

Perez, Lori

From: Quinton Zondervan <qyz915@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2022 12:23 PM
To: Patrick W Barrett III
Cc: Bob Simha; City Clerk; Denise Jillson; Farooq, Iram; Federspiel, Seth; Glowa, Nancy; Jason Alves; Kenneth Barron; Michael Monestime; Michael Simon; Nolan, Patricia; Stuart Rothman; Siddiqui, Sumbul; Rasmussen, Susanne; City Manager
Subject: Re: BEUDO Meeting Recap

Thanks Patrick.

1) The ordinance did not change 4 days prior to this meeting. In fact it hasn't changed at all since CDD introduced it last year. We have been working on draft amendments over the past year or so but none of them have been formally adopted by the council thus far (we did vote in ordinance committee to change the deadline to 2035 but that is not yet reflected in the official version before us; technically that vote asked CDD to propose language that would change the deadline, but it did not amend the language itself). So I'm not sure what you are referring to. Perhaps you only became aware of the new draft amendments four days ago, but that doesn't mean we changed them at that time. Any further changes to the draft amendments would appear on the ordinance committee meeting web page prior to the next discussion of them as that is the proper mechanism to share them with the committee and the public. We are not obligated to notify you any sooner than that, nor is it practical to do so. The drafting process is dynamic and we are being extra inclusive about it but it is not usually done this way. Amendments aren't "real" until they are moved and voted on by the committee/council. Once the council votes to adopt any amendments, those would be reflected in the ordinance language on the website as well. We have been fully transparent throughout this process and I really don't appreciate your constant attempts to claim otherwise. It's beginning to border on gaslighting. I'm always happy to meet and discuss the draft amendments whenever you'd like.

2) It's simply not practical for CDD to monitor individual homes or smaller buildings through BEUDO. There are other policy mechanisms contemplated in the Net Zero Action plan to address smaller buildings, including time of sale requirements. I'm happy to review the net zero action plan with you anytime. It's our comprehensive policy roadmap for addressing building emissions and the framework within which the BEUDO amendments and other policy proposals are being discussed. So it's important to understand that context and not think of BEUDO as the singular policy to address our building emissions because it's not.

Best,

Q

On Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 9:32 AM Patrick W Barrett III <jbrealtyllc@gmail.com> wrote:
Cambridge City Council,

I thank you all for hosting the BEUDO meeting the other day and especially appreciate the apologies from both the Mayor and Councilor Nolan about the lack of transparency and notice throughout this process. To date I've still not received an email or mailer regarding BEUDO; in fact none of the qualifying BID members have. What I find fascinating about this is that we are a really small city. In fact many of you know where I live, see me regularly walking through the square,

and this is likely the case from many concerned BEUDO property owners. The silence is just really odd. However, there are a couple of items of concern and I'm not really certain what the next steps are in this discussion.

- 1) The ordinance changed four days prior to this meeting without notice from anyone. Imagine if any developer or third party did this. How would that be received by the Council? There is already a massive lack of trust and that did not help. Can you please send out alerts from this moment forward to let those affected know about changes being made? I'd also appreciate a clear reasoning for any changes. Stating that you took "feedback" isn't exactly a basis.
- 2) Many citizens raised the question of why single family homes were excluded. I agree with them that this does seem like very low hanging fruit with none of the complexities multi-unit buildings face. I think this is where following Boston too closely (see also: copying and pasting) has gotten us into a bit of trouble. How can we claim to be a just city when we omit the rich from having to participate?
- 3) In places like Ithaca, often cited by this Council as the benchmark, they arranged for technical support and funding mechanisms from third parties. Last evening I heard that the Council is "looking into it." Can you be more specific? Which groups have you engaged? What level of funding are you seeking? Most property owners do not have sustainability teams and if this Council really wants action on this I suggest you supply us with the tech support we need and funding. The current setup is not helpful or responsive. I emailed the CDD tech support hotline a few days ago and have yet to get a response.
- 4) There were many questions not answered and many questions that were answered that had no substance. Why? Will those omitted questions get answered by staff? Many attempts by CDD staff were also lacking substance. For instance, my questions about switchgear and transformer locations seemed to catch CDD completely off guard. I find that very alarming and I would hope that over the course of four years CDD at the very least modeled some of these issues. A non-response at this point is unacceptable. I will be encouraging all of our members to do so.
- 5) The City Solicitor's memo from Nov '21 was not part of the presentation; why is that? At what point will we ask her to revise that memo to reflect these proposed changes? I think it important to point out that those stating Boston passed this with no issue are not disclosing that Phase II of their plan doesn't go into effect until 2023. When that happens it is likely to change the tenor of property owners in Boston. It might be worth seeing how that plays out.
- 6) CDD said they'd share a list of the 40 property owners they've been talking to. I am making a formal request please send that to the BID and other business associations.

I really want to find common ground on this issue but it is hard not to get the sense that this is really a one-sided conversation. CDD's presentation didn't really get into any substance, most of it was a recap of what has been done to date with some notable omissions like Nancy Glow's memo. Has the director of CDD weighed in on this proposal, its feasibility, or merit? I think the public would like to hear from her. CDD is also still miscounting the number of affected properties by over 1200 buildings. I find it also confusing that Seth couldn't offer any ballpark costs associated with retrofitting. These aren't tough questions and people need guidance. If you all want this to work and not trainwreck the BID and business associations are happy to help but we need a place at the table that we've currently not been invited to.

Regards,

Patrick W. Barrett III

Emails sent or received shall neither constitute acceptance of conducting transactions via electronic means nor shall create a binding contract in the absence of a fully signed written contract.

--

Quinton Zondervan
Cambridge City Councillor
617-901-2006