

2

To the City Council and City Clerk,

I am unable to attend tonight's City Council Meeting because of a prior obligation. This written comment is in response to tonight's (12/10/2012) policy Order O-9.

I want to state for the record that I respect the City Council's clear choice of Mr. Rossi for City Manager. I think a three-year contract is too long for anyone, but that is a debate for another day. My OML complaint is not about changing the outcome of your vote. It is about public process.

I have an additional concern that has come up as I have researched my original OML (Open Meeting Law) complaint.

The Government Operations and Rules Committee of the Cambridge City Council may also be considered a public body under the OML. If so, this means it must follow the rules of the OML in all deliberations which are assigned to it.

At your March 19, 2012 meeting under Policy Order O-7, the Council voted to order the Government Operations and Rules Committee to begin "...developing a comprehensive short-term and long-term succession plans..." for the City Manager position.

As indicated below in a response to me by the City Clerk, a quorum of three members of the 5-member Government Operations and Rules Committee appear to have conceived of the December 3, 2012 Policy Order O-6 outside of a properly called meeting of the Committee. This, I believe, is also a violation of the OML statute.

I am in contact with the Attorney General's Office to see if I must formally make a new specific complaint or if it can be appended to my original complaint. In the meantime, in the interest of time and completeness, I would respectfully suggest that the Council makes sure that the City Clerk and the Law Department consider this while drafting their response to my original complaint.

Thank you,

Tom Stohlman
19 Channing Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-547-5246
tstohlman@alum.mit.edu