

Mathews, Jennifer

From: katherine Olivier <kloliv@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 7:18 PM
To: Mathews, Jennifer
Subject: Commemorative Project for the Cambridge Common

Dear Jennifer Mathews

I have just become aware of the proposal to put an art installation on the Cambridge Common commemorating the 19th Amendment to the Constitution. All four artworks under consideration would take up valuable green space at a time when we are desperately trying to protect as many trees and green spaces as possible. The Cambridge Common is not very large. I am very against turning it into a park of monuments. After this worthy project - there will be others. I propose that other sites are considered.

Thank you very much
Katherine Olivier

--

Katherine L. Olivier
23 Bigelow St
Cambridge, MA 02139-2301
617.492.5814

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Wentworth, Randolph Nelson <randolph_wentworth@hks.harvard.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 1:36 PM
To: Mathews, Jennifer
Cc: Maggie Booz
Subject: 19th Amendment Art

Jennifer,

I am writing to comment on the public art installation proposed for the Cambridge Common. I support the celebration of the 19th Amendment, but I strongly oppose the location of this installation in the Cambridge Common. Cambridge has very few large open spaces and we are losing our tree canopy at an alarming rate.

I have spent my career creating parks and green space in cities throughout the country and I now teach environmental politics at the Harvard Kennedy school.

170 years ago, Fredrick Law Olmsted, architect of Central Park, advocated for the public health benefits of large green space in cities. This is particularly important for working people and communities of color who do not have access to remote natural areas. Over the years, there have been dozens of proposals to build monuments, public sculpture museums and other buildings in Central Park. If all of these were built there would be nothing left of this extraordinary park. Fortunately, civic leaders had the courage and foresight to preserve the integrity of the park for future generations.

Cambridge has an abundance of sites that would touch more people, for example:

- the heavily travelled plaza at the Alewife T-station
- new plazas being developed in Kendall Square
- the new public space being created in Inman Square
- northern Mass Ave, a central artery/entrance to our City
- one of the pocket parks and islands currently being re-designed near Binney Street, Land Boulevard, etc

Would you pass my comments on to the City Manager and the design review committee for the art installation?

Thank you,

Rand Wentworth
Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy
Louis and Gabrielle Bacon Senior Fellow in Environmental Leadership
Harvard University

President Emeritus
Land Trust Alliance

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Marilee Meyer <mbm0044@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 5:25 PM
To: Mathews, Jennifer
Subject: Fwd: another Harvard Sq comment

This same commenter continued below. I am only cluttering your inbox so you can see what I am hearing and which may be helpful.

"To your last point (about how many monuments can the Cambridge common take), public space is finite, so there's an opportunity cost to every monument, therefore they should be compelling not just in what they represent, but how well they do it.

One thing I like about the multigenerational idea is that many of the women who fought for the franchise (and much more than that) never lived to see it, but did it for their daughters and granddaughters, and example that connects with many other challenges we face, where instead of sacrificing for future generations, we steal from them.

thanks,

Marilee

-----Original Message-----

From: Marilee Meyer <mbm0044@aol.com>
To: JMathews@CambridgeMA.Gov <JMathews@CambridgeMA.Gov>
Sent: Thu, Aug 6, 2020 5:00 pm
Subject: another Harvard Sq comment

"I've been thinking about what could best express the import of this long struggle for civic standing. It occurs to me a sculpture of 3 women, a girl, a mother, a grandmother, perhaps hand in hand, might better capture the journey from disempowered and largely silenced past to a better future, and all those who went before and will come after, without even having to mention ballots directly".

as traditional as it seems, I have no problem with this because it is direct and not overly intellectualized.
BTW- this commentator's sister produced and directed "The Vote" on PBS.

thanks,

Marilee Meyer

Mathews, Jennifer

From: J. Snow <jsnow@citysource.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 6:18 PM
To: Peterson, Lisa; Mathews, Jennifer
Cc: louise@eastmanweed.com
Subject: Protecting Cambridge Common Green Space

Hi Lisa and Jennifer,

Louise Weed asked me to forward to you responses to the net loss of green space that would result from the proposed monuments to the 19th Amendment and to ask you to forward this to the Committee. Below is a memo we sent to a number of citizens who are concerned with protecting our City's green spaces and were unaware of the Common plan. An initial list of alternative existing hard surface spaces were proposed in response to our recent emails. These first suggestions are listed at the end of this message.

Thank you for your attention to this,

Janice

Louise Weed, former chair of the Fresh Pond Advisory Board contacted me last week when I was on vacation to let me know that she had just learned of the City's plan to install permanent 19th amendment monuments on Cambridge Common. The proposals are large art projects and all involve adding concrete, stone and or metal structures to a large area of the Common's green space. Between 2011 and 2016, the City and state spent \$5 million restoring the Common's green space and redesigning pathways there and at a nearby Flag Staff Park (the small park separated decades ago to accommodate a roadway.

I am on numerous city email lists as is Louise and others involved with green space restoration and protection. Louise in addition to her years of work on Green Space Committees is a recent member of the Urban Forest Task force. Like Louise I had not received any notification of the existence of this group formed in 2019. None of the 19th amendment project's 8 members are to our knowledge associated with green space/park protections.

My understanding from Louise was that the Committee's first choice for the commemorative structures was the Joan Lorenz Park in front of the Main Library on Broadway. Lorenz Park supporters objected to adding monuments to their hard-fought for green space so the project was moved to an equally precious green space, the Common. With the exception of the 1870s Civil Ware memorial, the 19th Amendment project would cover more green space than any other memorial, most of which are stone markers with bronze plaques commemorating war heroes and located along the edge of the Common. See the attached map to see the large area allocated for these new proposed memorials.

We wonder why planners continue to think they need a park to construct a worthy memorial. Clearly the Committee's first choice of a space near the main library & high school was the superior educational location where young people can see it but NOT one that sacrifices the Neighborhood's limited green space. Is their no developed location near the library or the high school where such an educational commemoration could be placed? Or near City Hall where laws are made and changed?

The women who worked to get the vote were not spending time in contemplation in city parks. They were marching and riding horses in the streets, protesting in the halls of Congress and state houses, disagreeing with one another on tactics and the role of Black suffragists. They called out and insulted male candidates who did not support the cause; they collected signatures on suffrage petitions, erected billboards on highways. They were arrested for "obstructing the sidewalk," had hunger strikes and were beaten by prison guards.

What better, more appropriate location to commemorate their efforts than urban, not park spaces. The late Pat Pratt who began fighting for protecting Cambridge green spaces and Fresh Pond Reservation in the 1960's was born only a decade after the 19th amendment was passed. Her mother was a working nurse who attended Wellesley College during the suffragist fights. I am confident Pat would continue to insist that our few, hard fought green spaces in the City to preserve for future generation should never be concreted over to honor even those who would have likely rebelled to demand their rights and to protect our environmental birthright.

-Janice Snow

An Initial List of Alternative Non-green Space Locations respondents have suggested for a fitting 19th Amendment Memorial. None were aware of the Common plans.

JFK park (state controlled) next to a graduate school of government

Fort Washington which could use some updating.

The lawn in front of City Hall.

Areas adjacent to the Main Library that do not support the growth of trees due to underground parking structures, students and families who pass through there all the time and there would be plenty of adjacent space for periodic ceremonial activities at the monument.

The "lagoon" and fountain at the CambridgeSide Mall

Former Middlesex Co. Courthouse in East Cambridge.

The "Mall" on Aberdeen Ave. has an already funded garden project; This might be converted into the "19th Amendment Mall"

The park at the intersection of Garden St. and Concord Ave that currently has a monument to soldiers who fought in the Spanish American War.

<https://www.cambridgema.gov/Departments/citymanagersoffice/100years/nineteenthamendmentcentennialcommittee/>
I looked at those today

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Maggie Booz <maggie@smartarchitecture.net>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 12:53 PM
To: Mathews, Jennifer; Sansoucy, Kimberly; DePasquale, Louie; Peterson, Lisa; City Council; O'Riordan, Owen; Putnam, Andrew; Watkins, Kathy; Sullivan, Charles M.; Burks, Sarah; Woodbury, Catherine; Hsu, Lillian; Coppinger, Ellen
Cc: Shippen Page; Devereux, Jan; Kelley, Craig; Robert@rwinters.com; gary@reedhilderbrand.com; Marieke Van Damme; Barbara Murphy-Warrington; Elena Saporta; Cynthia Smith; Joan Krizack; Seanna Berry; Sophia Emperador; Martha Sieniewicz; Michael Hanlon; daviddavis7777@gmail.com; Ann MacAdam; Chantal Eide; Nancy E. Phillips; Nancy Jordalen; Paula Cortes; Sandra Fairbank; louise weed; Laura Nash; Annette LaMond; drfoster@fas.harvard.edu; suzanne r dworsky; Elizabeth Bierer; gottschalk.jane@gmail.com; Owen Dempsey; Wentworth, Randolph Nelson; Louisa McCall; Jan Ferrara; lisa ulrich; steven Nutter; Blake Allison; Jeff Clements; Rita Laguna; Kelly, Kathleen; Mitch Nelin; Rocco Ricci; Catherine Zusy; HMSnively@aol.com; Mike Nakagawa; Laurie Gaines; Marc Levy
Subject: 19th amendment commemoration and the Common: ideas

Dear Jen and Kimberly, members of the 19th Amendment Monument Selection Committee, City Council, City Manager, Department of Public Works (overseeing Urban Forestry), Cambridge Historical Commission, Director of Public Art,

and copying interested members of the public and those including former City Councilors, members of the Cambridge Committee on Public Planting, Cambridge Plant&Garden Club, Tree Task Force Committee, Green Cambridge, and the Cambridge Historical Society:

We're writing in response to your helpful letter, Jen, of August 7th, which explained the process that was used to select a location for a piece of public art to commemorate the 100th anniversary of passage of the 19th Amendment to the US Constitution. It was a sound process, obviously, and we understand the opinions of those who participated, but we feel that it left out some crucial considerations. We apologize for only entering the conversation a month ago, but nothing could be truer right now than the adage "better late than never". We, by the way, are members of the Cambridge Plant & Garden Club, the Tree Task Force, and the Committee on Public Planting. Collectively we have extensive knowledge about art, architecture, monumentation (in the public commemoration sense of the word), and trees and open space.

Primarily, we have a strong objection to the siting of yet another monument on the Cambridge Common. Our objection is about the sacrificing of open green space, permeable land and trees that thrive because of unobstructed soil conditions and minimal paths and compaction. This is an identified time of critical environmental preservation in which it has been shown that the more we pave and build and minimize private and public open land the more we contribute to an unlivable environment. There is a groundswell of awareness in the citizenry about the importance of permeable open space, tree and green cover, even the subterranean exchange of nutrients between growing flora. But shoulder to shoulder with that is the notion that the Common is our shared park, our place of respite and recreation, our green gem, our most important open space. Reflection and contemplation and thought occur there spontaneously because people respond to the natural world.

In addition, the reasons cited in the selection of the Common could as easily be reasons *not* to place a monument there:

-There are already 12 monuments there, at what point do we curtail this plethora of objects? Do we commemorate in our central, small public park the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Black Lives Matter movement, the Occupy movement, the National Environmental Policy Act, the triumph of Gay Marriage? All are worthy of commemoration, and some have more to do with Cambridge, specifically, than others.

-The Common is a center of civic activity (we have ourselves attended in the past year protests for BLM and Womens rights there) which needs *space* to occur

-Streets, city halls, and voting booths evoke suffragists/suffragettes

- Children go to the Common to play and to be on grass in unencumbered open space
- The Common is a park, not a museum

Public art activates Public places, and in its best iteration brings vivacity and beauty to underwhelming or under-appreciated spaces. Public art enlivens, can educate, but most importantly *enhances* the space that's it's placed in, *better*s that space, *enriches* a City. So too, do parks and trees, with a different "set of tools". The trees and grass and open air of a park, at their best unsullied by paving, signage, furniture, fencing, and yes, even art, are a rare treat in the City and must at all costs be protected for what they do: provide a place to enjoy nature, to exercise, to just BE in the presence of living things and their shade and oxygen.

We ask, respectfully, for three things.

We would like to see published the public comment that was offered on the four finalists' proposals.

We would like to see delayed the choosing of a finalist and the construction project on the Common.

We would like to see considered an alternate location for a monument, and permanently stop construction of objects on the Common (as the Boston Common has done).

Please forward this letter to the Members of the Selection Committee.

Thank you so much,

Maggie Booz, Sandra Fairbank, and Louise Weed
Citizens

e maggie@smartarchitecture.net

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Laura Nash <laura.nash11@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 2:55 PM
To: suzanne r dworsky
Cc: Louise Weed; Maggie Booz; Mathews, Jennifer; Sansoucy, Kimberly; DePasquale, Louie; Peterson, Lisa; City Council; O'Riordan, Owen; Putnam, Andrew; Watkins, Kathy; Sullivan, Charles M.; Burks, Sarah; Woodbury, Catherine; Hsu, Lillian; Coppinger, Ellen; Shippen Page; Devereux, Jan; Kelley, Craig; Robert@rwinters.com; gary@reedhilderbrand.com; Marieke Van Damme; Barbara Murphy-Warrington; Elena Saporta; Cynthia Smith; Joan Krizack; Seanna Berry; Sophia Emperador; Martha Sieniewicz; Michael Hanlon; A David Davis; Ann MacAdam; Chantal Eide; Nancy E. Phillips; Nancy Jordalen; Paula Cortes; Sandra Fairbank; Annette LaMond; drfoster@fas.harvard.edu; Elizabeth Bierer; gottschalk.jane@gmail.com; Owen Dempsey; Wentworth, Randolph Nelson; louisa mccall; Jan Ferrara; lisa ulrich; steven Nutter; Blake Allison; Jeff Clements; Rita Laguna; Kelly, Kathleen; Mitch Nelin; Rocco Ricci; Catherine Zusy; HMSnively@aol.com; Mike Nakagawa; Laurie Gaines; Marc Levy
Subject: Re: 19th amendment commemoration and the Common: ideas

Perfect letter! Just the right focus! Couldn't agree more. Thank you, authors! Laura

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 24, 2020, at 2:51 PM, suzanne r dworsky <srdworsky@gmail.com> wrote:

I too think this is a fabulous letter, very clear and eloquent. Congratulations to the authors whom I join in their recommendations.

On Aug 24, 2020, at 1:19 PM, louise weed <louise@eastmanweed.com> wrote:

Chuck , who was out at the "sauna writing area" this morning, just read the letter and also thinks this is an excellent letter.

Fingers crossed. xxxxxx

On Aug 24, 2020, at 12:53 PM, Maggie Booz <maggie@smartarchitecture.net> wrote:

Dear Jen and Kimberly, members of the 19th Amendment Monument Selection Committee, City Council, City Manager, Department of Public Works (overseeing Urban Forestry), Cambridge Historical Commission, Director of Public Art,

and copying interested members of the public and those including former City Councilors, members of the Cambridge Committee on Public Planting, Cambridge Plant&Garden Club, Tree Task Force Committee, Green Cambridge, and the Cambridge Historical Society:

We're writing in response to your helpful letter, Jen, of August 7th, which explained the process that was used to select a location for a

piece of public art to commemorate the 100th anniversary of passage of the 19th Amendment to the US Constitution. It was a sound process, obviously, and we understand the opinions of those who participated, but we feel that it left out some crucial considerations. We apologize for only entering the conversation a month ago, but nothing could be truer right now than the adage “better late than never”. We, by the way, are members of the Cambridge Plant & Garden Club, the Tree Task Force, and the Committee on Public Planting. Collectively we have extensive knowledge about art, architecture, monumentation (in the public commemoration sense of the word), and trees and open space.

Primarily, we have a strong objection to the siting of yet another monument on the Cambridge Common. Our objection is about the sacrificing of open green space, permeable land and trees that thrive because of unobstructed soil conditions and minimal paths and compaction. This is an identified time of critical environmental preservation in which it has been shown that the more we pave and build and minimize private and public open land the more we contribute to an unlivable environment. There is a groundswell of awareness in the citizenry about the importance of permeable open space, tree and green cover, even the subterranean exchange of nutrients between growing floras. But shoulder to shoulder with that is the notion that the Common is our shared park, our place of respite and recreation, our green gem, our most important open space. Reflection and contemplation and thought occur there spontaneously because people respond to the natural world.

In addition, the reasons cited in the selection of the Common could as easily be reasons *not* to place a monument there:

- There are already 12 monuments there, at what point do we curtail this plethora of objects? Do we commemorate in our central, small public park the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Black Lives Matter movement, the Occupy movement, the National Environmental Policy Act, the triumph of Gay Marriage? All are worthy of commemoration, and some have more to do with Cambridge, specifically, than others.
- The Common is a center of civic activity (we have ourselves attended in the past year protests for BLM and Womens rights there) which needs *space* to occur
- Streets, city halls, and voting booths evoke suffragists/suffragettes
- Children go to the Common to play and to be on grass in unencumbered open space
- The Common is a park, not a museum

Public art activates Public places, and in its best iteration brings vivacity and beauty to underwhelming or under-appreciated spaces. Public art enlivens, can educate, but most importantly *enhances* the space that’s it’s placed in, *better*s that space, *enriches* a City. So too, do parks and trees, with a different “set of tools”. The trees and grass and open air of a park, at their best unsullied by paving, signage, furniture, fencing, and yes, even art, are a rare treat in the City and must at all costs be protected for what they do: provide a place to enjoy nature, to exercise, to just BE in the presence of living things and their shade and oxygen.

We ask, respectfully, for three things.

We would like to see published the public comment that was offered on the four finalists' proposals.

We would like to see delayed the choosing of a finalist and the construction project on the Common.

We would like to see considered an alternate location for a monument, and permanently stop construction of objects on the Common (as the Boston Common has done).

Please forward this letter to the Members of the Selection Committee.

Thank you so much,

Maggie Booz, Sandra Fairbank, and Louise Weed
Citizens

e maggie@smartarchitecture.net

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Paula Cortes <paulavcortes@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 3:04 PM
To: Maggie Booz
Cc: Mathews, Jennifer; Sansoucy, Kimberly; DePasquale, Louie; Peterson, Lisa; City Council; O'Riordan, Owen; Putnam, Andrew; Watkins, Kathy; Sullivan, Charles M.; Burks, Sarah; Woodbury, Catherine; Hsu, Lillian; Coppinger, Ellen; Shippen Page; Devereux, Jan; Kelley, Craig; Robert@rwinters.com; gary@reedhilderbrand.com; Marieke Van Damme; Barbara Murphy-Warrington; Elena Saporta; Cynthia Smith; Joan Krizack; Seanna Berry; Sophia Emperador; Martha Sieniewicz; Michael Hanlon; daviddavis7777@gmail.com; Ann MacAdam; Chantal Eide; Nancy E. Phillips; Nancy Jordalen; Sandra Fairbank; louise weed; Laura Nash; Annette LaMond; Foster, David R.; suzanne r dworsky; Elizabeth Bierer; gottschalk.jane@gmail.com; Owen Dempsey; Wentworth, Randolph Nelson; Louisa McCall; Jan Ferrara; lisa ulrich; steven Nutter; Blake Allison; Jeff Clements; Rita Laguna; Kelly, Kathleen; Mitch Nelin; Rocco Ricci; Catherine Zusy; HMSnively@aol.com; Mike Nakagawa; Laurie Gaines; Marc Levy
Subject: Re: 19th amendment commemoration and the Common: ideas

I heartily concur! There are many places in the City which would benefit by a memorial and which would not replace significant green space.

Paula Cortes

On Mon, Aug 24, 2020 at 12:53 PM Maggie Booz <maggie@smartarchitecture.net> wrote:

Dear Jen and Kimberly, members of the 19th Amendment Monument Selection Committee, City Council, City Manager, Department of Public Works (overseeing Urban Forestry), Cambridge Historical Commission, Director of Public Art,

and copying interested members of the public and those including former City Councilors, members of the Cambridge Committee on Public Planting, Cambridge Plant&Garden Club, Tree Task Force Committee, Green Cambridge, and the Cambridge Historical Society:

We're writing in response to your helpful letter, Jen, of August 7th, which explained the process that was used to select a location for a piece of public art to commemorate the 100th anniversary of passage of the 19th Amendment to the US Constitution. It was a sound process, obviously, and we understand the opinions of those who participated, but we feel that it left out some crucial considerations. We apologize for only entering the conversation a month ago, but nothing could be truer right now than the adage "better late than never". We, by the way, are members of the Cambridge Plant & Garden Club, the Tree Task Force, and the Committee on Public Planting. Collectively we have extensive knowledge about art, architecture, monumentation (in the public commemoration sense of the word), and trees and open space.

Primarily, we have a strong objection to the siting of yet another monument on the Cambridge Common. Our objection is about the sacrificing of open green space, permeable land and trees that thrive because of unobstructed soil conditions and minimal paths and compaction. This is an identified time of critical environmental preservation in which it has been shown that the more we pave and build and minimize private and public open land the more we contribute to an unlivable environment. There is a groundswell of awareness in the citizenry about the importance of permeable open space, tree and green cover, even the subterranean exchange of nutrients between growing flora. But shoulder to shoulder with that is the notion that the Common is our shared park, our place of respite and recreation, our green gem, our most important open space. Reflection and contemplation and thought occur there spontaneously because people respond to the natural world.

In addition, the reasons cited in the selection of the Common could as easily be reasons *not* to place a monument there:

-There are already 12 monuments there, at what point do we curtail this plethora of objects? Do we commemorate in our central, small public park the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Black Lives Matter movement, the Occupy movement, the National Environmental Policy Act, the triumph of Gay Marriage? All are worthy of commemoration, and some have more to do with Cambridge, specifically, than others.

-The Common is a center of civic activity (we have ourselves attended in the past year protests for BLM and Womens rights there) which needs *space* to occur

-Streets, city halls, and voting booths evoke suffragists/suffragettes

-Children go to the Common to play and to be on grass in unencumbered open space

-The Common is a park, not a museum

Public art activates Public places, and in its best iteration brings vivacity and beauty to underwhelming or under-appreciated spaces. Public art enlivens, can educate, but most importantly *enhances* the space that's it's placed in, *better*s that space, *enriches* a City. So too, do parks and trees, with a different "set of tools". The trees and grass and open air of a park, at their best unsullied by paving, signage, furniture, fencing, and yes, even art, are a rare treat in the City and must at all costs be protected for what they do: provide a place to enjoy nature, to exercise, to just BE in the presence of living things and their shade and oxygen.

We ask, respectfully, for three things.

We would like to see published the public comment that was offered on the four finalists' proposals.

We would like to see delayed the choosing of a finalist and the construction project on the Common.

We would like to see considered an alternate location for a monument, and permanently stop construction of objects on the Common (as the Boston Common has done).

Please forward this letter to the Members of the Selection Committee.

Thank you so much,

Maggie Booz, Sandra Fairbank, and Louise Weed
Citizens

e maggie@smartarchitecture.net

--

Paula V. Cortes, FASLA

Tel & Fax: 617-441-9353

Cell: 617-868-7900

paulavcortes@gmail.com

Mathews, Jennifer

From: Mitch Nelin <mitchnelin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Laurie Beth Gaines
Cc: Maggie Booz; Mathews, Jennifer; Sansoucy, Kimberly; DePasquale, Louie; Peterson, Lisa; City Council; O'Riordan, Owen; Putnam, Andrew; Watkins, Kathy; Sullivan, Charles M.; Burks, Sarah; Woodbury, Catherine; Hsu, Lillian; Coppinger, Ellen; Shippen Page; Devereux, Jan; Kelley, Craig; Robert@rwinters.com; gary@reedhilderbrand.com; Marieke Van Damme; Barbara Murphy-Warrington; Elena Saporta; Cynthia Smith; Joan Krizack; Seanna Berry; Sophia Emperador; Martha Sieniewicz; Michael Hanlon; daviddavis7777@gmail.com; Ann MacAdam; Chantal Eide; Nancy E. Phillips; Nancy Jordalen; Paula Cortes; Sandra Fairbank; louise weed; Laura Nash; Annette LaMond; drfoster@fas.harvard.edu; suzanne r dworsky; Elizabeth Bierer; gottschalk.jane@gmail.com; Owen Dempsey; Wentworth, Randolph Nelson; Louisa McCall; Jan Ferrara; lisa ulrich; steven Nutter; Blake Allison; Jeff Clements; Rita Laguna; Kelly, Kathleen; Mitch Nelin; Rocco Ricci; Catherine Zusy; HMSnively@aol.com; Mike Nakagawa; Marc Levy
Subject: Re: 19th amendment commemoration and the Common: ideas

Well done. Thank you. I hope it works.

Mitch

from my mobile

On Aug 24, 2020, at 15:28, Laurie Beth Gaines <lauriebee4@aol.com> wrote:

Eloquent and insightful. I agree wholeheartedly. As an artist, I am especially aware of public art. Spaces to be utilized can be creative- like the sculptures outside the ICA.

Best,

Laurie Beth Mangili-Gaines
617-763-2585
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 24, 2020, at 12:53 PM, Maggie Booz <maggie@smartarchitecture.net> wrote:

Dear Jen and Kimberly, members of the 19th Amendment Monument Selection Committee, City Council, City Manager, Department of Public Works (overseeing Urban Forestry), Cambridge Historical Commission, Director of Public Art,

and copying interested members of the public and those including former City Councilors, members of the Cambridge Committee on Public Planting, Cambridge Plant&Garden Club, Tree Task Force Committee, Green Cambridge, and the Cambridge Historical Society:

We're writing in response to your helpful letter, Jen, of August 7th, which explained the process that was used to select a location for a piece of public art to commemorate the 100th anniversary of passage of the 19th Amendment to the US Constitution. It was a

sound process, obviously, and we understand the opinions of those who participated, but we feel that it left out some crucial considerations. We apologize for only entering the conversation a month ago, but nothing could be truer right now than the adage “better late than never”. We, by the way, are members of the Cambridge Plant & Garden Club, the Tree Task Force, and the Committee on Public Planting. Collectively we have extensive knowledge about art, architecture, monumentation (in the public commemoration sense of the word), and trees and open space.

Primarily, we have a strong objection to the siting of yet another monument on the Cambridge Common. Our objection is about the sacrificing of open green space, permeable land and trees that thrive because of unobstructed soil conditions and minimal paths and compaction. This is an identified time of critical environmental preservation in which it has been shown that the more we pave and build and minimize private and public open land the more we contribute to an unlivable environment. There is a groundswell of awareness in the citizenry about the importance of permeable open space, tree and green cover, even the subterranean exchange of nutrients between growing flora. But shoulder to shoulder with that is the notion that the Common is our shared park, our place of respite and recreation, our green gem, our most important open space. Reflection and contemplation and thought occur there spontaneously because people respond to the natural world.

In addition, the reasons cited in the selection of the Common could as easily be reasons *not* to place a monument there:

- There are already 12 monuments there, at what point do we curtail this plethora of objects? Do we commemorate in our central, small public park the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Black Lives Matter movement, the Occupy movement, the National Environmental Policy Act, the triumph of Gay Marriage? All are worthy of commemoration, and some have more to do with Cambridge, specifically, than others.
- The Common is a center of civic activity (we have ourselves attended in the past year protests for BLM and Womens rights there) which needs *space* to occur
- Streets, city halls, and voting booths evoke suffragists/suffragettes
- Children go to the Common to play and to be on grass in unencumbered open space
- The Common is a park, not a museum

Public art activates Public places, and in its best iteration brings vivacity and beauty to underwhelming or under-appreciated spaces. Public art enlivens, can educate, but most importantly *enhances* the space that's it's placed in, *better*s that space, *enriches* a City. So too, do parks and trees, with a different "set of tools". The trees and grass and open air of a park, at their best unsullied by paving, signage, furniture, fencing, and yes, even art, are a rare treat in the City and must at all costs be protected for what they do: provide a place to enjoy nature, to exercise, to just BE in the presence of living things and their shade and oxygen.

We ask, respectfully, for three things.

We would like to see published the public comment that was offered on the four finalists' proposals.

We would like to see delayed the choosing of a finalist and the construction project on the Common.

We would like to see considered an alternate location for a monument, and permanently stop construction of objects on the Common (as the Boston Common has done).

Please forward this letter to the Members of the Selection Committee.
Thank you so much,

Maggie Booz, Sandra Fairbank, and Louise Weed
Citizens

e maggie@smartarchitecture.net