the administration of the affairs of the city; to see that within the city the laws of the commonwealth and the ordinances, resolutions and regulations of the city council are faithfully executed; and to make such recommendations to the city council concerning the affairs of the city as may to him seem desirable; to make reports to the city council from time to time upon the affairs of the city; and to keep the city council fully advised of the city's financial condition and its future needs. He shall prepare and submit to the city council budgets as required of the mayor by section thirty-two of chapter forty-four and, in connection therewith, may, to the extent provided by said section thirty-two in the case of a mayor, require the submission to him, by all departments, commissions, boards and offices of the city, of estimates of the amounts necessary for their expenses. He shall make all appointments and removals in the departments, commissions, boards and offices of the city for whose administration he is responsible, except as otherwise provided in this chapter, and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by this chapter or be required of him by ordinance or resolution of the city council. The city manager shall have and possess, and shall exercise, all the powers, rights and duties, other than legislative, had, possessed or exercised, immediately prior to the adoption of this plan, by the mayor, board of aldermen, common council and all other boards, commissions and committees of the city and their members, severally or collectively, except such as are by this chapter conferred upon the school committee or are otherwise provided for thereby.*

Reference was made to last week's court decision overturning Cambridge's billboard ordinance. Several councillors were miffed by the fact that they learned of this decision through the local newspapers.

The last business item of the City Council was when they went into executive session to discuss pending and/or recently decided legal matters. Just prior to this, the Council, led by Mayor Frank Duehay, sang Happy Birthday to Councillor Ken Reeves. This

was quite a change from the tone of the previous week. Councillor Reeves comment was simply, "You guys are a tough group."

**Scorecard: Feb 9 meeting (and late Orders of Feb 2)**

Listed are seven categories of Council Orders: **(P)**policy-related orders; **(I)**requests for info.; **(R)**rules and routine procedural items); **(M)**maintenance orders (potholes, traffic, etc.); **(D)**death orders; **(C)**congratulatory orders; and **A**)announcements. Here's the approximate tally of orders introduced:

Councillor	P	I	R	M	D	C	A
<b>Born</b>	1	0	0	1	1	7	0
<b>Davis</b>	1	0	0	4	1	6	0
<b>Duehay</b>	1	0	0	2	3	4	0
<b>Galluccio</b>	3	0	0	2	12	11	0
<b>Reeves</b>	0	0	0	1	1	4	2
<b>Russell</b>	1	1	0	5	2	2	0
<b>Sullivan</b>	1	0	0	1	5	8	0
<b>Toomey</b>	4	1	0	4	5	5	0
<b>Triantafillou</b>	1	0	1	2	2	6	1
<b>Total by category</b>	7	2	0	19	16	24	3

**6) 1997 Election Campaign Finance Reports**

Here are the approximate totals spent by the various City Council and School Committee candidates in their 1997 election campaigns, including in-kind contributions and bills not yet paid.

Candidate	Total	#1 Votes	\$ per vote
Galluccio	\$48102.37	2449	\$19.64
Sullivan	\$43770.48	1699	\$25.76
Duehay	\$43203.88	1982	\$21.80
Reeves	\$28164.59	1383	\$20.36
Toomey	\$29145.11	1740	\$16.75
Born	\$29053.59	1519	\$19.13
Triantafillou	\$28342.89	1749	\$16.21
Davis	\$22238.10	926	\$24.02
Russell	\$19186.58	1508	\$12.72
Trumbull	\$7020.32	343	\$20.47
Frymire	\$3142.16	74	\$42.46
Cunningham	\$2853.14	376	\$7.59
Harding	\$2617.62	356	\$7.35
Winters	\$1278.67	289	\$4.42
MacKinnon	\$950.74	265	\$3.59
Matheu	\$450	41	\$10.98
Whitlow	\$290.35	33	\$8.80
Vienneau	\$90.69	29	\$3.13
Jones	\$0	38	\$0.00
Segat	\$16493.43	2606	\$6.33
Simmons	\$14851.33	2043	\$7.27
Maher	\$13642.12	2190	\$6.23
Harris	\$9268.75	1990	\$4.66
Turkel	\$6077.39	2684	\$2.26
Grassi	\$5884.40	2071	\$2.84
Stead	\$1306.79	967	\$1.35
Fantini	\$1155.25	1781	\$0.65

Notes on campaign expenditures: Ken Reeves reports are somewhat ambiguous, so the listed amount is tentative. Other reports were also difficult to decipher due, in part, to loans by candidates to their campaigns and subsequent repayments. One candidate submitted about 300 pages of documents. Most reports were just a few pages.

**Calendar:**

**Tues, Feb 17**

6:00pm **School Committee Meeting** (Media cafeteria, CRLS)

**Thurs, Feb 19**

7:00pm **Porter Sq. Neighbors Assn. Meeting** (Metropolitan Baptist Church, 16 Beech St.) Representatives from the Porter Sq. shopping center will discuss the latest developments and concerns. Also, PSNA will review the status of the Mass. Ave. roadway improvement plans and hear an update about new residential developments affecting the Creighton, Porter, and Regent Street neighborhood.

**Mon, Feb 23**

5:30pm **City Council Meeting** (City Hall, Sullivan Chamber)

The Cambridge Civic Journal is produced by Central Square Publications. Guest submissions are welcome, subject to discretion of the editor. For further info, to submit articles, or to get on our electronic mailing list, send e-mail to [rwinters@math.harvard.edu](mailto:rwinters@math.harvard.edu) or mail to Editor, Central Square Publications, 366 Broadway, Cambridge MA 02139. All items written by Robert Winters, unless otherwise noted.