
Cambridge Civic Journal

Issue 13

25 October 1998

DEAD LEAF HARVEST ISSUE

CCJ web site <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~rwinters/ccj.html>

The Cambridge Civic Journal is produced by Central Sq. Publications, 366 Broadway, Cambridge MA 02139. All items written by Robert Winters unless otherwise noted. (e-mail: rwinters@math.harvard.edu)

Contents:

- 0) Foreword
- 1) Preview of October 26 City Council meeting
- 2) Touchable Stories Group Spends Some Time in Central Square
- 3) Sept 14 City Council meeting
- 4) Sept 28 City Council meeting
- 5) Oct 5 City Council meeting
- 6) Oct 19 City Council meeting
- 7) Civic Tidbits
- 8) Calendar

0) Foreword

Now that the leaves are falling from the trees, I'd just like to make a pitch for all you responsible citizens to COMPOST THOSE LEAVES! While you're at it, you might consider composting your food waste as well. We provide compost bins at unbelievable discounts thanks to grants from the state and good deals with wholesalers. It's been my pleasure to play a role in this program since 1992 and I'm not planning on quitting any time soon. To date we have distributed over 1700 compost bins in and around Cambridge. If you would like information on the types of compost bins that are available and their prices, call me at 661-9230 or send me e-mail at rwinters@math.harvard.edu. Free wood chip mulch and compost is still available at the Recycling Center in the Public Works Yard, but it won't be for long now that winter is approaching.

In case you haven't heard, street cleaning and towing has been extended into December. Don't say you weren't warned!

1) Preview of October 26 City Council meeting

The special meeting will begin at 4:30pm for a hearing prior to the vote on tax classification necessary for the City to seek approval from the Department of Revenue of the tax rate for FY99. Included in the communication from the City Manager is the following good news:

- B. Appropriate \$2,000,000 to the Capital Improvement Budget to establish an Open Space Acquisition Fund for the purpose of increasing the amount of open space in the City to be funded from free cash \$1,750,000 and property taxes \$250,000;

There is also the following proposed allocation:

- F. Authorize the use of \$8,702,000 from the Unreserved Fund Balance (free cash) to reduce the FY1999 tax rate: Operating Budget \$2,400,000 (as adopted in the FY99 Budget); Affordable Housing Trust \$2,250,000 (as adopted in the FY99 Budget); Capital Budget \$3,150,000 (as adopted in the FY99 Budget); and Overlay Reserve \$902,000;

There is also a hearing scheduled during this meeting to address the matter of the racial climate in Cambridge. This was requested several weeks ago by Councillor Reeves. There was a forum on race and class last week led by School Committee member Denise Simmons. I was not able to attend that forum, but I've been told it was well attended.

In the wake of horror stories of how Central Square was about to be invaded by Borders Books and The Gap, I heard this past week that we're about to get a Buck A Book and an army surplus store instead.

2) Touchable Stories Group Spends Some Time in Central Square - by Robert Boulrice

Next weekend, October 30 & 31 will be the final performances of the Touchable Stories Group's multi media, oral history treatment of Central Square, its people and their heritage; its past and its future. Created by Shannon Flattery with the assistance of ten artists and performers, the hour-long production should not be missed by anyone who feels an affectionate connection to Central Square.

The production is highly evocative, stimulates all the senses and owes its success to the clever creativity of its designers who have applied the magic of technical theatre, lighting design and sound to conjure something special amid the clutter, bricks and dust in the sub-basement of the First Baptist Church. The program describes Touchable Stories "as a project series that focuses each year on a different working class neighborhood of Boston. A core group of artists work with local residents over the year, recording oral histories to uncover the unique nature of each of these communities." Ms. Flattery certainly chose a provocative year to become acquainted with our unique nature. She recorded hundreds of hours of stories from seventy speakers and then, collaborating with her artists, edited these remembrances, opinions and emotions into ten vignettes or tableaux which are set in the basement's various corners and spaces.

At the outset, the fifteen member audience is given a curious prompt: "You are encouraged to interact with anything red you may find during the performance. Touch, open, play with, sit on, whatever. Your experience of the production will be enhanced if you do this..." Indeed. For the "Homeland" piece, designed by Shannon and Louis Pesce, the audience is led into a small area where, on a table, a red napkin covers a small basket. Next to the basket is a red-handled, serrated knife. Under the napkin, a very warm loaf of raisin bread. As the audience enjoys sharing the bread, the audio track offers very poignant remembrances of grandmothers. Against one of the walls, a stairwell is separated from the audience by a sheet, behind which a female interpretive dancer (Stephanie Cohen) and accordionists (Melanie Hedland and Dale Rosenkrantz) perform. The sheet is backlit, so the audience sees shadow performances, as it eats warmed bread and listens to heart-warming stories about loved ones. Excellent, compelling stuff. For Laura Mack's piece "Women, Violence & Poverty," the audience is led inside a gauze tent, where inside on stools are red mittens. Inside the mittens are tiny speakers. Audience members, with hands pressed next to ears, listen to the unfortunate stories of violence endured by women. While listening, slides are projected on the walls of the tent. The red mittens upside the head provided a very powerful symbol, juxtaposed with the audio tape and the slides. Multimedia effectively utilized.

Touchable Stories covers all the important bases, in a non-preachy, nonjudgmental way. It is indeed unfortunate that its run was short. There may be a few tickets remaining for performances next Thursday, Friday and Saturday at 7 and 8:30. Call 423-3651. Tickets are \$6 and the production is not recommended for people unable to see well in the dark, as moving about in the cellar is somewhat difficult.

3) Sept 14 City Council meeting

The Cambridge City Council returned from its summer recess to face another year of zoning petitions and discussions about flower plantings, church bells, and whatever else it will take to get voters to send back the home team.

The long-awaited Planning Board recommendations for the WR Grace site in North Cambridge gave birth to yet another zoning petition for that area, the von Grossman Petition. There were 65 consent communications to the City Council of which 24 were in opposition to the Hinds petition, also known as the IPOP (Interim Planning Overlay Proposal).

Normally any City Council meeting held the night before an election (the state primary in which three councillors were candidates for other offices), is very brief. This meeting managed to last about 3½ hours. Probably the most interesting part of the meeting was the way in which the City Council danced its way around making a decision on the Frankelton petition in order to allow one project to move forward.

Public comment

The dominant subject of this evenings mini-speeches was the Frankelton Petition and the Planning Board recommendations on how the City Council should respond to it. Seven people spoke in favor of the Planning Board's recommendations and ten people spoke against them, principally local business owners in the affected area and people who wish to live in the proposed Cornerstone Cohousing project that was the cause of the petition being filed. I attended the March 17 meeting at which that project received Special Permit approval and witnessed the outbursts of opponents to the project. Mean as they were, they paled in comparison to the invectives hurled at the item that followed, the decision on the Special Permit for the Holmes Trust proposal in Central Square. (CCJ Issue 7)

Charles Hines and School Committee member Joseph Grassi gave testimony in support of the eminent domain taking of the ComEnergy site in the Kendall Square area. Their remarks centered on the need for additional playing fields in the eastern half of Cambridge and the scale of the proposed development which they estimated would produce 1.2 million sq. ft. of commercial floor space and add 14,000 vehicle trips per day to the local roads. Strong arguments were made about the fact that commercial development in East Cambridge since 1980 accounted for 68% of all such development and that 25% of the tax levy comes from the 3% of the land in Cambridge on which this development took place.

Joe Joseph said something that really amused me. While speaking in support of the Frankelton Petition that would downzone the properties abutting the Linear Park in North Cambridge from Industry A1 to Residence B, he said, "Why wouldn't you want a city with more residences?" What makes this so funny is that he was perhaps the most angry and outspoken critic of the Cornerstone Cohousing project that led to the filing of the petition. He argued at that time that there were just too many units of housing in the project.

Most of the testimony of opponents of the Frankelton Petition centered on the fact that by reducing this area to Res B, all incentives to one day convert the existing commercial properties to residential use would be removed. The Planning Board recommendations would restore some, though not all, of those incentives. This was the curious reality of the situation - changing the zoning to the same residential zoning as the surrounding neighborhood would virtually guarantee that none of the existing commercial property would ever see any residential use.

Council discusses, passes on Frankelton

Councillor Davis moved that the Planning Board recommendations on the Frankelton Petition be substituted for the original petition.

Following this, the discussion centered on how the City Council could sidestep the issue long enough for the Cornerstone Cohousing to move ahead unmolested. The votes were probably there were it not for this one project. After a considerable amount of discussion and legal opinions from Deputy City Solicitor Don Drisdell, the Council failed to pass the substituted petition. Due to opposition from property owners, seven votes were needed to pass the zoning amendment and only five voted in favor (Born, Galluccio, Reeves, Toomey, and Triantafillou).

Following the failed vote, Councillor Sullivan moved to resubmit the Planning Board recommendations as a new zoning petition. State law dictates that the only way in which a petition cannot be resubmitted is if it fails before the Council and receives a negative report from the Planning Board. The Planning Board recommendations were seen as a positive report in spite of the amendments to the petition as filed.

Tim Toomey Speaks

Councillor Toomey delivered a prepared speech on the subject of his proposal to take the ComEnergy site by eminent domain. He likened his proposal to the City's decision to take the land around Fresh Pond in the 19th Century in order to secure a reservoir for Cambridge. Responding to the City Manager's less than enthusiastic response to the idea, Councillor Toomey took to task the city manager form of government used in Cambridge which leaves it to the city manager to recommend any such proposal.

Councillor Toomey also took to task Councillor Born for her letter in the Cambridge Chronicle in which she questioned the fiscal sense of the proposal and suggested sensible alternatives. It was interesting to hear Councillor Toomey characterize his proposal as visionary in light of the fact that he was so voluminously silent prior to this land being purchased with significant development plans. True visionaries tend to see things more in foresight than in hindsight.

Arguments by Councillor Born about the very significant economic value of this land and the equally significant cleanup costs that will have to be shelled out for this property before anything can take place there were compelling. Her emphasis is more on the establishment of an open space acquisition fund and having the City actively seek parcels, especially in places like East Cambridge, where parks and athletic fields can be established.

The approach that Councillor Born prefers makes total sense, but it doesn't pack the instant political punch of a call for an eminent domain taking. The last time the City of Cambridge did an eminent domain taking in that part of the city ("The Front") we had to make a very significant financial settlement in order to avoid what would likely have been a much greater payment had the courts made the decision. The costs associated with an eminent domain taking of the ComEnergy site will make that earlier settlement look like pocket change.

As has become his practice of late, Councillor Reeves leapt on Councillor Toomey's bandwagon in order to take his shots at City Manager Robert Healy and asking about where "the vision" was to be found. Councillor Sullivan followed by noting that the ComEnergy site may not be the best site for the purposes that are being proposed and suggested that a site closer to the residential neighborhood would be preferable to one in an industrial zone. Councillor Davis drew attention to the open space needs in Cambridgeport and Councillor Triantafillou took a few shots at the Community Development Department for not being more proactive.

While there may be some basis for criticizing the CDD for not being sufficiently proactive, what I see is a department forced into being reactive by one zoning petition after another. While it might be argued by some that these zoning amendments are overdue, the City Council

continues to play a populist game as it dances around every zoning petition in the never-ending quest for votes.

4) Sept 28 City Council meeting

This meeting was probably viewed by most observers as the meeting in which the Cambridge City Council passed a modified version of the IPOP. I saw it as the beginning of the 1999 City Council election season. Unlike the old days when all the “progressives” wore CCA hats, there are now two ex-CCA councillors (Reeves and Triantafillou) who seem to be in the process of building political coalitions for 1999. Attacking the City Manager and aligning with anti-development activists seem to be two principal themes in building this coalition. It’s only a matter of time before we hear a name for this political coalition announced in the press.

Of the 84 consent communications on the agenda (many of which were carried over from the Sept 14 meeting), 26 of them expressed objection to the Hinds Petition or IPOP. This proposal calls for all projects in excess of 40,000 sq. ft. proposed before October 1999 to seek a Special Permit from the City Council. Issuance of a Special Permit would require a two-thirds majority and would have to satisfy several criteria including a provision that there be no traffic impacts. This has led to the IPOP being characterized as a de-facto moratorium on all moderate and large developments in Cambridge until at least then.

Hearing scheduled for Oct 26 to discuss racial climate in the city

Councillor Reeves asked that this hearing be scheduled in the wake of allegations of racist behavior against the now-departed principal of the Agassiz School and a recent lawsuit filed by three City employees claiming racially discriminatory practices by the City. Mayor Duehay has scheduled this during the October 26 City Council meeting.

Much of Councillor Reeves’ words referred to his belief that minority employees rarely make their way into positions in which they have any real authority over more than 3 or 4 people.

Councillor Triantafillou chimed in with her well-worn criticism of the Manager. Several other councillors followed with expressions of support for having a Council discussion on the racial climate of the city.

Public comment

This was mercifully brief with only 9 of the usual suspects stepping up to the microphone and only two noteworthy statements. Elie Yardin made a connection between zoning and a racist society, responding to earlier remarks of Councillor Reeves and others, saying “speaking of racism in terms of good will or ill will is ignoring the issue in typical liberal fashion.” The other moment was when Ralph Yoder asked the City Council to send a message of condemnation to the Kendall Cinema for showing the film “Lolita” which he claims encourages pedophilia.

Mr. Yoder’s remarks about wildlife in the Alewife area led to various jokes from councillors about geese and goose droppings at the golf course. Councillor Triantafillou noted the increase in the skunk population which caused Councillor Russell to joke that she would put in a Council Order to regulate skunks.

The Manager’s Agenda

A discussion about deteriorating buildings led to Councillor Born asking about state requirements for the periodic inspection of multi-family dwellings. Mr. Healy’s response was a reminder of some of the politics of the rent control era. He said, “This was debated ad nauseum at the time in terms of how repairs would impact rents in an era of rent controlled properties. There were issues of dislocation and capital improvements and as a policy matter a conclusion was never reached in the Council chamber.” He followed this by stating that now that the

circumstances are different, the City will be issuing a plan by January for carrying out these periodic inspections of multi-family dwellings.

There was a discussion about asbestos testing on Russell Field in North Cambridge. Acting CDD Director Beth Rubenstein made it very clear that there are no dangers to children playing at Russell Field and that any contamination at the site is well below the surface. Suzanne Rasmussen spoke about recent tests of groundwater flow that show that groundwater flows away from the residential neighborhood.

The IPOP is amended and passed

Councillor Born moved to bring the IPOP forward for discussion only, but some behind-the-scenes politics led to it being brought to a vote prior to the Planning Board report as several councillors competed for the right to be seen as The One True Opponent of Development. After a discussion of the legalities of what kinds of amendments would be possible without requiring the matter to be re-advertised and have further hearings, Councillor Davis led the discussion as a series of amendments were made to the original petition. Most of these amendments were presented to the Council by the original CRGM petitioners as changes that they could live with.

Councillor Galluccio gave the best account of the reasons why the City Council should not be deciding on each proposed development project on a case-by-case basis, likening this to something more likely found in Tammany Hall. He was critical of the fact that we seem to spend a lot of effort on zoning petitions and comparatively less on vision and planning. He and Mayor Duehay made crystal clear that they could not support the IPOP if it gave Special Permit authority to the City Council.

Councillor Reeves turned the discussion into an election issue by threatening “when we have this election next year I’m gonna call names.” He continued, “We cannot be shilly-shallying here about ‘Can we have another report.’ Either shit or get off the pot! That’s where we are with respect to development in Cambridge.”

Councillor Triantafillou followed, saying “You took the words right out of my mouth. I don’t see the need to get another Planning Board report.” She implied that there was no separation between the Planning Board and the City administration. She made very clear that she wanted the Special Permit authority to rest with the City Council rather than the Planning Board. Councillor Toomey expressed the same point of view.

Councillors Russell, Davis, Galluccio, and Sullivan and Mayor Duehay brought the discussion back to the issue of just how having Special Permit authority in the Council would work and making clear what an impossible situation this would be.

The motion to amend the petition to have the Planning Board be the Special Permit granting authority rather than the City Council passed without a roll call. Councillor Davis moved to increase the threshold to 50,000 sq. ft. (It is rumored that this was intended to allow the Bread and Circus at Putnam Ave. and River St. to be able to proceed.) This motion passed 6-3 with Councillors Galluccio, Russell, and Mayor Duehay opposed.

After a long recess to work out the legal fine points, it was moved that all housing projects with 30% or more units dedicated to persons with less than 80% of median income should be exempt. Later, Councillor Davis moved to amend this to 25% or more of units for persons less than 110% of median income. This was intended to allow for housing not only for low-income residents but some moderate-income residents as well. This amendment passed.

The only other significant amendment to the IPOP was in the wording related to traffic impacts. The phrase “shall have no substantial adverse impact on city traffic” was the wording that was approved. (This has since led to several meetings of the Planning

Board in which they have tried, together with CDD and the Department of Traffic, Parking, and Transportation, to clarify exactly how “substantial adverse impact” might be determined.)

The main motion finally passed on an 8-1 vote with Councillor Sullivan casting the lone dissenting vote.

Councillor Born immediately moved that the CDD prepare for consideration an ordinance that would put an annual cap on the total amount of sq. ft. of development that would be allowed in Cambridge. Councillor Sullivan exercised his right under the city charter to delay consideration of this until the next meeting.

5) October 5 City Council meeting

This was a meeting short in both time and substance. The only real highlight was a series of jokes made about how to get Vice Mayor Galluccio a date the following weekend.

Noteworthy, at least to me, were several communications and orders calling for the eminent domain taking of properties on Broadway in Area 4, most notably one of the properties associated with the recently contentious Bulfinch development. The irony is inescapable. Several councillors, most notably Councillor Toomey, voted against a zoning proposal that would have limited development at this site and across the street from it. Now he is calling for a rezoning and an expenditure of mammoth proportions to take the ComEnergy site in order to halt development there.

As much as I dislike the degree to which the City Council agenda is dominated by death resolutions, there was one such resolution at this meeting that registered with me, an order from Councillor Reeves noting the death of my neighbor Alice Freeman. It caused me to think about the degree to which we have come to equate civic participation in Cambridge with such things as downzoning petitions. Alice was one of many Cambridge residents who dedicated an extraordinary amount of her time to her church and to actions to make life better for others. The reality is that 90% of civic life has nothing to do with matters that come before the City Council. So here's to all the community gardeners, to the people who bring us all the feasts and festivals we visit each year, to the volunteers who bring food and company to those in need, and to every other person who goes out of their way every day and whose names never make it into the newspaper.

During a discussion of Councillor Born's order introduced at the previous meeting calling for the City to investigate the possibility of an annual development cap, Councillor Reeves again took the opportunity to lash out at the City Manager and the Planning Board. The politics of the 1999 election grow daily.

The City Manager explained that delays in sending out the tax bills this year were due to several deaths in the Assessors Office and the fact that this is a revaluation year. In asking that the hearing and vote on tax classification take place at 4:30pm on October 26th prior to the regular Council meeting, Mr. Healy gave the first public indication that he intends to recommend a significant allocation that evening for establishing the Open Space Acquisition Fund advocated most notably by Councillors Davis and Born.

Late in the meeting, in response to Councillor Reeves' suggestion that Vice Mayor Galluccio attend a particular concert the following Sunday, Vice Mayor Galluccio said, “I might have a date Sunday evening. I'm trying to get a date Sunday.”

Councillor Reeves answered, “If you don't, I will pay someone to come sit next to you!” This caused Vice Mayor Galluccio to respond, “That's what friends are for.”

When Councillor Triantafyllou tried to make an announcement, Vice Mayor Galluccio, who was chairing at that point, joked, “Is it related

to me trying to find a date?” She responded, “It is not related, but I think it would probably be a very good idea, Mr. Chair.”

With the City Council taking calls that night for input on its goals and objectives, Councillor Russell suggested that they should have a call-in to get Vice Mayor Galluccio a date. He responded by saying, “How many lines do they have up there?”

To this, Councillor Russell responded, “One will be enough.”

One of the last orders of business was the announcement by Mayor Duehay that due to a bet between him and the mayor of Parma, Ohio about the outcome of the Cleveland Indian - Boston Red Sox series, a pound of baked beans would soon be on its way to Ohio.

Scorecard: Sept 14, Sept 28, Oct 5, Oct 19 Council Orders

P (policy-related), **I** (requests for info), **R** (rules and procedural items), **M** (maintenance - potholes, traffic, etc.), **D** (deaths), **C** (congratulatory orders), **A** (announcements), and **F** (foreign and national policy).

Here's the approximate tally of orders introduced:

Councillor	P	I	R	M	D	C	A	F
Born	2	7	0	5	2	3	2	0
Davis	17	14	1	9	6	13	6	1
Duehay	1	1	1	1	5	29	4	1
Galluccio	7	6	0	1	66	14	0	0
Reeves	1	5	2	9	8	8	5	0
Russell	4	4	1	6	18	26	6	0
Sullivan	5	4	0	8	43	22	4	0
Toomey	6	1	0	3	29	14	5	0
Triantafyllou	3	1	0	4	1	5	1	0
Total by category	39	42	5	46	91	119	26	2

6) October 19 City Council meeting

The dominant feature of this meeting was the four-hour hearing on the sewer and road work in Mid-Cambridge. In response to complaints by some residents, the Department of Public Works gave a detailed presentation on the scope of the project and the lessons learned from it, especially in the area of better communication with the public.

Public comment

The most visible presence during the public comment was by the Eviction Free Zone (EFZ). The best speech was delivered by Bill Cavallini as he laid out his case for passing new controls on condo conversion and a home rule petition to require “just cause” for evictions. Mr. Cavallini said at one point, “To the tenants, what good are the improvements to the parks, to the roads, to the schools when they can't live in the city anymore?” He claimed that tenants are being forced out by “a tidal wave of greed.” He advocated for continued funds for affordable housing acquisition and the establishment of real estate transfer fees.

Bill Marcotte, the new lead housing organizer for EFZ, advocated for a new local condo law and brought cheers to the audience when he announced the purchase of the controversial 59 Norfolk St. building a few days earlier by the nonprofit agency Just-A-Start.

Hatch Sterritt took a lower road as he suggested that the recent murder of a gay man in Wyoming could be attributed to “daily indifferences that we indulge in as we pursue our self-interest in the marketplace and the advantages that some of us hold.” He seemed to be laying the blame for this man's murder on those who own property and who rent apartments. This was just plain offensive, yet he received an ovation from many in attendance.

Bill Zamparelli and Rachael Solem spoke in favor of amending the pending Parking and Traffic Demand Management (PTDM) Ordinance to require evaluation and recertification within a few years after its

intended and unintended consequences could be gauged. Ms. Solem listed a number of shortcomings of the proposed ordinance, especially in its failure to address issues of pass-through traffic, regional context, and economic development in proximity to public transportation.

Mid-Cambridge road construction hearing

It was astonishing that what should have taken about an hour or so was extended into a four-hour marathon. This hearing came about as a result of a request two weeks earlier by some people associated with the Mid-Cambridge Neighborhood Association (MCNA). The chief presenters were Chuck Schwartz, Bill Craig, Ed DeAngelo, Mary McCallum, and John Pitkin. Their remarks centered principally on dissatisfaction over delays in the construction, poor communication with City officials, excessive noise, terrible road quality, and what they perceived to be a diminution of their quality of life. An article in the most recent MCNA newsletter took issue with the color of the cement used in the new sidewalks.

Other persons added their comments prior to the response by the City Manager and representatives from the Department of Public Works (DPW). James Cusack related his tale of being arrested for protesting construction that began prior to 7am. Karen Schlomy complained of crosswalks not being marked during road construction. Nancy Jones of Irving Street said she was "terrified" because her street may be next. Linda Schwartz gave a long list of anecdotes as she made her case that her life was severely impacted by the construction. Isabel Chopin questioned the need to be replacing sidewalks that were in reasonable shape already. John Grossman complained about damage to his car and suggested some sort of nefarious activity involving radiation.

I spoke for the purpose of suggesting that the construction should be put into a proper context. It is being driven by federal and state mandates to separate many of the combined sewers that still exist in Cambridge. This is one facet of the program to improve the quality of nearby receiving waters such as the Charles River. My point was that while we should learn from our mistakes, we should view the project as leading to an improved quality of life rather than as a short-term lessening of our quality of life.

I also made the point that a complicated project like the Big Dig in Boston could be completed in a year or two at a fraction of the cost if they simply shut down Boston. What complicates projects like these is the requirement that all the roads, water supply, sewers, and other utilities remain in use during the project.

It was a bit bothersome to this observer to watch as each of the city councillors took turns trying to convince viewers that he or she was the most responsive to citizen complaints. I understand that this is one of the most tried and true methods of attracting votes your way, but the substance of this hearing was clear to all in the first half hour.

Credit should be given to the DPW for their excellent graphics and in their entire presentation. Their explanations were excellent and their willingness to acknowledge their mistakes and to learn from them was admirable.

The rest of the meeting

Among other topics that came up was the possibility of requiring pitbulls to be muzzled. (Bill Jones suggested that their owners should be muzzled.) When discussion turned to the subject of people bringing their dogs to the Cambridge Cemetery, Councillor Russell said, "I think this meeting's going to the dogs!" She later introduced an order asking the Law Department to draft an ordinance that would ban dogs from the Cambridge Cemetery.

Most of the other topics discussed before the time of the meeting expired was not that interesting, though Councillor Davis did move to

have the Law Department draft an ordinance raising the age for requiring bicycle helmets to eighteen.

Calendar:

Mon, Oct 26 4:30pm Special **City Council** Meeting to conduct a public hearing on the Property Tax Rate Classification. (Sullivan Chamber)

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

7:00pm The City Council will conduct a public hearing to discuss race relations in the City of Cambridge. (Sullivan Chamber)

Tues, Oct 27 9:00am The **Government Operations Committee** will conduct a facilitated goal-setting meeting. (University Park Hotel, 20 Sidney Street).

5:30pm The **Finance Committee** will conduct a public meeting to discuss the issue of eminent domain taking of property for open space, especially in East Cambridge and also in other areas of the City in need of more open space. (Kennedy School Cafeteria, 158 Spring St.)

Thurs, Oct 29 7:00pm MBTA community meeting to discuss **The Urban Ring** (Central Square Library, call 349-4604 for details.)

Sat, Oct 31 10:00am Dedication ceremony for the naming of the Mid-Cambridge Park at Broadway and Ellery St. in memory of Joan Lorentz.

Mon, Nov 2 5:30pm Regular **City Council** Meeting (Sullivan Chamber)

Thurs, Nov 5 5:00pm The **Human Services and Youth Committee** will conduct a public meeting to discuss the assessment of youth programs, including its relationship to extended day programming. The meeting will begin with a tour of the Moore Center. (Willis Moore Center Gilmore Street)

Mon, Nov 9 5:30pm Regular **City Council** Meeting (Sullivan Chamber)

Tues, Nov 10 5:30pm The **Ordinance Committee** will conduct a public meeting to discuss a recommendation from the Historical Commission on its revised Final Report on the Proposed Arsenal Square Extension of the Old Cambridge Historic District and/or the proposed Landmark Designation of 22, 24 and 26-28 Garden Street. (Sullivan Chamber)

6:00pm The **Ordinance Committee** will conduct a public meeting to receive an update on staff work toward the regulation of newsboxes. (Sullivan Chamber)

Thurs, Nov 12 5:30pm The **Cable TV Telecommunication and Electricity Committee** will conduct a public hearing to receive an update on the progress in the area of competition for Cable TV and on the refranchising process. (Sullivan Chamber)

Mon, Nov 16 5:30pm Regular **City Council** Meeting (Sullivan Chamber)

Wed, Nov 18 5:30pm The **Traffic and Transportation Committee** will conduct a public hearing to review the recommendations regarding trucks in Cambridge. (Sullivan Chamber)

6:30pm The **Traffic and Transportation Committee** will conduct a public hearing to discuss the traffic impact of the University Park development. (Sullivan Chamber)

Mon, Nov 23 5:30pm Regular **City Council** Meeting (Sullivan Chamber)

Mon, Dec 7 5:30pm Regular **City Council** Meeting (Sullivan Chamber)