

MEETING	Monday, January 5, 2015 Attles Meeting Room 459 Broadway
TIME	5:39 PM
PRESIDING OFFICER	Mayor David P. Maher
PRESENT	Mayor Maher, Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey
PRESENTATIONS	None
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE MOMENT OF MEDITATION	Offered in memory of former Senator Edward W. Brooke

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Councillor Carlone requested suspension of the rules to introduce a late Policy Order relating to the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The question now came on suspension of the rules and on a voice vote of seven members the rules were –
Suspended.

Councillor Carlone read the Policy Order.
(HERE INSERT POLICY ORDER # 4)
Action was taken on Policy Order # 4 later in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol O’Hare, 172 Magazine Street, spoke on Policy Orders #2 and 4 and Reconsideration Item #1. She stated that if all municipalities in the Commonwealth regulate drones it will be nightmarish. She noted that drones are sky vehicles that the FAA has barely begun to deal with. She stated that there will be drone traffic jams outside our doorways and that drones will rob us of our peace. She stated that this policy order should be expanded to include other pollutions and side effects. She stated that the City should join with other municipalities, perhaps with the Mass Area Planning Council, so that people are not duplicating their efforts. Regarding Reconsideration #1, she stated that the City Solicitor should issue a legal opinion in writing about the distinction between the words “may grant,” “will normally grant” and “shall grant” as it relates to Special Permits. She stated that having the public record should include a reasoned analysis for future and current reference. She stated that she did not understand the City Solicitor’s opinion.

Charles Teague, 25 Edmunds Street, spoke on Reconsideration Item #1. He asked the City Council to vote to advance part two of the Teague Petition to a second reading. He stated the need for the City Council to tell the Planning Board how to use its discretion to grant Special Permits. He stated that the missing step to get to the end is to get the City Solicitor's opinion. He stated that this opinion must respond to his attorney's opinion letter. He stated that he would like the City Council to have the City Solicitor's opinion for the Roundtable and would like the City Council to tell the Planning Board that they have discretion to deny some Special Permits. He noted that Part two is sending a message and that the Planning Board has asked the City Council to send them a message. He questioned if "business as usual" at the Planning Board is acceptable.

Jan Devereux, 255 Lakeview Avenue, spoke on Policy Order #2. She stated her support for this order. She stated that this path could alleviate some traffic congestion by connecting the Minuteman Trail with the Watertown Greenway. She stated that the order also asks about the possibility of purchasing the short section of the path that runs behind New Street. She stated that the Fresh Pond Residents Alliance has asked that the design for New Street be a complete street. They would like both paths along New Street itself. She stated that the Department of Public Works is holding public meeting on January 15, 2015 at the Tobin School to discuss the designs for the future of New Street.

Hadassah Fleishon, 100 Landsdowne Street, spoke on Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking. She stated her opposition to the smoking ban. She stated that she is the daughter of parents who survived the Nazi Holocaust. She stated that this proposal seems very innocuous. She stated that prohibition has never worked to eradicate the use of any substances or actions. She stated that this has to do with social control of certain populations of people.

Christie Dennis, 983 Memorial Drive, spoke on Policy Order #4. She stated that that she has three reasons why it is important to pass this policy order. The first is that there was a similar policy order last year and it is important that Cambridge is a current signatory. The second reason is that the Mass Peace Action is going to send representatives to conferences for the non-proliferation treaty in April and Cambridge is, and should be, a leader. The third reason is that it is the moment to put maximum pressure to move substantially on the promise to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons instead of what is proposed to modernize them at the cost of one trillion dollars. We must do something to find our way to eliminate nuclear weapons. They are a danger to humanity.

John Ratliff, 218 Thorndike Street, spoke on Policy Order #4. He stated his support for Policy Order #4. He added that the national government has gotten itself into a real roadblock in terms of addressing the priorities of the country. He stated that it is appropriate that City Council speak out about issues that affect them. He stated that after the end of the Cold War, many have forgotten the nuclear nightmare that we faced when the military forces confronted each other in Europe. Sadly, some of the tensions are beginning to resume. He stated that he is proud of the leading role that Cambridge has played for many years.

Sheila Foreman, 14 Chauncy Street, spoke on Policy Order #4. She stated that most of the important points have been made except that Cambridge is a model city. It is a wonderful city

to be part of and a wonderful city to represent. She would like Cambridge people to be sent to New York for the treaty conference. She asked the City Council to pass this policy order.

Steve Helfer, 3 Crawford Street, spoke on Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking. He stated that several City Councillors have noted receiving many e-mails in opposition to this item, particularly to a complete park smoking ban. He thanked the City Council and the Department of Public Health for considering a less restrictive ban. He stated that many feel that the war on smokers has become abusive of the civil rights of some of the population and a lack of integrity. Smokers are depicted as having been "tricked" into smoking. He stated that it is sad that in a country that prides itself on freedom, he has to feel restrictions regarding smoking growing tighter. He stated that cigarette smoking is at a 22 year low among youth. He stated that there are many other things that are killing our youth such as opioids, guns, etc. He asked the City Council to give this ban due consideration.

David Ajemian, 1716 Cambridge Street, spoke on spoke on Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking. He stated that he is not a smoker but he respects the rights of those who want to engage in this activity. He stated that this seems discriminatory against a portion of the population that participate in this activity. He stated that there are many nuisances that we put up with day to day. He stated that prohibition has never been effective and this amendment seems to be in the direction of complete prohibition. He urged the City Council to consider a less restrictive ban.

Mitchell Feinberg, 10 Chauncy Street, spoke on Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking. He stated that he is a non-smoker. He stated that he is a law student and one concept in the law is the concept of individual rights. This should be the number one priority at every level - to protect. The current proposal grants privileges to some at the expense of others' rights. He stated that the public includes every citizen, including smokers. He stated that the public means that 100% of people living here should be able to use the parks. He stated that a proper resolution is not to protect the wishes of the non-smoker while ignoring the valid concerns of a smoker. Regarding sale of tobacco in drugstores, he stated that the way to implement this is not to take away freedoms from adults. He stated that store owners have the right to sell products in their stores. He stated that he does not want to live in a town where local government takes away the rights of some citizens. He urged the City Council to reject the proposed amendments.

Sue Butler, 14 Clinton Street, spoke on Policy Order #2. She commended the City Council for Policy Order #4. Regarding Policy Order #2, she stated that this area has been discussed at great length. There is concern that transportation be made available to the large number of units that have been added in that area. She stated that she is horrified that it seems that there is no reporting system for bicycle accidents in the city. She stated that people in cars are protected by metal but bicyclists are very vulnerable. She urged the City Council to develop the well with particular attention to the bicyclists and pedestrians. She noted that there should be some mechanisms in place for the safety of both groups.

Ilan Levy, 148 Spring Street, spoke on Reconsideration Item #1. He stated that he does not know if the change of language will make a difference. He stated that the City Council should change the language. He urged the City Council to clarify the language as much as possible. As

it relates to the Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking, he stated that public parks should be available to all the public.

Hasson Rashid, 820 Massachusetts Avenue, spoke on Calendar Items #1 and #11. He stated that converting the Foundry Building into infrastructural spaces to accommodate the region's homelessness concerns is part and parcel of the mosaic of possible uses for this building. He stated that the availability of the Foundry Building represents a splendid opportunity for Cambridge to catch up on its obligations.

Emily Wieja, 11 Franklin Street, Charlestown, spoke in opposition to Unfinished Business Item regarding smoking. She stated that the aim of smoking bans is not to protect anyone's health, it is about demoralizing smokers. She stated that this issue is one that comes down to personal bias and prejudice. She stated that Option B is a better option than the original proposal. She stated that Option B will not tackle the root of the problem. She stated that Public Health has used bad science as a distraction. She asked the City Council not to ban smoking in public parks and allow business owners to make choices for their own businesses.

Ken Payson, 102 Sycamore Street, Somerville, stated his opposition to the smoking ban. He stated that he enjoys the company of people at outdoor cafes. He stated that a smoking ban at outdoor cafes should be at the discretion of the business.

Minka vanBeuzekom, 20 Essex Street, spoke about the Area 4 History publication party and stated her support. She noted that police patrols in Area 4 have helped. She congratulated the City for its Class I fire rating. She congratulated Joan Abrams on her award. She stated that she would like the city to consider the rail to trail program that will recycle steel. Regarding the curb cut on Harvard Street, she stated that this is a home-grown developer and noted her support. She stated that this will be affordable housing right next to a park. Regarding Councillor Cheung's order on the Building Energy Use Disclosure Ordinance, she stated that this will be valuable.

Patrick Barrett, 234 Broadway, stated that he is grateful for the fantastic Police Department in the City of Cambridge. He stated that this is only half a step and we should think how the community can be more engaged. He stated that as it relates to Vail Court, his belief is that it is one of the most dilapidated properties but without having talked to the property owner, this move might be aggressive. With that being said, he stated that there are property owners that would like to see more interaction from the City Council regarding graffiti and cleanliness. He noted that there are properties that are less "pretty" than others. Regarding the 131 Harvard Street, he noted that he is an abutter and this parcel has sat empty for a long time. He commented that he is happy to see that two people from Cambridge have put this project together and the curb cut should be easily passed.

Diane Hopson, 1 Leighton Street, stated that regarding Calendar Item #1 she would hope that there are more persons interested in arts and we can encourage those persons to speak on behalf of love and peace. She stated that she is a concerned citizen due to the unpleasant events and hate crimes causing division amongst the city, state and nation. She does not believe that a malefactor should be killed instantly. As a concerned citizen, she does not believe retaliation on police departments is the answer. She stated that these activities have not occurred in Cambridge. She stated that there are individuals that act without integrity in every

profession. She stated that she believes that it hurts when a child is killed. Finding a way to heal is more glorifying than becoming a vigilante. She would like to say that all life matters.

Marilyn Wellons, 651 Green Street, stated that her mother was a lifelong smoker who felt like a pariah. She stated that as it relates to Policy Order #6, she is concerned about nuclear targeting. While she supports this, she would like to think more about the proposal to modernize the nuclear force. She pointed out that the question regarding hair trigger alert is unfortunately part of the U.S. strategy. She stated that while she is grateful for the work being done on this, she does not urge the City Council to do the full thing because it is a serious set of questions that deserve serious thought. She stated that in regards to Special Permits, the problem that she sees is that for 30 years or more, the City Council has passed off hot potatoes to the Planning Board and has been insulated. The problem is the political accountability for the development strategy for the City of Cambridge.

Paul Neff, 18 Ware Street, spoke about the patio portion of the proposed smoking restrictions. He stated that he has been drawn to this struggle because it was getting obvious that the anti-smoking movement is asking too much of us. Sensible people are rejecting a hysterical position. He stated that the fact that you can smoke in some establishments has been praised in reviews that he has read. He stated that most people do not make an issue of smoking. He stated that patios are rare and special and public health regulations can afford to let them be. Trying to eliminate them is aimed at wiping out the last places where people can smoke and feel comfortable. He stated that smokers are all types of people.

Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street, stated that as it relates to public bulletin boards, it is wonderful that they are in the parks but they are needed in places where people run across them without going in search of them. She encouraged the rails to trails program. She stated that this will make things better. As it relates to the second part of the Teague Petition, she stated that the real question is what the Planning Board thinks its job is. Are they there to approve good projects or are they there to massage what is presented to them. It is a serious distinction and it seriously matters. She stated that the City can have either people living up to expectations or we can have them living down to them. She stated that good developments breed better developments and community. She commented that the first step is to convince the Planning Board that they can say no. She stated that if you never say no, they won't know that you can. She would like the language changed to "may."

Jonathan King, 40 Essex Street, stated that the City Council is aware of the decline in federal support for the community. He stated that our community has been hit hard by the reduction in federal housing programs. He stated that one source of this is due to the continued draining of tax dollars into nuclear proliferation. He stated that rather than following the treaty, the United States is embarking on a modernization program. He asked the City Council to support policy order #4.

Rachel Ann Warden, 411 Franklin Street, stated that she began smoking at 18. She stated that she smokes approximately four cigarettes a day. She stated that she enjoys smoking and is not a victim of the tobacco industry. She stated that she has chosen not to be bothered with other people's activities. She stated that we should promote our children's ability to be critical thinking. She stated that critical thinking is not being promoted especially since she sees politically-correct ideas promoted. She stated her opposition to the smoking ban. She stated

her support for Policy Order #4. She stated that she does not see Russia as the aggressor and she sees our government invading one country after another.

Elaine Scary spoke about Policy Order #4. She stated that the focus of the spring's meeting is Article 6 which is the article in which the United States has done the least amount of work. She stated that our own arsenal is the most powerful on earth. She stated that we are now going to renew these weapons with a trillion dollar renewal plan. She stated that this spring, people of all faiths and races can work together to get the United States to disarm.

Christopher Hope, 49 Roseland Street, spoke on the increased presence of the Cambridge Police in the Cambridgeport area. He noted that there has been an increased level of police activity which has been a great thing. He stated that there should be more dialogue with respect to the community engagement piece. He stated that recently there was incident in Newtowne Court. He stated that this incident took place at 2:00 p.m. on a Friday afternoon. He stated that a militarized group of police officers with semi-automatic weapons questioned a group of individuals that were hanging out in Newtowne Court. He stated that it was communicated to him that there was fear and trepidation about this encounter. He stated after contacting the Cambridge Police it was communicated to him that the Police Department received a phone call about an anonymous person in Newtowne Court with a gun. He stated that it is important to continue the dialogue when talking about increased police presence in the Cambridgeport neighborhood.

RECONSIDERATION

Councillor Mazen stated that he wanted to speak on whether to bring the reconsideration forward and whether Part II of the Teague petition should be reconsidered. He stated that whether this should be reconsidered is important to him. Parliamentary procedure can be used for many things. Mayor Maher questioned whether the item was before the body. Councillor Mazen stated that he wanted to speak on whether the item is reconsidered. Mayor Maher stated that this is not in order because the item is not before the body. Councillor Mazen stated that conversation on this matter was silenced before in a way that he is not comfortable with. He wanted to explain why Parliamentary procedure is used this way and why it is important to reconsider this matter.

Councillor Kelley stated that he was in agreement with Councillor Mazen. Discussion is not about the subject matter but rather about whether this should be reconsidered. He stated that there was procedural confusion previously and Councillor Mazen feels he did not have the opportunity to discuss or vote on the matter as he chose.

Councillor Cheung made a motion for a roll call on reconsideration before discussing the matter.

Mayor Maher stated that the issue is that there is nothing before the body. The vote is to reconsider the item and bring it back before the City Council for discussion or not.

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern and Simmons	- 7
NAYS:	Councillor Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 2

ABSENT: None

- 0

and the motion to reconsider –
Prevails.

Here insert Reconsideration read by Mayor Maher.

Mayor Mazen stated that he does not think that reconsideration is necessary. When this matter came before the body the first time he hoped that it could be discussed then. He stated that a vote was called before the discussion. He stated that there are ways that the City Council can close discussion before a roll call vote is called. He wanted a little space of time be allotted for topics of importance and that Parliamentary procedure not be used to side step discussion. When something is on the agenda he would rather discuss the item before a vote is called. He stated that during public comment it was stated the importance of “shall,” “may,” and “must.” He felt it appropriate to have the City Solicitor reflect on this issue in writing. He felt that Part II should be passed to a second reading. If there are objections to the language changes that could be discussed now. He stated that “may” was very appropriate to a body that should say “yes” when it can. There are case law precedents for the Planning Board to say “no,” even when all criteria is met. It is appropriate to say “no” when it is appropriate for the petitioner to do a better job. This is basic negotiation. This word change may affect the way that petitioners proceed.

Councillor Cheung spoke about the motion to reconsider and not the underlining subject. He is happy to bring this forward for discussion. He stated that his recollection is that there should be a vote to close debate before taking a roll call vote. He stated that Chair has discretion unless the body wants to challenge this.

Councillor Toomey asked if there was vote to close debate on this matter at the last meeting. He stated that he does not remember a vote to close debate. The City Council did not vote to close debate on this subject matter. The City Clerk stated that she would have to check the record.

Councillor Cheung stated that the language change is giving the Planning Board the discretion that the City Council intends. He supports the change.

Councillor Carlone stated that the Planning Board has always had discretion. The word change as proposed would make it more obvious that this is the case to the public. Every development entity has the legal advice that the words may not have different weight as stated by the City Solicitor. He stated that the City Council wants the Zoning Ordinances to reflect what reality is. He supports the word change. He stated that special permits “normally” granted suggested entitlement and the proponent afforded some advantage. The City Council wants this to be neutral. He stated that he is in support of Councillor Mazen’s motion to reconsider this matter.

Councillor McGovern stated that there is a feeling in the community that the Planning Board never says “no.” He stated that the Planning Board says no many times to the developers coming before them and before they get to the final vote of “yes.” He stated that the Planning Board say no to developers to ensure that they better meet the criteria. He stated that it is unfair to say that the Planning Board never says “no.” There is still the issue of getting to “yes.”

He stated that changing the words do not matter much. He is fine with the word change but the issue is that people feel that special permits get issued too often. If there are issues with the criterion then this should be addressed. He spoke about setting up false expectations for people. He stated that the Planning Board will continue to operate with the discretion that they have. They will use the criterion that the City Council created. He does not think this will lead to change.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that the Planning Board has criterion that is covered in the state law and set by the City Council. He asked if the word change would substantively change the criterion that the Planning Board will use before making decisions on special permits. City Solicitor Glowa stated that changing the word to "may" does not change the substantive criterion. She stated that the Planning Board is governed by Chapter 40A, the Zoning Law, as well as the criterion to grant special permits is established by the City Council. The law is that if an applicant meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance the special permit granting authority must grant the permit if the applicant meets the criteria. If the Planning Board denies a special permit where the criterion has been met then this decision is subject to being overturned by the court. She stated that she would prepare a legal opinion if this would be of assistance to the City Council. She explained that changing the word to "may" may be more misleading as to the extent of the discretion of the Planning Board. The Planning Board does have discretion if the criterion is not met. Some of the criterion is broad or loose and is subject to interpretation. The law is specific. If an applicant has met specific criteria laid out in the Zoning Ordinance and the Planning Board denied the special permit without showing that the applicant did not meet other criterion this would be overturned in the court.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated he has reservation about this change. He felt that this should be discussed in committee. This is sending out the message to the public that the discretion of the Planning Board is being expanded with the word change. This is not the case. If the criterion that the Planning Board uses to make decision needs to be changed then this should be done in committee. The criterion established has to be consistent with state law. This may not be consistent with state law. He stated that having this conversation at a City Council meeting, without all the information, is a disservice to the public. He would vote to keep this matter in committee. If one is serious about this then a committee hearing should be held to discuss the matter.

Councillor Mazen stated that sending this to committee would be the logical next step. This should be sent for a second reading. If not sent to a second reading the petition will expire. He stated that given that it is legal to go either way the City Council should support the Planning Board with the most tools needed. He acknowledged that the word change is not a silver bullet. The criterion should be discussed at the second reading. He wanted it recognized that certain things need more discussion and making sure that for Zoning Ordinances that the City Council is cognizant of the timeline and expiration date.

Councillor Carlone stated that he agreed with Councillor Mazen's comment that the word "may" explains the discretion of the Planning Board. He supported reviewing Article 19, the criterion that the Planning Board uses. The Planning Board has asked for this.

Vice Mayor Benzan asked what the expiration date of the petition is. The City Clerk responded that the expiration date is February 10, 2015 per state law.

Mayor Maher explained that it is routine that Zoning petitions are not passed by the City Council when first submitted. He stated that he is confused about this discussion. He stated that the vote at the last meeting was to pass Part 1 to a second reading and that Part 2 and 3 remained in committee for further discussion. This is up to the Ordinance Committee to schedule another meeting to discuss the issues. There are many options for the petition. He stated that this is odd having this discussion at the City Council meeting without members from Community Development Department being present.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that there is a roundtable scheduled for next week with the Planning Board. This is a topic for discussion during the roundtable. These are important issues that should be vetted in committee. This is not the forum to have these discussions. He stated that if the criteria that the Planning Board follows needs to be changed then the City Council should do this as a body. He felt that making the word change will not have substantive changes for the City and this also sends the wrong message to the community. He supports having another hearing on this matter.

Councillor Mazen stated that from his perspective the reason for this conversation, such as is happening this evening, was omitted last time. This conversation is appropriate. No vote was taken to close discussion on this issue. There was a roll call to keep Parts II and III in committee. He stated that he could have objected. He considered using reconsideration as a means to have this discussion. He stated that a basic discussion of all of the parts of the issue would have been helpful to members of the City Council. He stated his frustration with the omission by the City Council of discussion of the issues. Vice Mayor Benzan disagreed about not having a discussion on this issue. He stated that he chaired the Ordinance Committee when this petition was presented to the committee. The committee discussions included Part I, II and III of the petition. It was the pleasure of the committee to forward this to the full City Council. He stated that the process was followed. This is what happens when issues are not properly vetted in committee. He asked how the criteria of the Planning Board can be changed when this is the real issue.

Councillor McGovern stated that at the last meeting this was referred back to the Ordinance Committee. Is the issue here that a meeting cannot be scheduled? Mayor Maher stated that the vote at the last meeting was to keep Part II and III in committee. Councillor McGovern stated that the issue will not die by sending it back to committee. The committee will take up the matter. Mayor Maher explained that any City Councillor, prior to the expiration of the petition, can file a City Council order to extend the petition. This requires a vote of the City Council. Councillor McGovern commented that if a hearing before the Ordinance Committee cannot be scheduled by February 10, 2015 then an extension can be filed. This should not be voted on tonight if there are members that want to continue the discussion. He suggested to Councillor Mazen that he file an Order to extend the petition.

Councillor Simmons commented that she wanted to get a sense of the options. She asked if this were to be forwarded where this puts the petition. She asked that the Mayor provide a clear explanation of the process. Mayor Maher stated that if the City Council does not act on the motion to reconsider the prior action taken stands which passed Part I to a second reading and Parts II and III remained in committee. He believes that it is the intention of the Ordinance Committee chairs to schedule another hearing after the January 12, 2015 roundtable.

Councillor Simmons noted that it is the intention of the chairs of the Ordinance Committee to schedule another hearing to discuss Part II and Part III. Mayor Maher explained that if the hearing could not be scheduled prior to the expiration of the petition, a member of the City Council could file a City Council Order to re-file this portion of the petition. This brings the petition back to the beginning. A hearing would be held before the Ordinance Committee and the Planning Board.

Mayor Maher explained that if the City Council voted not to reconsider the action remains that Part I was passed to a second reading and that Part II and III remain in committee. If the City Council votes for reconsideration the matter is before the City Council to take action.

Councillor Mazen asked what does passing to a second reading mean. The City Clerk explained that passage to a second reading is a step in the legislative process. The petition appears on the Committee Report List and is before the City Council. The City Council can discuss the petition because it is part of the Agenda. Councillor Mazen stated that a second reading would be appropriate venue in which to have a discussion. He stated that the content of this is not the issue. The issue is quickly pulling an item on the agenda and voting on the report which may or may not be one person's interpretation without discussion. The City Clerk stated that the petition contained three separate sections. This is part of the confusion.

Vice Mayor Benzan asked if this were passed to a second reading would this come up for ordination at the January 26th meeting. He explained that at the January 26, 2015 there was an intention to file Policy Orders relating to STEAM as well as to submit the STEAM summit report. Passing this to a second reading will bring City staff to the meeting to discuss Part II of the Teague petition. This issue should come before the Ordinance Committee to vet this and refer it to the full City Council for deliberation.

The question now came on the motion reconsider Part II and III remaining in committee and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Councillors Carlone, Cheung and Mazen	- 3
NAYS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Kelley, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 6
ABSENT:	None	- 0
and the matter –		

Remains in committee.

CONSENT AGENDA

- # 1 Order adopted 9 – 0 – 0
- # 2 Order adopted 9 – 0 – 0
- #11 Order adopted 9 – 0 – 0

NON CONSENT AGENDA

3 Here insert Agenda # 3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Kelley asked what is a once time salary increase. Ms. Semonoff stated that this is a state salary. The state contracts with the City and the City contracts with the YWCA. This the salary reserve money voted annually, sometimes. This goes into the salary permanently for the individuals who are covered by it.

This is for human service worker who make less than \$40,000 per year. It amounts to up to \$1,000 per person. This funding is built into the contract for the following year. If the state votes for another salary reserve there may be an increase on this.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT ORDER FOR AGENDA # 3)

The question now came on adoption of the order and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –
Adopted.

4 Here insert Agenda # 4 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Kelley spoke about the technical difficulties about putting the traffic enforcement data on line. He commented that the conversation will be different when he can see the data about traffic enforcement. He explained an incident he encountered on his bike where a car turned and he bounced off the rear of the car because he did not have time to stop. He stated that three members of his family have had bike accidents. He stated that he will continue to vote against this until he has data. He stated that it is a hard thing for him to not be able to protect his family.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT ORDER FOR AGENDA # 4)

The question now came on adoption of the order and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 8
NAYS:	Councillor Kelley	- 1
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –
Adopted.

5 Here insert Agenda # 5 read by Mayor Maher. Vice Mayor Benzan spoke about the protesting that is occurring around the country as it relates to the police. He spoke about a death in Cambridge, Kingsley Davis, and about the anger and frustration was centered on the lack of police presence in the neighborhood. He stated that the police stepped up to the plate and increased patrols. He expressed his thanks for the increased police presence in Area IV. He explained that police officers need to be hired who are residents and that they need to develop a relationship with the youth of the City. He spoke about the community policing that is done in Cambridge.

Councillor Simmons appreciated the update. She voiced her concern about safety as spring is approaching. The increased police presence is appreciated by the community. She stated that Cambridge is not afraid to have difficult conversations on how to engage the community. She asked how details are handled by personnel that do not have the Cambridge training. There are problems with details around the City. Mr. Rossi stated that details are a matter of collective

bargaining. He stated that the City is making proposals with the unions around collective bargaining on details. Councillor Simmons asked if officers are used for details from other communities is there a way that these officers can be trained in the Cambridge method. Mr. Rossi stated that conversation can be held on this. Moving forward he would like to work effectively with the City's unions to keep details within the Cambridge employees.

Councillor Toomey stated that outside officers are doing details in Cambridge because there is an inadequate supply of Cambridge officers. He stated that home rule petition has been filed to allow retired Cambridge Police Officers to do details. He stated that he was unsure if the detail issue was a collective bargaining issue. He stated his concern with lateral transfers who have no connection with Cambridge. He spoke about helping Cambridge youth to take the exams to get on the fire and police forces. He stated Cambridge residents get preference as long as they are qualified. He is against lateral transfers taking jobs from Cambridge residents. He is also disappointed with the lack of women and persons of color added to the forces. Mr. Rossi stated that he has not made any lateral transfer appointments. He stated that he would like to have a conversation about what has been done in the City to recruit women and persons of color.

Councillor Kelley stated that he felt that construction details are not useful. The police are asked to do a host of things that require support and training. Policing has changed and is a professional job and should be treated as such.

Councillor Cheung stated that the unofficial discussion he has had is that lateral transfers are problematic in trying to build the police force wanted. The police force should represent the diversity of the community. Mr. Rossi stated that there are no plans for lateral transfers to come to Cambridge police.

Councillor McGovern stated that the mere fact that police officers wear a uniform creates distrust. He stated that it is not just resources for policing; it is also about investing in social and case workers in the neighborhood who work with youth in a way that the police cannot.

Mayor Maher spoke about the professional police department that Cambridge has. He stated that he views details on the street as extra eyes available. He commented on the fact that first responders have been personnel doing details. He stated that with all the construction going on in the City, the sewer separation project and buildings that he wanted the police as eye on the street in the community. He wanted to put Cambridge eyes back on the street using retired officers in a deputized way to supplement the workforce. He stated that despite what is happening nationally we are hearing an appreciation for those that work and live in Area IV. It says a lot when people are coming forward to say that they like seeing the increased police presence in the community.

5 Placed on file.

6 Here insert Agenda # 6 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone stated that the parkway is important use wise and building wise between the neighborhood and Fresh Pond. He stated that the zoning on this site does not allow for expanded car service use. Mr. Murphy stated that this would require a variance. He stated that the Alewife area will be part of the first phase of the Master Plan process. He stated that he hopes this includes this and the adjacent site. He stated that in time these sites will become viable sites for housing.

Councillor Cheung stated that he was frustrated that the owner of the site chose to ignore the City. He mentioned Paris having the same problem citing affordable housing. They have the right of first refusal. He asked if Cambridge has something similar to this because the City has been aware of this property for a while. Mr. Murphy responded in the negative. The City has no right on first refusal. It is the owner's choice of when to sell and to whom. The City has expressed their interest in the site but the owner has not responded. He stated that he would be interested to hear from the Law Department what the City could do.

Councillor McGovern stated that this is an example of how the City is behind on having knowledge of properties. He stated he was happy that the City was still talking with the property owner. He stated that the City needed to use every opportunity to purchase and build more affordable and moderate housing.

Councillor Cheung commented that the fence has been an eyesore for the neighborhood. He asked if there have been any inspections of the site. Mr. Rossi stated that he would send a team to inspect the site.

Mayor Maher commented that the neighbors have been patient for a long period of time.

6 Placed on file.

7 Here insert Agenda # 7 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Kelley asked about the grant funding. He stated that things that are important the City should pay for and if it is not important enough to pay for he does not know why the City needed the grants. He stated that cycling does have inclusion issues. He asked why the City was only looking toward the grant rather than the task getting done. Mr. Murphy stated that this is being worked as a regional issue. Mr. Rossi stated that he will not let this fail because of funding.

Councillor Carlone stated that the Policy Order mentioned low income and it has been expanded. He asked if Boston can have a program for low income and it is regional why can't Cambridge? Mr. Murphy stated that Boston has a different approach. He stated that he is not sure that the reduction in the dollar amount will have the desired effect. To increase usage of the Hubway system is this the best way to increase the utilization. He stated that there is a difference in the philosophical approach. Councillor Carlone stated that this is not a lot of money. Economics does play a role in decisions for low income families and if it were so inviting more people would give it a try. The goal is to increase bicycle usage and if it costs the City \$95 per person and 400 people use it. This is not a big issue and it is worth a try. He stated that if Boston uses this system Cambridge would have to have a good argument not to use it. Ms. Seiderman explained that the City wanted to work on a substantive approach because the City wanted to get to the real issues. The monetary barrier is not the issue. She spoke about finding out what are the barriers for people. She stated that the intent of the grant is that it is multi-community and there is added value. If money is not a barrier the things that are needed to be addressed. It is not just signing people up it is getting people to use the system. If the resources are expended to develop a system for everyone to use this is where the focus should be. If there are barriers because of cost the City would act on this, but this is not what the evidence is showing. Councillor Carlone asked if the Boston experiment showed an increase in the numbers. Ms. Seiderman stated that people are signing up for the program in Boston. It is not clear that there is more engagement in the usage. She stated that Boston is not paying for

the system. Councillor Carlone stated that this is more incentive to have more people sign up. Mr. Rossi noted that this does not eliminate what is being asked.

7 Placed on file.

8 Here insert Agenda # 8 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Kelley stated that the response did not address the issue of the financial future of Hubway. He stated that the Hubway bikes are safe. He likes the program but they came on a three year grant. He asked how this will the operation be funded after the three years. He was hoping to see the initial cost of Hubway after the grant funding is gone. He stated that the City owns the bikes and bike stations and is hoping to contract it out for the operation and maintenance of the program. He asked if the program will be able to be operational without City subsidy. Mr. Murphy stated that the program has been successful in Cambridge because of private donations and investors. He stated that \$1.2 million has been received from donations that helps expand the system. He stated that the Parking Sticker funds of \$280,000 has been allocated annually. He stated that the focus has been on expansion of the system. The money received back from Hubway is going toward expansion of the system. He stated that there will be a need to have an allocation such as the parking sticker money going forward. He stated that the system operates well with the annual fees. He stated that Boston is ahead of Cambridge in the cycle. He stated that Cambridge has not heard from Somerville or Brookline that they will be backing away from the system. He is optimistic that the system will continue to be regional. Hubway has come a long way in three years. Mr. Rossi stated that looking to see if there is an appetite to do advertising to keep the system going is a possibility.

Councillor Kelley stated that what he is hearing is that the City is committed to filling the gap, whatever that is. He questioned the operational, installation and maintenance costs. He noted that some of the funding for Hubway was ARA money. He stated that he would like to hear that the City will fund Hubway possible through advertisement. He stated that there are a lot of issues with advertising. Mr. Rossi stated as long as this program continues to be a successful service and people are using it, the program is a key part of the transportation system. The City would want to fill the gaps to keep this successful. He spoke of what advertising would bring to the City and what the advertisement would be. He stated that Boston gets revenue from advertising. It would be worth the exercise to see what advertising would bring to the City. Councillor Kelley stated that he felt that the City cannot look at advertising as a source of revenue. He is hearing that the City will fund the gaps, with or without advertising, for the operational costs. Ms. Seiderman stated that the money received from the grants were used to start up the system. The revenue coming in from corporate memberships is increasing as well as donations from private donors. She stated that the City receives on a regular basis corporate donations for installation of a Hubway system. There is potential for expansion through this mechanism. Councillor Kelley stated expansion is one thing and maintenance is another issue. He was concerned with the maintenance and the fact that a high level of maintenance has not been seen because the system is not very old.

Councillor Simmons stated that Hubway is popular. She asked for an estimate of what the municipal funding expense will be. She asked that the City be mindful of the installation of the stations. She asked where the two stations at MIT will be. Ms. Seiderman responded one is near the main entrance at 77 Massachusetts Avenue the second is on Vassar Street. The two new stations will be on Vassar Street near the dorms and on Pacific Street. Councillor Simmons noted that the relationship between Hubway and the University is good. Mr. Rossi stated that

the City learns lessons as they move forward. She stated that bus shelters were underwritten and the advertisers had control over where the station would be located. She did not want to relinquish control. Mr. Rossi stated that the City would decide the ads, not a private agency. He explained that there are bikes that end up in Cambridge with advertising. Other communities are received the revenue. He stated that the City should look into getting its fair share of revenue. Councillor Simmons wanted the City to have control over the location of the stations and the the advertising.

Councillor Kelley stated that the big stations only take up 2-3 parking spaces. When bike lanes or Hubway stations are installed the City has to have good data to discuss this. He cautioned about using bad or no data at all.

Mayor Maher stated that moving forward the revenue possibility must be reviewed. Cambridge has bikes from other communities with advertisement.

8 Placed on file.

9 Here insert Agenda # 9 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone asked how is something attached to the mesh. The response was scotch tape. He hoped that the discussion was expanded to the neighborhoods given the locations of the bulletin boards.

Councillor Mazen questioned the design, material and installation costs. Commissioner O'Riordan stated that the cost associated with the installation in the squares is associated with finding suitable locations for the foundations. The biggest challenge is finding appropriate locations. He stated that the City pays a premium when installing anything in the squares of the City. The simpler bulletin board cost \$4,000 with a cost of \$10,000 to install in Harvard Square. Councillor Mazen stated that they are a good idea, but the cost is exorbitant. He suggested using buildings and doing a one sided bulletin board as a foundation and work with property owners to reduce the cost. He wanted more focus on where people work and live for the locations of the bulletin boards. Commissioner O'Riordan stated that the locations were selected because they are sites where there is congregation. Mr. Rossi stated that it is what will work.

Councillor McGovern asked why is the cost more in the squares. Commissioner O'Riordan stated that experience shows that construction in the squares is expensive and more challenging for contractors working around pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The utilities are the dense in the squares and finding space for foundations is more challenging. Police details are needed for construction in the square. Councillor McGovern asked if RSTA students could help create the bulletin boards. Is there a cheaper way to obtain the bulletin boards. Commissioner O'Riordan stated that there are high design standards for the furniture in the squares. Councillor McGovern asked if there are bulletin board in front of all City buildings. He suggested that municipal buildings and schools should be considered as locations for bulletin boards.

Councillor Cheung asked if the costs of digital bulletin boards was known. Commissioner O'Riordan responded in the negative.

Councillor Carlone spoke of the cost for custom kiosk. He noted that the installation would be less expensive if there is street construction or sidewalk upgrades occurring.

Deputy City Manager Peterson stated that the cost of the structure is not the biggest problem. The challenge is the maintenance and keeping the bulletin boards updated. Another issue is finding a space that does not impede access.

Councillor Simmons commented that not all bulletin boards are created equal because they are not cared for by City staff. Information is thrown up and it is cluttered. She does not want the bulletin boards to become an eyesore. She liked the idea of an electronic bulletin board. As technology develops one should be more in tune with the 21st century. Mr. Rossi stated that the City should put into the budget next year to experiment with a digital bulletin board.

9 Placed on file.

#10 Here insert Agenda #10 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone was surprised that the review agency felt there were training areas that needed improvement. Chief Reardon stated that the lack of the score is related to the fact that Cambridge does not have its own dedicated training facility within the City. Cambridge's training is over the top but the City will not get the full credit. The City has a commitment that it is looking for a training facility within the City. Mr. Rossi stated that if a new DPW site is found this would be built into the site. The thing to do is to find a place in the City where there can be a training tower.

Councillor Toomey commented that the fire training academy in Stow, MA does a tremendous job in training every firefighter. He has seen the recruits in training. He did not want people to think because Cambridge does not have its own training facility that the firefighters are not properly trained. Chief Reardon stated that all firefighters since 1977 have been trained at the fire academy. He stated that he taught at the academy for twelve years. He stated that the ISO is narrowly focused on protecting the City. Training is done on a recurring basis. He stated that the necessary equipment and funding is imperative for the training. Cambridge is one of 61 or 62 ISO certified departments in the United States. This rating lowers the commercial fire protection rating. This gives the best fire insurance rate for residential property.

Councillor Cheung stated that all can sleep better knowing that Cambridge has one of the best fire departments. Residents and commercial benefits because of the rating of the fire protection.

Mayor Maher commented on the professionalism of the department.

#10 Placed on file.

#12 Here insert Agenda #12 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Toomey stated that this is the beginning of a comprehensive neighborhood discussion for the rebuilding of the school, the Valente Library and the Gold Star Mother's Pool. He stated that a community public meeting will be held at the school on Thursday to answer questions from the community. This will be a huge impact on the community moving forward. The building will be a NetZero building. He questioned the house doctor design services. Mr. Rossi stated that the City has open ended contracts for design and architectural work. The same is done for geothermal work. These services are used so that the City does not have to spend months going out to bid for the services. Councillor Toomey asked if the building would be torn down. He was hopeful that the drop off and pick up be altered. This is quite and undertaken. Deputy City Manager Peterson stated that this is the feasibility study; there is nothing preconceived. The building is not a

historic building and does not need to be preserved. It has not been determined what will happen on the site. The City anticipates that it will be a complete tear down. There is an architectural firm, the same architect that worked on the library. Mr. Rossi explained that Ms. Peterson will lead the community process which will be robust. He stated that the several communities would be engaged in this project.

Councillor Carlone stated that having in house program is good and having quality firms on the program is tremendous. He stated that the land was a homestead park at one time. The site was a pond. He is excited about the potential of the site. It could become more a neighborhood center. A central public space that leads to the park in the back and a possible road behind the building that can be used as a pick up and drop off location. The current building hides the park. He commended the City Manager on the choice of the architectural team.

Councillor McGovern stated that seeing this come to fruition is exciting. He suggested having conversations with the community about the murals to salvage the mural. He stated that there is concern that the construction of the school is being delayed because of the library and the pool. Mr. Rossi stated that this is a much bigger school than the MLK School. The City has negotiated the schedule with the School Department and will stick to the schedule of opening the new school in September 2019. The important issue is getting the certificate of occupancy for the school. It would not be a big deal if the library or the pool were not ready at the same time as the school. He does not anticipate any problems. Councillor McGovern asked if there would be any upgrades to the Frisoli Youth Center as part of this project. Deputy City Manager Peterson stated that the City plans to look at the connections to the school, the playground and the youth center. There is no plans to do work in the Frisoli Youth Center at this time. Councillor McGovern noted that the enrollment of students in the schools has been steadily increasing as well as the number of students leaving the district has decreased. He wanted this included in the plans for the space. Mr. Rossi stated that the student information comes directly from the School Department. Mr. Black coordinates weekly meetings with the architects and the School Department. The City manages the construction and the School Department provides the needed information. Mr. Rossi stated that rebuilding this center is going to be incredible. Councillor McGovern stated that no other community is rebuilding four schools with little or no assistance from the state. This fact is a great testimony to the financial stability of the City. Mr. Rossi stated that previously the City Council voted to take \$12 million from free cash and put it into debt reserve and the reason for this is that the City does not want future generations to feel strapped by actions taken by the City in 2014-2015. This will enable the City to keep taxes level and allow the opportunity to build great new facilities. This is smart planning. This is also an opportunity to make corrections to students being dropped off and picked up on Cambridge Street and to make the corridors more visual to the park. Councillor McGovern also noted that space will be needed for the early childhood education programs.

Vice Mayor Benzan asked if the School administration offices would be moved into this facility. Mr. Rossi stated that during the feasibility study it will be determined whether it is feasible to create enough space to move the school administration into a new building and to provide parking that will not negatively impact the community. Deputy City Manager Peterson noted that the space that the administrative offices are in is an odd space. She stated that 15,000 square feet is the area needed for the administrative offices. Vice Mayor Benzan asked if the administrative offices moved to the new facility could the City entertain purchasing the site that

currently houses the administrative offices. Mr. Rossi stated that the site is controlled by the Archdiocese. The City would be interested in talking to the Archdiocese.

Councillor Cheung pleased that this is a NetZero project and that the school administration offices are being included. He stated that this is an investment in education but he wanted to know how this affects the City's bond rating and impacting taxes. He commented that lessons learn regarding the Foundry building may be incorporated into the schools. He wanted the schools used as an open space for 24/7 rather than just for school hours and building schools where portions of the school can be opened to the public beyond the school day. Mr. Rossi stated that this will be seen in the new King School. Ms. Peterson added that the future use of the branch libraries is to augment the technology. Mr. Rossi stated that the City Council is being asked to consider this as a \$130.5 million project and to appropriate the \$1.5 million to do the feasibility study.

Mayor Maher thanked the City Manager and his team for the school renewal program. He stated that this is creating facilities that the City can be proud of. This is an extraordinary site. The King building on Putnam Avenue is constrained site. He spoke about addressing the traffic on Cambridge Street.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE COPY ORDER FOR AGENDA #12)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –
Adopted.

#13 Here insert Agenda #13 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen requested an explanation of this item. Mr. Rossi stated that this is a refinancing. Mr. DePasquale stated that the City asks is there are old bonds that could be refinanced at a lower rate to achieve savings. There is certain guidelines. The bonds need to have at least ten years left in their life cycle to be eligible at a lower rate. The rate will be monitored and the timing is right because in February the City will go out for the bond sale. He stated that he will ask the bonding agencies to rate the City for the refinancing. He stated that this will reduce the debt service budget by \$190,000 annually. He hopes to have this done by February. This has been done before.

Councillor Mazen asked how often can the City refinance. Mr. DePasquale stated the City can refinance annually as long as there is a ten year life cycle left on the bond. Councillor Mazen asked why the 2009-2012 bonds were not refinanced. Mr. DePasquale responded that the rates for the 2009-2012 at the current rate if refinanced the next is not worth refinancing. The rates for 2009-2012 were substantially lower. Councillor Mazen asked why 2005-2008 were not refinanced in 2009. Mr. DePasquale stated that the rates were not comparable. The first time the City was able to do this was in 2012.

Mayor Maher asked if the refinancing is for the same duration. Mr. DePasquale stated that the 2005 bond become due in 2025 and with the refinancing there is no additional time added to the bonds. It allows for a lower rate for the same length of time.

The question now came on passage to a second reading on the following:

(HERE INSERT FIRST PUBLICATION #3348)

Passed to a second reading at the City Council meeting held on January 5, 2015 and on or after January 19, 2015 the question comes on adoption.

CALENDAR

1 – 11 No action taken.

APPLICATIONS AND PETITIONS

1 Order adopted

2 Charter Right exercised by Councillor Kelley.

3 Here insert Application and Petitions # 3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Simmons spoke of her experience on the curb cut. This property has been in the public domain for community use. She is pleased that this is moving forward.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:

(HERE INSERT CURB CUT ORDER)

The order was -n

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

4 Order adopted

CONSENT COMMUNICATIONS

Councillor Simmons moved the Communications.

1 - 17 Placed on file.

CONSENT RESOLUTIONS

Councillor Simmons moved adoption of Resolutions #1-31, except # 17 removed by Mayor Maher, for adoption and upon adoption that they be unanimously sponsored.

1-31 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

POLICY ORDERS

Councillor Simmons moved adopted of Policy Order # 1 - 3.

1 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

3 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1 Councillor Simmons announced that for the next 24 months the CHA housing list will be frozen as the CHA is doing a large scale renovations. Only emergency housing will be filled.
(HERE INSERT COUNCILLOR SIMMONS REMARKS)

Mayor Maher stated that this is a dire situation. The units need to be renovated and families are being moved to other units while the units are being renovated. Councillor Simmons stated that this will be done in phases.

Councillor Carlone stated that there is a problem with rehabbing the buildings. He stated that Mr. Russ assessment of this was impressive.

Councillor McGovern commented that the Housing Committee meeting has been productive. He stated that inclusionary housing and more affordable housing are conversations that need to be held. He stated that whatever we can do to help please stay in the City is important.

Mayor Maher stated that this investment is necessary and long over due.

1 Report accepted and placed on file.

In connection with this matter Councillor Simmons submitted the following order, the question being on adoption, to wit:

(HERE INSERT ORDER # 8)

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Councillor Simmons submitted the following order, the question being adoption, to wit:

(HERE INSERT ORDER # 9)

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Councillor McGovern spoke about the short and long term issues. He stated that there are people that need immediate solutions now such as food, clothing and shelter.

2 Report accepted and placed on file.

NON CONSENT RESOLUTIONS

17 Mayor Maher recognized Diane Squire on her retirement.

17 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members and made unanimously sponsored.

NON CONSENT POLICY ORDERS

2 Charter Right exercised by Councillor Toomey.

5 Order was withdrawn with unanimous consent on motion of Councillor McGovern.

6 Charter Right exercised by Councillor Cheung

7 Charter Right exercised by Councillor Toomey.

TEAGUE PETITION

Councillor Mazen made a motion for suspension of the rules to move to Calendar Item Number Twelve.

The motion for suspension of the rules
Carried on a voice vote.

The question now came on passing to be ordained Part I of the Zoning Petition filed by Mr. Teague, which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY ORDINANCE #1363)

The question now came on passage to be ordained and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the proposed amendment was -
Passed to be ordained.

LATE RESOLUTIONS

32 - 38 Resolutions were adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members and made unanimously sponsored.

LATE POLICY ORDERS

A motion was made for suspension of the rules to introduce late policy order and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 7
NAYS:	Councillors Cheung and Kelley	- 2
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the suspension of the rules -
Carried.

Councillor Kelley registered his displeasure with the filing of Late Policy Orders. He

stated that this event is not until April and he could not understand the urgency that it needed to be a late Policy Order.

Mayor Maher explained that there was a mix up with this particular Order.

4 Order adopted

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Councillor Carlone the meeting adjourned at 10:25 PM.

A list of documents and other exhibits used at the meeting:

City Manager's Agenda

City Council Agenda

CD of meeting

Remarks by Councillor Simmons