

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

Wednesday, August 23, 2006

President Baker convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. First item of business was to reconsider docket item #102-06, KESSELER DEVELOPMENT, LLC proposing to amend to Section 30-15, DENSITY & DIMENSIONAL CONTROLS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND FOR RESIDENTIAL USES, by inserting in Table 1 a new footnote 9. On voice vote, the item was approved for reconsideration. On voice vote the item was then postponed until September 5.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

A motion was made, seconded and passed on voice vote to go into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the Newton North High School Site Plan that was approved by the Public Facilities Committee on July 19, 2006.

Present: Aldermen Burg, Coletti, Danberg, Fischman, Harney, Hess-Mahan, Johnson, Lennon, Mansfield, Schnipper, Sangiolo, Lappin, Linsky, Gentile, Parker, Vance, Merrill, Yates, Weisbuch, Baker, Albright, and Salvucci

Also Present: Sandy Pooler, Commissioner Nick Parnell, Mike Kruse, Ouida Young, Dori Zaleznick, Reenie Murphy, John Prokos, Rob Juusola, Bill Lyons, Dan Solien, Clint Schuckel, Graham Gund, Bob Rooney, T.J. Williams, Tommy Giusti, Heidi Black

Alderman Schnipper opened the discussions by stating that what is before the Board is the vote of the Public Facilities Committee (which includes the Board order). She stated that she would like to see unanimity in their decision, but did not think that would happen. Alderman Schnipper reminded the Board that the Mayor's Task Force had eliminated the renovation option. It was the Task Force's recommendation that they look at a hybrid, but in the end the decision was made to go forward with a new building. The state has supported the city in that decision. Alderman Schnipper believes that it is the program that has created the design of the building and the fact that every room is to have natural light and operable windows. The design was also dictated by the constraints of the site and there were limited options for the design. Five or more stories would not work for the students or in a residential neighborhood. This is going to be an extraordinary opportunity for the children of the city and one would hope that it would be an exciting process. There'll be no attempt to take a vote this evening; the vote will be on September 5. She reminded the Board that it does have the authority through the 5-58 process to alter what has come out of the design review process.

Alderman Sangiolo asked for a copy of the questions that were submitted. Alderman Baker and the Clerk indicated that those questions could be provided. Alderman Johnson asked if the presenters could address those specific questions in their presentations.

Sandy Pooler introduced the evening's presenters.

Commissioner Parnell stated that he was excited about this once-in-a-lifetime project. The plan has gone through 26 iterations and has been approved by the Design Review Committee. The zigzag appearance of the plan is a bent floor plan with a double loaded corridor which allows for natural ventilation and light. The reason it takes this shape is so that you don't spread the building out. It also gives you an undulating façade. They were also able to take the athletic program and lay it out around the school, while creating open green spaces for neighbors around the site by pulling the building to the center of the site. Drop-off areas are spread across the site. Parking is dispersed across the site with easy access by pedestrians. Elm Road will be utilized as bus drop-off. To fit the program into the building, the designers had a lot to deal with, including being aware of the neighborhood. The site will have a retention pond underneath the football stadium to mitigate run-off into the city sewer system. Keeping the rainwater on the site will help to keep the fields green. A rainwater collection system on the roof will also help to irrigate the fields. There will be a front door off of Walnut Street and a large playing field in front of the building, and open space at the back of the building with the football and baseball fields located there. This plan achieves pedestrian and vehicle access, being a good neighbor, effective utilization of the site, and sustainability. Accomplishing all of this is a challenge. This building is not talking about bells and whistles, here form follows function. The function is the program. The constrictions of the site necessitated the bent floor plan, which achieves an economy that could not be achieved in a long bar. The design allows for windows in the corridors, which is totally different from the current configuration of the high school. This is good design and we will be working on the pricing of that design. This is the best site plan to accommodate the building. Commissioner Parnell reiterated that he is really excited about the project. The City has hired a project manager, and the architects have been working for a year. We've begun talking with potential Construction Managers at Risk and are pleased with those that we've spoken with. With the Board of Aldermen's blessing of this design the City can move forward with the project. This is an exciting project and he hopes that the Board will become excited about it too.

Site Design and the Academic Program

School Committee Chairman Dori Zaleznick focused on the education specifications and stated that the site plan is based on a sound education program. The School Committee has tried to learn from the current Newton North. We want to maintain the strong sense of community and eliminate the current features of the building that are not working. The single largest concern was natural ventilation and light in every classroom. The School Committee came up the best program they could for 1,850

students, that's a smaller than the current number of students at Newton North. This is a reality of redoing both high schools to be medium-sized schools with similar, but not identical, program elements. This site plan allows for three elements that flow together: a prominent athletic facility, a prominent academic core, and a prominent theater arts area. In the academic core, there have been many conversations about what teachers need to teach and what students need to learn, and how that functions together. The School Committee wanted to maintain some degree of flexibility with the space, so that if it were necessary to add classrooms in the future, there would be space designated for that to happen. They want a building in which they can reassess and change the uses of the spaces to meet future programmatic needs. There are many stakeholders in the school community that have spent countless hours talking with the designers about what they need both now and in the future.

Alderman Gentile pointed out that T.J. Williams and Tommy Giusti from the Newton North High School Athletic Department were at the meeting to address any questions about the athletic program.

Alderman Coletti was glad that he had the program square footage requirements and heard the presentation by Dori Zaleznick because the program inside the building drives the design. The façade is determined by how you want to spend money aesthetically. He asked if the Board was going to get to the program inside the building tonight and some of the potential problems that we see with that?. If we agree on what's inside, then site plan approval becomes easy. Alderman Coletti asked why are we having less space available for the classrooms than we have for the athletics? He wanted to find out why the space was allocated this way and how these basic assumptions were derived.

Alderman Gentile pointed out that there was more classroom space than Alderman Coletti had indicated, there are science labs, chemistry labs, a business computer lab, child care study, to him that's all classroom and teaching space. It's not correct to state that there are only 46,000 square feet of classroom space, there's substantially more than that.

Alderman Baker reiterated Alderman Coletti's question of how this design is driven by the educational program.

Alderman Schnipper pointed out that the core educational space only encompasses five subjects, it does not include science, career and tech voc, art, music, special education, and technology, and all of those are core education spaces.

Alderman Sangiolo asked the architects if there was a change in program would it have an impact on the site plan.

Heidi Black explained that Newton submitted to the state the educational specifications for Newton North and Newton South which outlined the number of educational spaces that were needed at each school. The number of classrooms is

determined by the total number of students, class size, the number of sections needed for each subject area, and the number of blocks the school schedule accommodates. The 60 classrooms were determined by the 1,850 students projected to be enrolled at each school. The athletic spaces are all part of the wellness program as required by the state and city. The classroom size of 780 square feet is within the range recommended by the state for a high school classroom.

Alderman Coletti asked why the classroom spaces are the smallest spaces in the building? He also questioned why so much space was allocated to showers for the wellness program when he's heard that students do not use them.

Heidi Black responded that we're using guidelines provided to us by the state. There are ranges for classroom size and at the elementary level they are larger, because the type of instruction delivered there is quite different from that at the high school. 780 square feet is the typical classroom size at Newton South, there's plenty of room, even when we've had to fit 28 students into those room, there has been no problem. Students are sitting in tab-armed desks allowing the teachers to use those desks in different configurations and they are able to deliver instruction in that way in that size classroom.

T.J. Williams responded that the showers are an integral part of the program. The athletics use of the facility is a bonus, the wellness program is what the space was designed for. The showers are designed for the instructional wellness program and are used by those students. We need to make them available and the design has less shower space and fewer showers than the current building. In the new facility we'll have less footage than we currently have now and are trying to be more efficient with it. Heidi Black stated that if you take the pool out of the equation, the athletic space at the two high schools is almost equal.

Alderman Coletti stated that he didn't want this discussion to be driven by equity at both schools, because that has raised the cost for Newton North. He stated that the more he understands about the insides of the building and the construction costs, he'll get a sense of what it's going to cost to build the building.

Alderman Mansfield made the point that we need to look at both the interior programmatic spaces and how the building fits into the community. He asked that the architectural team point out any differences in their presentation tonight from previous presentations.

Alderman Salvucci cautioned that the Design Review Committee has not completed the interiors of the building and we don't know what changes they're going to come up with. We're here tonight to decide whether or not this is the proper design for the site. Once the design review committee has completed the interiors, then the Board can discuss the interior plan and what the costs are going to be.

Alderman Coletti reiterated that we need to look at what's happening in the interior of the building to make sure that the exterior accommodates that. We need to make sure that what's going to be put inside fits the building design. We have to understand that how the architects work from this point on has a major impact on the cost.

John Prokos stated that they brought in a world renowned individual on high school program, Frank Locker from DeYoung Associates who work closely with the Gund Partnership. The school had a good idea of what they wanted in the new building. Gund Partnership worked with the experts for five months. John Prokos stated that they've done many schematics based on their knowledge of school building components to see how each piece functioned and showed the School Committee how these spaces could function, how they could be economized, and how to be more efficient to get the square footage down to the smallest size.

Alderman Coletti asked why the factor of .41 that is used as a multiplier on the bottom line?

John Prokos stated that the .41 grossing factor from the programmatic documents is what the building code tells the designers to use to account for structure to support the building, exterior walls, interior walls, mechanical spaces, plumbing, electrical systems, fire protection systems, corridors, stairways. All of these things are explicitly required by the building codes. This number can range from .4 to .55 and we've been able to squeeze this down to .41, because of the size and efficiency of the building. Many schools, including your current schools, have a larger grossing factors.

Alderman Coletti asked if these accessory spaces are the expensive components of the building. John Prokos responded that no, many of those things are not expensive, the science lab is very expensive, all of those things are just part of the cost of the building, every building has to have it, you don't have a choice.

Alderman Coletti asked how you would associate a cost with the .41 grossing factor. John Prokos responded that the .41 grossing factor doesn't factor into the range of construction costs, the range was based on inflation factors. With no inflation, we'd be at the lower end, if inflation runs rampant, we'll be at the higher end.

Alderman Sangiolo asked for an answer to the question of what happens when there needs to be a change in either in the program or what you have allocated for programmatic space? Could that have an impact on the site plan that we are going to vote on? The additional space allocated shown in that grey box, is that easily accessible? Once the building is up? Then we decide we are wrong on the numbers and we need more classroom space for construction vehicles to be able to get back and forth while school is in session.

Alderman Johnson asked if there had been a question about whether we could ask the School Committee to revisit the program, because the program drove the design? If the program changed, could the design change and the siteing? With that what parts of the program would have to change to have the greatest impact on making a difference on the design?

Alderman Gentile asked if the athletic program offered at Newton North is any different than the one offered at Braintree High School, Wellesley High, Brookline High, Natick or any other that we participate in the Bay State League?

Mr. Williams stated that we are in the Bay State conference. In 1990, in order to get in, we had to show that we were willing to participate in so many activities. Every school with the exception of minor modifications, have the same program. Some will have not have freshmen teams in every sport that we have.

Alderman Harney stated that he heard you say it was better for safety purposes. If the football field had remained where it was and this new building were designed with the field house, the field house would be in the middle.

Mr. Williams said this is an opportunity to fix some of the problems that exist.

Alderman Johnson stated that assuming that there are changes that could impact the design. What parts of the program would have to change?

John Prokos responded that in the abstract, we cannot answer that. It is the city's responsibility to generate the program and we design the building from that program. We give our advice but to ask the question, of course, if you change the program dramatically, it would change the site plan. You are telling us what sort of school you need to satisfy your educational mission and program, and we are designing that school.

The Building and the Site

Sandy Pooler introduced John Prokos and Graham Gund who provided a presentation that addressed some of the general questions submitted by the Aldermen. (See attached presentation.)

Dan Solien, landscape architect, stated that they approached the project by trying to preserve existing trees wherever possible. They were able to preserve many trees along Elm, Walnut, and Hull. The trees in the center of the property need to be removed because of the nature and scale of the program. Trees will also be planted, the intent is to create a green screen all the way around the block.

John Prokos and Graham Gund indicated that the exterior of the building would likely be a combination of glass, red brick, and/or yellow brick.

Alderman Linsky asked if they could see elevations from Lowell Avenue, both inside and outside the proposed screening. John Prokos responded that he could do that with the model, but they'd like to do that later, once the elevations have been worked on.

Alderman Johnson asked if the design team could show the model from the street view as they did on the July 19 meeting. John Prokos responded that he believed he had that presentation if it would be helpful.

Alderman Sangiolo asked what would be housed in the main entrance area as it seemed fairly large? John Prokos replied that in the main entry was the main administration area, central reception, main staircase, access to the spectator area of the athletic facility, it's a central meeting space and hub for the school and the beginning of Main Street. It's a bookend for public circulation. When you have an athletic event, there will be hundreds of people coming through this lobby.

Alderman Sangiolo asked what the square footage of the main entrance is and John Prokos referred her to the program outline that they passed out.

Alderman Sangiolo asked about the reduction in the impervious surface. John Prokos responded that the footprint of the building is larger than the current building, but the square footage is 60,000 square feet smaller.

Alderman Mansfield asked for clarification about the acre less of impervious surface. John Prokos responded that yes, there is an acre less in comparison with the current site.

Alderman Mansfield asked if the multi-purpose field was considered pervious or impervious. John Prokos responded that the turf is pervious in that the water can drain through it, but will be collected in a catch basin system during a major storm from where the water can be drained off or evaporated.

Alderman Mansfield asked, that aside, where does the acre come from since the footprint for the building is larger? John Prokos responded that the existing football stadium has 5,000 seats, the new stadium has half the number of seats which is a component of that 1 acre. Some of the parking and roadways on the current site are not that efficient, we can design an efficient parking lot, design the optimum width for roadways, and the large deck at the top of the stadium will be eliminated.

Alderman Sangiolo asked where the expansion or fluctuation space goes. John Prokos responded that the site plan allows for future classroom expansion. We wanted to be able to add a minimum of four additional classrooms onto the building, there is space for 4 to 8 additional classrooms in an area just behind the football field.

Alderman Weisbuch asked how confident are you that this design takes in adequate mechanical space, as you have distributed the mechanical space around the building?

John Prokos responded that it is an ongoing process of incorporating mechanical systems. We are ultimately confident that they will all be properly accommodated within the building. There is a basic concept for them now. Space is allocated between the basement and roof top equipment and in this phase of design work we are beginning to lay all of that out in detail.

Alderman Baker stated that this is part of design development, which is not necessarily a function of the site plan, but is a continuing effort, is that correct?

Mr. Prokos responded yes.

Alderman Weisbuch asked if the architects anticipated any altering of the design plan to accommodate more mechanical space.

Mr. Prokos stated that there will undoubtedly be tweaking and things will be refined but we have a basic concept for it. Even the little model showed all of the rooftop equipment that the engineers have calculated that we are going to need. We have the sizes for all of that equipment and we are laying it out in the more detailed drawings as they are developed.

Alderman Weisbuch asked if the architects could explain the negative impact if one, two, and three or more of the tennis courts were eliminated from the site?

Mr. Prokos responded that it is a programmatic issue. It is a vibrant part of the program and a very important community use.

Mr. Williams reiterated once again that it is a facility drawn program. The ten courts that currently exist; physical education, health and wellness treat all 2,000 individuals in the school. Part of our program is dependent upon those tennis courts. Almost every period of every day with the exception of the winter, the tennis courts are being used. They are being used by the community in the morning; they are being used by community use in the afternoon. In addition, we have two athletic teams, actually four, varsity and junior varsity; two for boys, two for girls and that accommodates that program as well. Outside of the actual building itself, which is a 7 to 11 program; the tennis courts are pretty much the same thing. Ten is probably a base minimum for us, when we had talked with the designers before we were talking about how to function with six in one spot and four in another spot, but this obviously made more sense putting them where they are now. The ten are used and used often.

John Prokos continued the presentation and stated that this is where people wanted the building on the site. They wanted it pushed into the middle of the site. This

came from the community; we took this input from the abutters, various review groups and positioned the building on the site based on all the feedback we received in those early meetings. That started even before we were hired for the job talking to people in the community as to how best utilize the site. There are about 28 acres on the entire site. Of the 28 acres, just about every square inch is either utilized for landscape buffering or athletic fields, for parking and drop off, for building or sidewalks. The whole site is utilized efficiently in that regard. Of those 28 acres, there are about 11.8 acres of hard surface on the site; parking lots, paved areas, walkways, driveways, that sort of thing. There is about 13.1 acres of hard surface on the existing site; that is about a net reduction of 1.3 acres of impervious surface. The building foot print is a little under 170,000 square feet and that is being further tightened up.

There was a request to re-orient this one softball field on the site. Right now the sun would only be in someone's eyes here around 8 or 9 o'clock and to reorient that field; it really is an almost ideal orientation on a north/south axis. The ideal orientation of the playing fields is a little bit west of north/south as the ideal orientation. If we rotated it, it would take this infield area, the baseball bases, pitching mound and put it right in the middle of the overlay field and would not be efficient to do that and costly. We have talked about a removable fence that would form the outfield of the baseball field and that could be taken out when you were using the overlay field.

There was a question about why we would depress this field. It started out as an aesthetic idea by depressing the field, we could work all the grandstands into the edge of that so as we looked from the building, you would be looking over the seating and just see green space. As we got into it further, we studied a cut in fill analysis of the site. That is how much earth has to be taken away from the site or brought to the site to build this facility and without depressing the field, we are in a fill situation where we would have to truck fill into the site to elevate the baseball fields and to raise this building enough in relation to Walnut St. to get positive drainage away from it. It now is looking like it is a cost saver for us if we can depress that field. There was a question as how the roof would be used for the building. It provides some daylight. There are some skylights proposed for the athletic facilities to bring light down to those areas and over the main street space, there is some sky lighting over the cafeteria. The roof is also primarily used for mechanical equipment. There is quite a bit of roof top equipment around the building. We hope to incorporate some solar and wind power on the roof as part of sustainable design grants for the project.

It was asked if we could provide additional storage space and we could. Every storage space asked for in the program is incorporated in the 400,000 square feet. This would just be added space that you may deem necessary for the school but it would be outside of the program and we think it would cost about \$150. a square ft.

Access to the Site

Alderman Sangiolo asked if there was access off of Hull Street to get to the athletic facility? John Prokos responded that there is no vehicular access off of Hull, only pedestrian access. There are numerous drop-off areas.

Alderman Sangiolo asked if the driveway from Walnut was eliminated would you still have access from Hull? John Prokos responded there would be pedestrian access, but you would eliminate the possibility for athletic bus drop-off near the facility.

Alderman Sangiolo stated that she thought that the ceremonial entrance off of Walnut was just for drop-off and pick-up, not for buses. John Prokos stated that this entrance has been designed to accommodate athletic buses in the afternoons and evenings.

Alderman Sangiolo restated that buses would be allowed into the ceremonial entrance for athletic events. John Prokos stated that was correct.

Alderman Schnipper stated that you need access at the main entrance because students in physical activity may be injured and an ambulance needs to be able to pick up a child who is injured. It makes absolute sense to have vehicle access close to the athletic facilities. John Prokos stated that the fire department also liked to be able to access the building from multiple points.

Alderman Albright stated that we moved the traffic from Lowell Avenue to the congested Walnut Street and how will this site plan affect traffic and congestion? Could anything be done to move some of the traffic from Walnut Street to Lowell Avenue. She wants a good answer as to why there can't be an entrance off of Lowell. John Prokos stated that out of the traffic study, there was a recommendation to have multiple entries into the site. We have a major entry off of Lowell, all of the buses will have to come in that way. We have an entry off of Walnut to the parking lot and an entry off of Walnut in to the main entrance. We really have spread the traffic access out around the site. Commissioner Rooney stated that adding an entrance on Walnut Street is a huge improvement. He stated that we have to balance not only the traffic, but all of the issues for the site and this site plan works very well in doing that.

Alderman Albright reiterated her question of how an entrance from Lowell could be created to alleviate traffic congestion on Walnut. Alderman Albright stated that it was not her responsibility to redesign it, she wanted to know how the architects could redesign it or why it wasn't possible. John Prokos responded that because of the athletic field requirements, you could never get a road off of Lowell.

Alderman Albright asked if the football stadium had been left in place and the athletic fields were compacted, could you have gotten an access road off of Lowell. John Prokos responded that they did look at a scheme like that, but the access was off of Elm, not Lowell. They also looked at dividing the site with a road that ran from Elm to Hull,

but after placing the field in the north-south direction, which was a requirement, it wasn't feasible.

Alderman Albright stated that she wished that during design review someone had looked at the option of keeping the stadium where it is and having some access off of Lowell. John Prokos stated that there was a design that the Design Review Committee looked at that had an entrance off of Lowell, it was the hybrid scheme, but that was rejected for a lot of reasons besides the traffic circulation. Alderman Albright asked if she could see that scheme and why it was rejected?

Alderman Coletti asked about a snow removal plan. Where will the snow go that is removed from the parking lot on the Lowell side? You might want to consider an opening onto the field to put it on the field instead of spending money to haul it away. You need a plan to keep snow on the site without taking away parking spaces. There'll be a problem on the Walnut Street side because when the snow falls there won't be any place to put it. Alderman Coletti stated that the board order should also have a requirement for a snow removal plan.

Alderman Johnson asked why there couldn't be an entrance on the back? There is a gray shaded area just after the crook in Elm Road, why can't an entrance be over there and have some sort of drop-off and maybe move the building a little further so that you are utilizing Elm Road. If you had an entrance back there you could take the heat off Walnut Street.

Bill Lyons, Traffic Engineer, responded that a couple of things drove the design of the access plan for this site that we often lose sight of, but they are very important. First and foremost we made a conscious decision to try and distribute the access points to this site, so that no one are would bear the brunt of the majority of the trips coming to and from the site and as has been pointed out earlier there are more access points to the site now by vehicle and even more access points by pedestrians as a result of the plan that is before the Board. It is also important to note that it is very important to drop the children off on the correct side of the road and that has really driven the orientation of the access point as it relates to Elm Road. It is important to take the students and drop them off on the right side of the road, closest to the school so that they are not crossing across traffic whether that is school busses or general traffic we really want the students to be dropped off on a sidewalk and not have to pass across traffic in order to reach the school. Those are two points that have really driven the site from an access point of view. The distribution of parking across the site from Lowell and Walnut is very much the way it is today. Today there is a significant amount of traffic that accesses a parking lot off Walnut, there is a significant amount of traffic that accesses a parking lot of Lowell, and those proportions have not drastically changed in this plan. In fact, they are very similar to the way they are today and as a result do not change dramatically the dynamics of access to the site. What has changed is the parking is a little bit more spread across the site and therefore we have diffused some of the access points. It is an important point that has been lost in many of the discussions. The parking lot is not all that unlike the

parking lot that exists along the front of the site today and along this part of the site today. The parking lot along Lowell Avenue, which has direct access to Lowell Avenue, is not unlike the parking lot that is currently in this vicinity behind the school. The site parking and the site access is remarkably similar but in our view better than what exists today.

Alderman Albright stated that the parking you are referring to is all faculty parking, very little of that is student parking and the traffic is really parents driving their children or students driving themselves to school in the morning. You are right there is not much difference going on there, but you have moved the student drop-off all to the Walnut Street side.

Dan Solien, Landscape Architect, stated that he has been working closely with the Gund Architects on the development of site plan and otherwise following along through all of its many iterations. My observation is different; there are very effective points of access to the site off Lowell Avenue. The parking lot up along Lowell not only functions as a parking lot but also functions as a loop through which a parent might pull in and drop off a child and then on either end of the parking lot there are walks that begin that come along the edge of the property and cut into the property to rear entry points to the building. My job as a landscape architect will be to see that those pedestrian paths are ample and pleasant means of accessing the building. Graham Gund has correctly made the point that coming into the property deeper with vehicle circulation. Between the ballfields from a point off Lowell or into the property off Elm Road would have had a very disruptive impact on the organization of the site plan to the rear of the building. You achieve much greater success by having these remote points, although not that remote, and very effective means of access from corners of Lowell and Hull and Lowell and Elm. Though the distance of the drop off points from the school may be different from the ceremonial drop off point, they are very effective. Parents are very intelligent about not all coming to the same place. They somewhat naturally distribute themselves to points that are convenient and essentially create a balance around the property.

Alderman Johnson asked if there could be a vehicular entrance on the back of the building, so that the parents can come in? Where is the congestion today of parent drop-off? She would make an assumption that when the entrance is on Walnut that parents will drop off there, as it is closer. She wishes people would have their children walk more. If there is a way to utilize Elm Road because right now the only people during the day that are using Elm Road are the school busses.

John Prokos stated that there was a very intentional strategic decision made early on that we would not co-mingle busses and automobiles. You can only have busses coming in here in the morning to create a safe drop-off for the busses. If busses were here and cars were also coming in, children would have to cut between the busses, busses would be trying to pull out as cars are coming in and the school transportation director said that it does not work. You cannot commingle those two systems and secondly, this area of the site is where we are servicing the tech ed areas, where you have bays to pull in

automobiles, carpentry is over there, the main loading dock for food service comes into that area. It is not really a good place to bring any drop-off into.

Alderman Hess-Mahan stated that Aldermen Albright and Johnson's questions brought to mind the same concern that he has about how much of an impact the entrances on Walnut Street would have. He exchanged messages with the City's Traffic Engineer, and he pointed me to the traffic study. He was hoping to understand a little better what the actual impact will be on Walnut Street as well as on Lowell Avenue. He understands the traffic study and the as-build and projections for 2011 and what it would be by then and that the total increase is going to be the same whether you build a new school or not, but the devil is in the details on how it is going to be distributed around the site. It would be helpful to understand what the actual numbers are regarding the increase in number of trips on Walnut Street versus Lowell Avenue if any and on Elm Road and Hull as well. He specifically referred to figures 6 and 7 of the May 31 traffic study, which He think holds the answers.

Bill Lyons stated that Figure 6 and 7 of the traffic study talk about the current conditions in terms of accessing and egressing the site and what it would be under the proposed condition. Speaking in general terms without getting into the numbers because the numbers do speak for themselves in terms of how many would be exiting that point during the peak hours. The difference is that there is a slight increase in parking on the corner of Elm and Walnut as opposed to today. The principle is that the busses are going to exit there and a key strategy to the access and egress plan is to relocate the current police officer that is at the Elm and Lowell intersection to this intersection to facilitate the egress of the busses in the morning because obviously there is going to be a significant surge, they are all going to come and go within a very short period of time and the officer is going to facilitate. In the absence of the police officer, it would be very congested there but with the police officer control, we believe that the intersection will operate quite well.

Alderman Hess-Mahan asked if the change from Option 5a, which has approximately thirty spaces at the ceremonial entrance to Option 5b, which has 60 parking spaces changes at all the number of trips on and off the site at that point?

Bill Lyons stated that it is important to note that figure 7 in the report assumed virtually no drop-off activity at the ceremonial drive. However, at this time we expect some pick up and drop-off activity at the ceremonial drive, which would reduce the numbers that are in figure 7, as trips exiting Elm at Walnut. However, it is a very good point that whatever trips we displace to the center would obvious be trips that would be deducted from Elm Road at Walnut Street. We have always strived to distribute the trips across the site as much as possible. Any parking that we move to that center drive obviously further distributes trips and takes some trips off Elm Road at Walnut Street and further improves traffic operations at that intersection, which we view to be favorable.

Clint Schuckel stated that he has worked with many Aldermen over the years to institute the Newton North Park and Walk program in which many students realize their closest parking facility to the school is mom and dad's driveway. He thought, as many of the trade offs have been discussed, that it was basically a value judgment for the City and the community in terms of the orientation and the size of the playing fields that really did preclude an entrance to Lowell Avenue. The Board Order conditions do leave the door open for further study of how wide Elm Road should be, how it should be operated in terms of the hours of busses or the allowable parking in terms of turn restrictions at Walnut Street or police officers or traffic signals at Elm Road and Walnut Street. The Board Order does leave the ability for us to still make changes and further study exactly how Elm Road is going to work and how we might utilize it more fully. Finally, He stated that he wanted to be one of the few Traffic Engineers that will say that congestion is not necessarily a dirty word at a school. Congestion does a couple of things, in addition to the signs, it makes people aware that something is going on on the street as they are on auto pilot mode on their commute. They see a lot of activity and cars. It causes people to slow when they see a lot of activity and congestion at a school causes some people to decide to take another route. Some of that through traffic that you see on Walnut now is going to move over to Lowell Avenue because they do not want to be delayed at all during the peak school times. Again, the congestion on Walnut Street is going to be twenty minutes in the morning probably more severe because it coincides with the rush hour traffic, the afternoon is mid-afternoon before the commuter traffic starts up again and no matter what you do, you have points of congestion around this site. Certainly, it is a concern moving it from Lowell Avenue with a lower daily traffic to Walnut Street but in order of magnitude, you are talking about 30 seconds on average of delay that we are imposing on through traffic for that twenty-minute window. If you compare that to the program desires with the fields and the orientation that is where the trade off was made; thinking about the order of magnitude of delay, the congestion on Walnut and what you are trying to accomplish with program.

Alderman Weisbuch stated at the last Public Facilities meeting he raised the question of dropping an egress on the parking lot that is at the corner of Walnut Street and Elm at the southern most corner to help drain that parking lot when people leave and was wondering what thought was made to that and would that be something that we could do? Right turn only egress.

Bill Lyons responded that there would be a loss of a handful of parking spaces. A right turn exit there would not be disastrous by any stretch of the imagination but given that we have gone to great lengths to preserve as close as possible the number of parking spaces at the site you would probably lose between five and ten spaces depending on the geometry proposed. That would have that negative impact on the program.

Mr. Prokos added that as a basic planning principle, we find it is never a good idea to introduce more driveways onto a busy street. It is much better to limit the access points to the intersections and to the points where we can control the circulation a little better. It would just exacerbate the conflicts on Walnut Street to have another driveway.

Commissioner Rooney stated that if you think about the dynamics, in the morning, that parking lot there is inbound traffic then they park and they stay and so really, you do not have many cars coming off of the site. The drop off at the front entrance is where they will be coming out back at Elm Road. In the afternoon, certainly a lot of the faculty and teachers will be leaving after the students have been released. In the afternoon, it is never as critical as it is in the morning. It is the timing of that when you put it in context of another entry point onto Walnut; it is a safer situation to have them using the one entrance there.

Alderman Salvucci stated that a couple of months ago, at the Design Review Committee meeting, he suggested a cut off on the front of the building on Walnut Street for busses only and there was never got a decent answer to that question. What effect would that have on the site because Elm Street should not be solely used for busses? Cars should be able to go in there, drop off and exit onto Walnut. Why can't we create a cut out for busses on Walnut Street? It would open Elm Street to through traffic for drop-off of children. Why would that not work?

John Prokos stated that we need a greater length for bus drop-off, which can only be accommodated on Elm Road. Most importantly we felt that it would create a real conflict with the heavy automobile traffic out there and people pulling in and out of the site and busses trying to pull in and out. It could just be eliminated and solved in a much better way by bringing all of the busses to Elm Road and just having an area for busses.

Alderman Salvucci asked why can't you use the whole front entrance in front of the building as a cut off just for busses? He did not see the conflict with traffic if the busses are parked there and drop kids off and are parked there waiting to pick kids up.

Sandy Pooler stated that this was an issue that was considered in Design Review. The architect just told us the reasons it was rejected in Design Review. Alderman Salvucci may disagree with those reasons but those are the reasons.

Commissioner Parnell stated that when it was looked at it was determined that there was not enough length to accommodate all of the busses. What is important to realize is not only is Elm Street going to be used for busses but when those busses are not there it will be used for event parking. It has kind of a dual use in its purpose that during school hours the busses would use that, when there was a play or athletic event where you needed more parking people would be allowed to come in from Lowell and park on Elm Road.

Alderman Coletti stated that he thinks one of the problems that you have with that is that you have the local bus that drops kids and picks kids up every twenty minutes on Walnut Street. There is a bus shelter on Walnut Street right now, so there are a lot of kids, especially kids that come from both sides of Walnut Street that do not take the school bus they take the regular MBTA bus, which does stop out there. When the MBTA

bus stops it stops all of the traffic on Walnut Street because you have to go at least four feet over the double yellow line to pass that bus while it is dropping off or picking up kids. He used to take his daughter to school every day for four years and one of the things that he learned that what people have to learn when you come into the site is that the traffic engineer has to recommend making the drop-off over on Hull Street bigger, all the way back to where the tennis courts are and make the stairs that go down into the athletic area into the school larger so it is more conducive to more people and allowing the traffic coming down Walnut Street from city hall to take a left onto Hull Street and preventing left turns whether it is a short period in the morning or afternoon not allowing people to pull into the ceremonial drive by taking a left turn and cutting across traffic. As a result you force people coming in from the city hall side of Walnut Street to take Hull Street and you give them ample area to drop off but not taking any additional parking away from the students from the building on but making the entire area all the way back to the tennis courts drop off for people coming in from the west side. Then what you do is no left turn so you don't have traffic trying to cut across so the traffic coming down Walnut Street going towards city hall does not have to stop while people cut in front of it, which is dangerous. You have people who are coming from Washington Street only taking a right turn into the ceremonial drive and then coming out you can restrict maybe which way they go when they come out. Technically, you should only have traffic entering the ceremonial drive from Walnut Street from Washington. No left turn there and it should be enforced until people get used to getting tickets that you cannot take a left turn there. Doing a way with the island on Hull Street and making that a shot for everybody to come in and drop off coming the other way and you make this much safer. If you also put a restriction on the other side at Elm indicating that the area is specifically for busses and people who are dedicated in there for parking and you may have to give out stickers for those parking spaces for people and loading and unloading but you cannot change the building location there because you have big trucks that are going to have to back in that area in order to load supplies into that building.

John Prokos responded that it is certainly possible to increase the drop off area on Hull. We would just eliminate some parking spaces but that may be a very good suggestion.

Alderman Coletti stated that if you do not stop the left hand turn, you are going to have cars that are going to queue all the way up to the radius where the turn is at Hull Street and the through traffic will be stopped because you cannot widen the road enough to put a left hand turn in the middle of it. There should be no left hand turn into the ceremonial drive and than that allows people to come in there continuously from the right. You are not interfering with traffic but if the drop off is not big enough on Hull Street than it is not going to be worthwhile for them to swing in there.

John Prokos responded that there is a stacking lane proposed on Walnut for cars that want to take a left. Remember there is a traffic light that would facilitate that turn and also allow a left hand turn out. If you did not have the light, you would not allow those turns.

Alderman Coletti asked if everyone is married to having the light there. It is going to have to be synchronized to allow a turn and it is going to back up traffic even more on Walnut Street. The problem will take care of itself. Sometimes the traffic moves the best when the traffic lights are not working in some squares and the cars are able to get through and people get on their way. Lights can be more of a detriment than a benefit.

Alderman Schnipper pointed out that it is a condition in the Board Order to continue to study. It is not a resolved issue about the turns from Walnut and it certainly get further study.

Alderman Yates stated that he would just like to second what Alderman Coletti said. The issue of avoiding the left turn conflicts is very key to making Walnut Street at all feasible in the mornings. Alderman Schnipper is right it is in condition 5 that this issue will continue to be studied and it seems to me that changes the capacity issues dramatically there. If nobody is stacking, the ceremonial driveway may work. Without it, the lights are going to tie up traffic all the way over the Pike and down to Commonwealth Avenue.

John Prokos responded that we wanted to go through the written responses to the questions. Please refer to the packet of information provided. You have it all here in writing and review it at your leisure.

Commissioner Rooney stated that the question was raised about reducing entrances and we covered that earlier. From engineering standpoint, having entrances from different directions is going to ease congestion; it is not going to create more congestion. The question was related to reducing the number of entrances therefore easing congestion and it is our analysis that is backed up by the traffic studies and other traffic engineers that the converse is true that by having those entrances spread out around the site it is an optimal situation. What about internal roadways to get to the other entrances and not having access points on Walnut Street or Elm and the answer there is that if you look at the site to have an internal roadway is to cut up the green space. You try to envision looking out the window and you are going to see a pedestrian pathway that students are walking to go from athletic fields or between classes and it is a very campus like atmosphere. If you were to try to cut out this entrance onto Walnut and run an interior road there, there is a huge quality of life degradation. It also is going to have students going across a vehicular roadway to go between a building and say the soccer field. For those reasons, we feel that the extra entrance at Walnut is optimal. Alderman Weisbuch asked if we are listening to the residents and are we making any changes or are we just steamrolling them. From the traffic standpoint we listened very much to the residents. As a matter of fact, that is how we got to Option 5b in the first place was we looked at Option 5a, we looked at the optimal traffic situation from when you have an intersection it is better to have to minimize the offsets at that intersection but we hear the comments about the Trowbridge residents interested in having that offset. We heard the

comments about parking at the neck from Walnut and what it will look like when it is 40' wide and parking on both sides and we took away the parking at that point. We listened to many of those comments and made adjustments so that it would minimize the impact on residents that are using it. It will optimize the commuters that are using our public ways but really not having anything to do with the school and than certainly addressing the issues about the students themselves and how do they get there and how do they access and egress on a daily basis. It is a balancing act, we tried to analyze what is the difference between 5a and 5b. What are the differences? By moving, the entrance down 100' the trade off is that you do not have a signalized intersection for people leaving Trowbridge and if you look down at Otis and Cabot it is a very similar situation. It is an offset intersection, which can work but you do have some accompanying traffic that may block that intersection from time to time. We have had requests for signs that state please do not block intersections. It is indicative of what happens because of a light control at an offset intersection but that is a trade off and is something to keep in mind. The parking spaces because the entrance moved down it shifted the field down and therefore the parking spaces get cut and to maintain parking spaces which we all know are critical they added the parking spaces here in the loop to maintain that. One of the pros to that option is that now it puts more parking closer to the gym. The other bonus is that the residents on the corner instead of having the main entrance going close to the house now has more green space. The third is that the sight distance is increased. The reason that initially option 5A was better was that students walking from the southeast sector would be encouraged to use a controlled pedestrian light.

Alderman Sangiolo asked how wide is the roadway coming off of Lowell Avenue and how wide is the ceremonial entrance?

Commissioner Rooney responded that the Ceremonial Entrance is 24' and Elm is 36'.

Alderman Parker stated that as you look at the proposed site plan, it seems like the most direct route to get to the site from the parking lot is right across the field, it occurs to him that you might have kind of a path and in the proposal they have the synthetic turf and wondered about another having the synthetic turf? What uses will take place in the large field house that are not possible to do in the existing high school? Are concerned about the location of the softball field?

Mr. Williams stated that he assumes there will be fence – not only for safety but for maintaining condition of the fields and then the walk ways would be on the outside. The fence would be functional and safety. In terms of playing both games at the same time, he feels it could be accommodated. The instructional program; health, fitness, and wellness located next to the building allows us to take our classes outside to the multi-purpose field as opposed to taking them to the multi purpose field another 100 yards away. The turf will allow us to do things we are haven't done before. We have not asked more than what we have. With the multi-purpose field, it will work for us.

Alderman Mansfield asked why some of the changes that were not made to the building design that should have been made were rejected. He has questions regarding parking, traffic, and circulation. Specifically, how many drop off trips are anticipated in the morning drop-off hours and how many trips are anticipated to go on to the site? How many busses are there? He would like to see a comparison between the number of private auto trips that are going to be accommodated off Walnut Street and the number of bus trips accommodated off of Lowell? How many trips are expected to be leaving Trowbridge Street during the rush hours? How many students are anticipated to walk from the northeast side of Walnut Street to get to this site? What is the opinion of the Landscape Architect about taking non line of site routes particularly routes that involve going back and up and down hills such as Hull St. to get from point A to point B if they are dropped off on Lowell Ave?

John Prokos said parents and children will find what works for them in finding the appropriate walking routes and there are different drop-off points. If there is a minor modification to the design, there would be no expected changes to the site plan. The inside floor plans are developed and reviewed with the faculty and the School Committee and that does not affect the site plan. If there was a major change, it could affect the site plan.

What are the Next Steps?

Alderman Weisbuch stated that many of the neighbors have expressed to a feeling of unhappiness at not being understood, heard or having their opinions listened to despite the many meetings. What is your plan in going forward in working with the neighbors and how would you address that concern.

Graham Gund stated that as we go through the outline of the questions, we are going to discuss future steps. (Clerk's Note: A separate response has been recieved.)

Costs of the Site Plan and the Construction Manager at Risk

Alderman Weisbuch asked if the Gund Partnership has in its possession a document that lays out the summary elemental costs that you have used as a cost estimator to move forward?

John Prokos stated that we are going to discuss cost a little bit more as part of the presentation. There are reams of data on cost analysis. You have seen a lot of it presented to this Board. Even going back into January you had very detailed presentations of all the costs that have been studied to date. We are in the midst of a refinement of the cost estimate, which will be available later this fall as the design progresses. It is the next detailed stage of cost development.

Alderman Baker said that Alderman Vance asked who was looking out for the best interests of Newton and who specifically is going to be watching costs. Mr. Juusola of Turner Construction responded that he would fill that role. He is the Project Manager. He is an architect and designed public schools for the past 20 years and familiar with the process of watching costs. Both Mayor Cohen and Nick Parnell set the standards for this project's costs and quality. The role of the Project Manager is to be the eyes and ears and advisors for the City, constantly looking for the best interest of the city. Weekly meetings are held with city officials and design team to review design issues. The architect is reminded daily to eliminate costly details and to provide easy to maintain finishes, materials and equipment and at the same time provide a high quality functional public high school. Good design is cost effective. We would direct the architect to keep the square footage down to where it should be, if not lower. To eliminate non cost-effective items such as three story openings or atriums, to control materials, and finishes as well as minimal use of wood trim and decoration throughout the building.

An issue brought up was Construction Manager at Risk. The Construction Manager at Risk Procurement is a process to provide substantial benefits to the City on this project, including being able to negotiate the guaranteed maximum price. In addition the Construction Manager Selection Committee can select the Construction Manager based on the firm's reputation and record of previous accomplishment rather than being forced to have just the lowest bidder. The Construction Manager will provide weekly cost management updates on this project and provide advice on purchasing materials that have volatile pricing and bringing on a construction manager during the design and development stage is going to enable them to give input into site logistics and avoiding unbuildable details, limit inconsistencies in the plans and specifications and allow them to participate in pre-qualifying of sub contractors which under current bidding procedures is not allowed. All of these advantages will insure that the project is better overseen and ultimately that the project comes in as promised.

There was a question about how would a requested appropriation over one million dollars would be allocated towards construction management. The City has already received RFQ applications from six construction management firms. Three firms will be short listed, the RFP process, the second phase of the process begin. Of the \$1,076,250. requested in Board Order 230-06A, \$450,000 enables the project manager to perform their duties through what is called the preconstruction phase. The remaining \$625,250 will go to compensate the Construction Manager at Risk for services rendered through what is called preconstruction. The construction documents are at least 60% complete by the statute and work can start on negotiating a guaranteed maximum price. \$626,250 is derived from the industry standard of roughly one-half of one percent of the estimated construction costs. The Construction Manager Construction services fee is an estimate with the actual cost to be determined by the bidding firms. The Design Team is confident that the \$626,250 figure is a conservative estimate with the possibility that the fees coming from construction managers will be coming in lower. There was a question of other cities and towns who have used this. This method was only recently authorized by the Commonwealth in the fall of 2004. There are few projects utilizing this method of

procurement. A similar one is the Salem High School project that has been approved. The scope is quite different from Newton North. Salem is an occupied phase renovation of approx. 200,000 sq. ft of an existing 400,000 sq. ft. building.

Another question was how is what is called pre-contract work priced out? Pre construction services provided by the construction manager are part of the 2-part RFP proposal process. This includes a technical submission as well as a price submission where sealed bids will be provided for pre-construction services fee which they will submit with the detail of how they got to that number. A construction services fee is generally expressed in the industry as a percentage of the construction cost and an estimated cost of general conditions with appropriate backup. There will be a combined ranking based upon a price submission and a technical submission and then a contract will be negotiated starting with the top ranked firm.

Alderman Albright stated that the part of the question of who was watching out for quality and cost - some of the answers worried her. Mr. Juusola had mentioned eliminating costly details and then you gave as an example that you would not want a three story atrium and later on you talked about that. The library, for example, has a three story atrium. That is the kind of detail that makes a building beautiful and include architectural details. She was worried that in order to keep costs down, there won't be any beauty in the room and wantsto be sure that not both cost and beauty are considered.

Nick Parnell stated that it is a there is a delicate give and take. It is a back and forth that goes on and in the middle of that you have the project manager because the project manager working on our behalf. There will be ongoing dialogue working with the Design Review Committee to be sure that it is designed well and looks good and functions well.

Alderman Albright said when it comes up at Design Review; you don't have any input at all. She wants it to be a beautiful building.

Mr. Parnell said we are not out there to do a cheap building. For the money we are spending, we are looking for building that we can have civic pride in. He will be sure that it will be a beautiful building.

Alderman Baker reminded the Committee that there is a cost element in terms of time. The longer we wait the more the cost goes up.

Alderman Mansfield asked if Turner Construction could provide in the near future, examples of how they have provided these services, what projects municipal projects that have worked on and what cost savings they have achieved in the construction projects they have handled?

Alderman Johnson asked about a prior joint meeting where Mr. Juusola had stated that the Board would be getting monthly updates. Where are those reports? She then

asked about the selection process for the construction manager, is that done by the Design Review Committee?

Nick Parnell stated that there is a pre-qualification committee that is formed by Nick Parnell, the Project Manager, John Prockos and Ed White from Richard White and Sons. That is defined by statute.

Alderman Johnson asked if those meetings are private?

Ouida Young responded that those meetings are not subject to the Open Meeting Law. They are not open to the public. Information will be provided to the board, but it is not one that under the statute the Board has a role in.

Alderman Gentile stated that at the meeting mentioned by Alderman Johnson, he specifically made the recommendation that they consider having a representative from the Board involved in this selection process.

Ouida Young stated that the structure is defined in the statute

Alderman Danberg stated that she understand the notion of bringing in the the CM at Risk early in the game and thinks that is a good idea.

Once the CM is on Board, they will be doing cost management. They will meet weekly and tell us what the cost is and how it varies.

Alderman Danberg asked at what point do you finally negotiate that price?

By statute, the construction documents have to be 60% complete before you can negotiate.

Alderman Danberg asked how the CM at Risk, Project Manager, and Architect interface and what overlap might there be in job responsibilities?

John Prokos stated that he doesn't think there is really any overlap. The architect is charged with designing the building and what is called administering the construction; checking shop drawings, making field visits, at the end doing a punch list of what needs to be done and then signing off when the building is ready for occupancy. The Construction Manager is essentially the contractor who is going to build the building for you. The Project Manager is there to manage this entire process to make sure the architect is doing their job, getting everything the contractor needs to build it to be sure the contractor is getting everything he needs, that the architect is supplying it and the contractor is maintaining his schedule and hopefully under budget.

Alderman Linsky stated that his read of the statute would indicate that the members of that pre-qualification committee, it sets out the minimum members in terms

of the public members, there could be additional public members should it be determined to do so. We would not be precluded to adding members to that. The process is subject to the Open Meeting Law does not explicitly indicate that. However, on the other hand it makes sense for it to be a public process. Otherwise, how do you expect people to have confidence in that.

Ouida Young responded that there are some aspects of what you are going to be looking at that are not, just as in Sec. 6, under 30B, subject to being conducted in public. This is the same sort of process as we understand it, that we actually expect to occur during the process for selection of the CM at Risk. Going through the Inspector General's training courses, the IG actually does not anticipate those committees being a broad group of individuals. They are looking for individuals to be on that Committee who have experience with the CM construction process, that is why they specify you have to have your architect on board, and your project manager as members of the Committee, not just staff to the Committee, but members of that Committee. The focus of the statute is to have professionals who are familiar with this process actually conduct the selection process for the CM and go forward. There isn't anything that precludes someone from the Board of Aldermen or otherwise being a part but it certainly all the advice we are getting tends to look towards professional qualified individuals to participate as members of the Committee and to do that in the responsible process. As part of this process, you will be getting audited financial reports. Some of that information is not appropriately conducted in public.

Alderman Weisbuch asked if it isn't redundant to have an architect on this project and also an interiors consultant. Isn't there an architects consult on interiors when they design a building?

John Prokos stated that this would be for furniture.

Alderman Danberg commented on the football stadium. You mentioned that there would be a cost savings if we sank it as opposed to ground level. You would have to actually fill it if we were to bring it up to grade do that the drainage would be positive. If we do sink it, it would be a higher cost than at ground level. How much more expensive is that drainage going to be and do we have any kind of guarantee that that drainage system will last for x number of years? How long is that going to last?

Alderman Sangiolo asked if it was possible to use the fields at the same time?

Alderman Sangiolo asked what if, when we get to the final cost, we can't afford more than \$110 million dollars, whatever it is maybe the pool or something else would have to be rid of?

John Prokos responded that if you give us criteria such as "remove 5 million dollars from the construction budget", you could reasonably ask how we would suggest doing that? We could comment on it if we had criteria.

Mr. Pooler stated that we need to move beyond site plan approval so that the building can be designed. The elements such as surfaces, mechanicals, how much will the cost be for each. That would be developed over the next six months. In a traditional design bid build process, we would get to a point, as we got to South, where as we are getting ready to go out to bid, we had more and more cost estimates and we realized that some things had to be bid as alternates and we did that. Some things got built and some did not. One of the great advantages of our proceeding with this Construction Manager at Risk process, is that will be an ongoing discussion with the Construction Manager.

Alderman Sangiolo asked if we say that we are not going to move the football field, would that dramatically alter the site plan? If we said we don't want the athletic facility because there is a nice facility at Newton South, would that dramatically reduce the cost of this project? If we wait until we know exactly how much these pieces of the big project will cost to determine whether we want to fund them, will it be too late to eliminate them in order to save money on the bottom line for the total cost?

Sandy Pooler stated that our goal is to preserve the maximum amount of programs at this site because that is what the School Committee wants. If, at some point, there are fiscal restraints on what we can offer, then we will deal with that at that time. In the meantime, the goal is to give the students that programs that they deserve to continue to have offered to them.

Aldermen Parker, Harney, Linsky and Mansfield presented their concerns about the site plan in a Power point presentation, a copy of which is attached to this report.

At 11:30 pm Alderman Baker asked for a motion to go out of the Committee of the Whole. The motion was offered and seconded. Voice vote approved.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. Voice vote approved.

Respectfully Submitted

R. Lisle Baker, President