

CITY OF NEWTON

IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN

PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

SPECIAL MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2007

Present: Ald. Schnipper (Chair), Weisbuch, Albright, Salvucci, Gentile, Yates, Mansfield and Lappin

Also present: Ald. Baker, Burg, Coletti, Fischman, Hess-Mahan, Johnson, Lennon, Linsky, Lipof, Merrill, Samuelson, Sangiolo and Vance

City staff present: Nick Parnell (Commissioner of Public Building), Arthur Cabral (Budget and Project Specialist; Public Buildings Department), Robert Rooney (Commissioner of Public Works), Sandy Pooler (Chief Administrative Officer), Susan Burstein (Chief Budget Officer), Arthur Cohen (Design Review Committee Chair), Clint Schuckel, (Traffic Engineer), Reenie Murphy (School Committee), Anne Lerner (School Committee) and Dori Zaleznik (Chair of the School Committee)

#328-06 ALD. LINSKY, ALBRIGHT & JOHNSON, BAKER & SCHNIPPER requesting that the Design Review Committee periodically update the Board during the design phase of the Newton North High School project.

**HELD 8-0**

#224-06(2) ALD. LINSKY, ALBRIGHT & JOHNSON, BAKER & SCHNIPPER requesting further deliberation on the conditions set forth in the Site Plan Approval Board Order relating to the Newton North High School project, considering possible expansion and modification of the conditions.

**HELD 8-0**

Transcription

Ald. Schnipper: You have all received a copy of the agenda with the Chairman's Note. Let me just share with you the fact that I am going to start by having Mr. Pooler respond to questions that anyone may have relative to the memo that he has sent out as well as the coverage that I am sure many of you have seen both in the Tab and the Globe and than the design team will be here and we will shift gears to looking at the follow-up to questions that were raised when we had the Committee of the Whole meeting that really did not give us the kind of time to have much of a back and forth and discussion and meeting in the main chamber sets more of a speech tone than a discussion tone so we will pick up on that. I do want to share with you the fact that our Ward Two colleagues have asked to speak with us about a couple of issues and I would hope that we can keep in mind that it is going to occur after these other two portions of the agenda are dealt with, so hopefully we can keep our comments in a complete and thoughtful way but understand

that there are other things that will be coming up this evening. I would remind everybody again that this is not a one shot deal. I expect to continue to have updates as the work of the design team, the Design Review Committee, etc... to go forward before we ask Mr. Pooler to speak. Ald. Baker wanted to share something with you.

Ald. Baker: Mr. Wilkinson and I had spoken and he at my request prepared for the Board an analysis of Mr. Pooler's plan, which includes the memo, which Mr. Pooler had sent out to the members of the Board, and I just want to make sure that everybody has a copy. Mr. Pooler is obviously going to be able to respond to questions but this may save some time later. I will pass it around and please make sure everybody gets it.

### **City of Newton Capital Financing Plan Attached**

Sandy Pooler: Thanks for giving me the opportunity to talk to you tonight. I do want to update you on where we are. The financing and the things that we have looked at in the last year, since the last time I was talking to you, what has changed, where we think things are and I am sure that there will be specific questions and I will be happy to answer those. I just want to remind people of some of the fundamentals of this plan. We have a capital plan that is a citywide capital plan. In other words, it is not just a capital plan for North or for South or for city buildings or school buildings. It is for all of our capital needs together. That is what we started putting together back in 2000. I was looking back at some of my old memos, the first time I sent the Board of Aldermen on a capital financing plan was in July of 2000, where we had the news back then that we were starting to get some SBA reimbursement for the middle school. They came in earlier than we expected and so we thought instead of taking that money and putting it into the operating budget since it was going to eventually disappear. It was kind of one time money. Lets put it into our capital spending and start to build up a reserve so that we could anticipate the needs we were going to have for both South and North and for other capital spending down the road. So we started in 2001 doing that. Put the money into debt reserve, use those payments and then to some extent if there was a difference in any one year between our target of 3% of our revenue being spend on debt service and what we were actually spending on debt service we put the excess amount of that into the capital reserve. One of the questions I got last night, which I did incorporate in one of these slide but I think it was a question that somebody asked me last night and I also saw, not that I read these Tab blogs much, but Ald. Sangiolo did ask a question about where that money came from and is it true to say that the money we have been putting into debt reserve has not been coming out of the operating budget.

Ald. Sangiolo: I did not ask where the money was coming from that was the follow-up person. I wanted to know if it had any impact on our operating budget.

Sandy Pooler: Almost all of the money that we put into the debt reserve can be attributed either to SBA payments or in four of the last seven years we had premiums on our bond payments. In other words, when we sell our BANS the people who bought those BANS gave us a premium. They gave us an up-front cash payment and we put that money into the debt reserve. So, it's really been that kind of one time money that has gone into the debt reserve. We have not had to take money away from salaries or expenses or the rest of the operating budget in order to fund the approximately \$11 million that we have in the debt reserve today. I know that was an issue

with different (inaudible) people last night and I think that was kind of inherent in the question that Ald. Sangiolo asked in the blog. As you all well know, we sell bonds to finance the school construction and going forward in those years when our bond costs are above our 3% target we will use money in that debt reserve to insulate the operating budget from the costs of those bonds, which is really the whole key to this and I think that the most important thing that collectively the Board, the Mayor and the School Committee did when we first started setting this money aside is we were really trying to protect the operating budget from being cut when we had high debt costs for South and for North and that is what we have been doing. That is the background and I think most of you are pretty familiar with that.

The debt plan assumes a cost for Newton North of \$141 million. We will return to allocating 3% of our general fund revenue to debt service. When I say return that is because one of the things that we did in the last year, looking at what the numbers really are. If you look at 2007 and we realize on a budget of \$255,000,000, which is the general fund budget for this year and debt service of a little more than \$7 million, we were actually spending 2.77% of our budget on debt, not the 3%. Part of that is because we did not put \$258,000 last year as we had originally planned on and part of it was because our revenues grew faster than the debt plan from a year ago had assumed, so in other words I think that is good news. When we looked at what we thought revenue was going to be and what it really ended up being, revenue grew faster. So we have fallen behind a little bit and we do need to catch up in each of the next two years. In 2008 and 2009, we need to add about \$250,000 worth of new growth to get us right back to that 3% level but after that and this is the thing that I think is the most important for some of the people in this room given the discussion last January, after that we do not need to keep adding to it in 50..or any new growth into the debt reserve. Once we get to 3% and we keep committing 3% of the budget we are in good shape the plan works that way. So I think that is probably one of the most significant changes in terms of what we are suggesting to you in terms of this plan.

The next thing is that we have built in bonding for \$3.5 million, as a minimum for other projects going forward and that will grow over time. That number has not changed from last January. Newton North we will sell twenty-year bonds. We assume a 4.5% interest rate and in the plan I presented last January we had assumed a 5% interest rate. Why have we changed it now because we have looked at the bonds that have been sold by triple A communities over the last year. There have been about a dozen of them. The average sale price for those bonds has been 3.9%. So we know that the market is a lot lower than what we had assumed and we have looked at the long-term interest forecast that the economists have been putting out and so forth. So we feel that given the market is at a little less than 4% now that we are still being a little conservative in assuming that the interest rate on the bonds for North will be 4.5% but that does save us some money. The other major financing source is of course the \$46.5 million and the other thing that has changed since the last time I talked to you about financing is that we now have that \$15 million loan from the SBA at 2% and that saves us a good amount of money. The other thing is our revenue growth rate. How much money we set aside for capital depends (that 3%) every year how much our revenue grows and in the past I have just plugged in a very conservative number of 2.6% for revenue growth. Why did I do that because it happened to work? That is the number I backed into kind of at the end of the day. In a big model like this you have several different variables; you kind of assume a certain number of things, and eventually you back into a number to figure out how much you need to assume revenue is going to grow. At one point,

the Mayor asked me why did you do that. Where did that number come from, you are just making an assumption. What if you go and look back over time and see how much has our revenue actually grown from year to year. I said all right lets figure out what that is. I went back to 1996 and I excluded the amount that revenue went up because of the override and figured out that in fact our revenue growth has been 3.8% per year. That number is now plugged into the model, assuming that we will go forward. Other capital projects – one other kind of baseline assumption going into the more distant future those other capital projects I am assuming we sell for 15 year bonds and that we will sell them at 5% interest. So, inclusive the interest rate that is up to 5% for the long term stuff just to give us a little protection and in the short term keep the interest down at 4.5%. In sum, these are the sources in funding Newton North: \$15 million in loans, \$46.5 in grants and \$79.5 million in bonds sold by the City of Newton.

This is the debt reserve slide. You have seen this. This is to demonstrate where we are right now in 2007, we are at \$11 million dollars and as long as we always stay above zero, which we will going through 2020 than the plan works. We are always protecting the operating budget from those cuts because of our capital plan. The next slide demonstrates again how the plan works. These lines show the available money for us. It is which percent of our operating budget plus whatever SBA money we have coming in the next few years and you compare that with what our actual debt costs are going to be, it appears that the debt cost is going over a 3% in some years, those are the years we are going to take money out of the capital reserve. These years we are still putting some money in then take money out for several years and then eventually we will be in good shape. We can than make a decision in 2020 if we want to keep putting money in debt reserve but between know and then the operating budget will be protected. This slide is our debt service payments going forward. I show this for a couple of reasons. One is it shows the mix of old debt, the stuff at the bottom in blue is old debt, and that is everything up until the things we have sold most recently, which includes the debt for Newton South, for the Tier 1 projects, the middle school projects and so forth and even including some of the things we sold very recently. Last year for example to buy that fire ladder, fix the windows down at Station 4, to do the boiler repairs at those three elementary schools and so forth. The red lines are the debt for Newton North and the yellow lines are the debt payments going forward for other projects around the city, that 3.5 million left dollars that escalates from year to year. There has been some discussion about what percentage Newton North is going to take up of the budget of our debt going forward. This graph shows and answers that question and the next slide answers it a little more clearly. What this shows is the percentage of debt for any particular project in any particular year and so like right now all projects constitute 100%. By the time, we start selling North debt it will come in at about 5% in the first year, max out at about 60% and then go down from there. There have been some people that have said that North is some how going to use 80 or 90% of our debt capacity and that is just not true. This is the amount that North uses of our debt going forward. It maxes out around 60% and starts to go down from there and given it is a very expensive project it is still not using up as much debt as some people seem to think it is. My final slide is showing what we project we are spending on other projects starting at \$3.5 million and going up over time.

Ald. Salvucci: Every year since I have been on the Board, we have done nothing but raise taxes in this city. \$300-\$400 a year by far the most and in the same period in the past few years you have been cutting the budget, every department head has been getting a notice to cut his budget

5%. Now, you say we get a 3.8% revenue growth every year that does not give us any money for raises for H-grades. The H-grades have not seen a raise in four years and with the 3.8% growth, so if the 3.8% growth continues does that mean that these people (1) won't see a raise and (2) supposing, I wish I had your crystal ball but I get scared when people tell me for 20 years we are going to get 3.8% growth. Lets assume that it is less, everything is based on 3.8%, say it falls short of 3.8% than where does the revenue come from? First of all, answer my first question, what about the 5% cuts-are those going to continue?

Sandy Pooler: Every year the budget has gone up in total dollars. In other words departments have not seen cuts in there budget in terms of money. We have asked them to start out the budget process...to take a look at what would happen if given the automatic increases that are built into their budgets from year to year, they then had to go from say 2006 to 2007 and cut back 5% from that new level. That is the exercise that we have asked them to do but I have to tell you frankly at the end of the day that is applied to very few departments. It is mostly a budgeting exercise we don't really cut there budgets back that much. It gives me a chance to say to them what is this and what is that and in fact if you look at the budget for every single department in the city the dollar amount has gone up year to year. What is going on with those dollar amounts is that we have had cost drivers, particularly health insurance, that has really added a tremendous amount of money from year to year to our budgets. We have had 10% increases in health insurance budget every year for the last ten years and that has put pressure on our ability to deliver services, there is no doubt about it. In terms of the actual dollars, the budgets get bigger from year to year. I do want to answer your question about the H-grades. The H-grades have gotten raises every year just like the unions have. What they have not gotten is steps. Since I got here, we have had steps some years and not other years. I frankly think the steps for the H-grades are very expensive and the way we do steps for them really needs to be changed because it is not financially sustainable. The system went into effect years ago that I don't think we can afford. The School Department management does not have steps. They have gotten cost of living just like city department management has, so we are all on an even keel. I meet once a month with other cities and towns around the state to talk about common issues and the issue we met about last time was the start of a discussion that was so intense that we had to carry it over to our February meeting was how you pay your top management people because it is a big issue in every city and town that was around that table. I don't want to say that we have not gotten raises because we have gotten cost of living adjustments just like the unions.

Ald. Schnipper: I really want to try and keep the focus on North and these other issues can certainly be talked about at budget time or other times but we have a very full agenda tonight.

Ald. Salvucci: I will stop there. I will call Sandy Pooler.

Ald. Lappin: You once told me that sometimes you underestimate growth to be safe in case something happens and you never know what is really going to happen. Now it seems as if you are overestimating. I mean you are looking at the most it has been and you are saying that is what it is going to be and I was more comfortable when you said I underestimate so we will have a little left over.

Sandy Pooler: I would not say the 3.8% is an overestimate. I would say over the last ten years some times it has been above 3.8%, some times it has been below and again that is not including the override but on average every year its been a steady 3.8% growth. So what I am doing is taking a long-term trend and going forward.

Ald. Lappin: But you have used this in budget estimates and in turn the departments...I mean all of our budgets are based on that and we don't end up at the end of the year with a lot of extra money, so maybe your projections were correct. The health insurance is a huge issue. It is expected to be a huger issue in the future, so I am uncomfortable.

Sandy Pooler: Let me say this about that, health insurance has been a big challenge for us. There are years that we have been able to do something about it. In other words, we have gotten changes in co-pays and plan structure and so forth. There was one year where we had a 0% increase in our health insurance budget.

Ald. Lappin: Wasn't it 11% last year.

Sandy Pooler: Actually, it was more like 9%. Last year was a better year. My preliminary numbers for the coming year, I don't want to mention the number yet because we don't have them final, but I think we are going to be below 10% this year. For some reason our claims are better and maybe some of the things, we have been doing with Canadian drugs and getting people to switch off brand name prescriptions to generics are paying off. I think we might catch a break this year. In the long run, it is still going to be a problem and I think we still have to continue to look at. There are efforts on Beacon Hill to try and get us in the GIC and so forth.

Ald. Lappin: What about the projections. The fact that your lower projections drove the budget to be what they were and we did not end up with any more money at the end of our budget. So how does this make any sense.

Sandy Pooler: The fact of the matter is that whatever our projections were in the beginning at the end of the day we really raising and spending 3.8% more year to year. So even if I was a little conservative at budget time, when all was said and done we were really spending and we really have spent 3.8%. I am saying that is what we have done consistently for 10 years.

Ald. Lappin: So we have made that and spent it.

Sandy Pooler: Yes, that is right. We cannot spend more than we make. We cannot go into debt services that is all we have.

Susan Albright: I understand that the budget goes up but the budget doesn't seem to go up enough to cover everything that we are doing now. For instance if it going up by 5% and the revenue is 3.8%, you can't quite get to everything that we are doing. I know that at the end of the year last year there was a lot of hand wringing about this is the worst budget year ever for the School Department and the year before there was some hand wringing and I know that there were cuts in the Public Buildings budget that got restored. I know that in Public Works I think some of the stuff that we are allowing to be done with private funds is helping to keep Public

Works afloat a bit. I am not yet at a comfort level, where I believe that this new projection is really going to happen in a way that is not going to force us to keep cutting. Although, you say that we have been fine with 3.8%, I know every year that we are not flush and when we do our budget, we do a lot of hand wringing and we do some cuts. I am wondering what that means for the future.

Sandy Pooler: I would just say two things. Every year you do have to try to deal with the situation and be creative about it. Last month, someone very wisely pointed out in last debate, one of the things that we did was we voted money to change out our streetlights. It was \$1.4 dollars spent, we are bonding over three years to pay it back, we are going to have the savings in electricity to pay off the debt cost and after that we will have those savings forever. I think it is just part of the challenge of trying to run a government is that you do have to keep working at it. The other thing I would say is in my humble opinion our greatest challenge is our operating budget side. I think that is the greatest challenge facing the city and I think what we are talking about here is a capital plan that devotes 3% of our revenue to capital. I think that is an absolute minimum that we should be devoting to capital. The Blue Ribbon Commission has asked what other Triple A's are doing and we are definitely at the low end, so there is no way that we can go lower. I think we need to keep making that basic commitment to capital whatever challenges happen on the operating side, I don't think we can ever go below 3% and that is all that this plan counts on. You are right, depending on how much it goes up but I still think that there are things that are coming along. I don't want to count on and did not build in counting on the development down on Route 9 but there is still development going on in Newton whether it is Route 9 or Riverside. Again, if you look back in time we have sustained 3.8% and I think that is a reasonable assumption.

Ald. Weisbuch: The concern I have is something I think Ald. Coletti raised and you just mentioned. I think one of the points you raised last night was on streetlights. You mentioned \$3.5 million annually bonded for other capital projects, yet we are bonding for fire ladders and I think Ald. Coletti pointed out that we are bonding for things that we have purchased in the past. Isn't that putting more pressure...Isn't that kind of like holding the ball there a little bit? You are bonding for things that you used to be able to purchase, yet you are keeping this \$3.5 million annually bonded for capital projects. It just seems like you are pushing it out and pushing it out.

Sandy Pooler: I would say to some extent that it is a valid criticism. On the other hand, I don't think it is completely true either. There have been times in the past where we have bonded for equipment and trucks, that particular fire truck was \$850,000 piece of equipment. That is a big piece of equipment. The kind of equipment that we are bonding for is the really big stuff. It is not the middle and smaller size stuff. We will still pay cash for those things. I think that is probably the best I can answer that.

Ald. Weisbuch: I am not trying to challenge you but what I draw from what you have said and what I've drawn from listening to other people like Ald. Coletti, this \$3.5 million annually bonding is sort of an illusory number in that it does not necessary cover the middle and small purchases. Again, I am not challenging it but I am hearing that.

Sandy Pooler: I think that is accurate and I think that the small and middle stuff we will still have to buy and should buy with free cash. We should not be bonding for the smaller stuff.

Ald. Coletti: Obviously, we have a lot more to talk about in terms of financing when it comes to Finance but I respect what Sandy Pooler has done and what he put in the slides in front of us. I would just ask you to keep this one thought in the back of your mind because it is probably the only concern I have about the slide show. If you went back and look at the slide that said the assumptions, by going to the 3.8%, and my only concern is that Sandy Pooler kind of said to you that I picked 2.6% out of my head but you know the real reason that he did that because back in the old days he was attempting to build up free cash and by being at 2.6 he pretty much guaranteed we'd have \$3.5 to 4 million in free cash at the end of the year.

Ald. Lappin: Which we used.

Ald. Coletti: But remember what he always used to say to you "I don't like the idea of using free cash, non-recurring money for operating expenses. So what he has done is that he has basically said is that we are going to go to the 3.8% and we are going to allocate everything to the budget. So, what Ald. Lappin is really asking is what is going to happen to free cash because it will be very difficult to generate what people in the investment community like and that is 10% we typically aim at 5% but now that he has gone and maximized the revenue in order to turn around and generate the fund in the budget to dedicate to debt services, it is going to mean that we are not going to have very much free cash. So on the years that the 3.8% average, which means half the time it is lower and half the time it might be over, the question is how do we make up the difference and how do we do those things that we need to do. The answer to the question and there is an answer and he right when he says that there is new growth coming on line that will help but it has to be very clear to everybody to understand that we are now going to devalue the city's total revenue that is coming in at the max. We are going to set it at the top and that is going to have a tremendous impact on our free cash and it is going to mean that in the bad times, we may be have to be coming up with fees or something else to bridge the gap. In other words, he will have a lot of work to do once he has established this. If I am wrong, I hope people correct me but this is going to have a very definite impact as you expressed on free cash.

Sandy Pooler: We still will have to create free cash. We cannot survive without free cash.

Ald. Lappin: Where is it coming from?

Sandy Pooler: Even going to 3.8% as an assumption about what we are going to spend. Remember we don't always spend everything that we take in because we generate free cash. So we have always brought in a little bit more than that 3.8% and that is where the free cash came from. Yes, it is very important and I and this administration and anybody sitting in this office who is looking out for the city's financial interest will make sure that we maintain free cash for the city and we will continue to do that. I think that we can pull it off. I think that if we work together, we can do it but I don't want to leave the impression that this plan assumes that we are going to be in a position not to have free cash because that is not the way I look at it.



Ald. Coletti: I am pleased that we are going to get up to 3% because if we had gone to the 3%, I think that the reason that many of us don't really know what the total percent of the North debt is going to have in relation to all the other debt is that we really have never gotten to the point where we sold the amount of debt that we should have in order to keep these other projects going. So I hope you really are serious about making sure because a 3% debt number gives us a guarantee of at least \$7.5 million of new bonding every year and that may be even outside of water/sewer. I am pleased that you are going to do that but I have at home going back to 1986 how much debt we have sold. In your administration there have been years that we sold none. This is something that I am looking forward to because now we will be able to get some of these other projects that Ald. Albright and others are concerned about done if we really truly follow that policy.

Ald. Samuelson: It is new to me that you have abandoned that \$250,000 exponential and what is the difference.

Sandy Pooler: Basically, because we have a \$15,000,000 loan that we did not have before, interest rates we have to pay on debt is lower than we had assumed a year ago and the amount that the revenue is growing every year is higher than I had assumed a year ago.

Ald. Samuelson: You did not know about...When did the \$15 million dollar loan come into existence?

Sandy Pooler: Last summer is when we got notification of it from the SBA. We had to apply for it in August and we were notified this fall that we actually got it.

### **Discussion with Arthur Cohen**

Ald. Baker: My understanding is that the Mr. Prokos is going to present the value engineering that he presented before but is it your intention to ask people to pick those elements that they would like to talk about in anticipation of going to Design Review with further process.

Ald. Schnipper: One of the points that I wanted to make is that Design Review has a very specific charge. What we are doing now is not in any way shape or form meant to be a parallel process. What I have been hearing throughout the last year from people is concern that by the time things get to this table the decisions have already been made. So, what I have promised and am trying to hold to is for us to be aware of what is being discussed so that people might present their thoughts about and Design Review will hopefully be able to take that into consideration but they are the body that is really going to be making the decisions and sending them back to us. Obviously, I would hope that our input would be valued because we ultimately will sign the checks. We do have that ultimate authority there but it is not meant as a parallel process. It is meant as an update for us so that people are aware of what you are discussing. I received in the mail that the life-cycle costs are going to be the primary item of discussion tomorrow evening.

Arthur Cohen: Mechanical/electrical systems, yes

Ald. Schnipper: They have not really had that discussion yet, so it would not be something that I would expect would be before us at this point in time. When John Prokos does run through the list, I hope that people will pick out those things that they would particularly like to focus on. I don't think that we really have the time or the inclination to discuss every single one of them.

Ald. Sangiolo: Will Mr. Cohen also be updating us or able to answer questions on what Design Review is discussing?

Arthur Cohen: We did not meet last week. The meeting was cancelled for lack of an agenda.

Ald. Schnipper: I don't think there is much that has happened since the last time he updated us but there will be future updates.

Arthur Cohen: Also, we are not making decisions. Our job is to make recommendations to others in the City such as the Board and the Mayor.

Ald. Sangiolo: Well, when we first received the site plan there was a memo that Mr. Cohen had written that said we are recommending the site plan to the Board but there are items we have concerns about.

Arthur Cohen: There is a memo that went along with our recommendations to the Board for site plan approval and that states all of those items.

Ald. Sangiolo: And have those items been addressed?

Ald. Schnipper: No, because many of them are part of our Board Order conditions.

Arthur Cohen: Some of them are duplicates of the same concerns that the Board of Aldermen have attached to their Board Order as conditions. I will give you my understanding of what is going on. There are a number of things that we have asked the design team and the project management team to address. One of them is a response to both the decision that we brought up in our recommendation for site plan approval and also those items that the Board had as conditions of their Board Order. Mechanical and electrical systems-there has been a very elaborate study done and we are going to discuss it for the first time on Thursday. There were issues about program of the building that we needed to get reconciled, I guess some program changes to the building as well. There also been attempt on the part of the design team to try to tighten the building up, make it more efficient and we have yet to review all of those things. There were some concerns about certain aspects of the site conditions and how those might get resolved in the design as the design evolves. So there are a whole bunch of things that we have not talked about yet. It is my understanding that this issue of value engineering, which is neither value nor engineering, it is usually synonymous with cost guide, but the notion is to put together a list of items that warrant consideration as we try to get the most value for the dollars we spend and to look at them in those terms. There will trade-offs associated with those. It is not just a shopping list, that list is continuing to evolve, and continuing to expand and will as much is necessary in order to keep the project on budget without jeopardizing the quality.

Ald. Sangiolo: Is the budget \$141 million and we are getting to that point?

Ald. Salvucci: That is the problem. The Mayor came in and requested all these cuts but they have not been finalized yet as far as the Design Review Committee is concerned.

Ald. Sangiolo: So do you finalize the cuts?

Sydra Schnipper: No

Arthur Cohen: There two things that can be discussed, one is process and the other is content and I think you have to decide what you want to talk about tonight.

Ald. Johnson: I had asked Dan Funk, City Solicitor, what is the process because the Board Order as it stands today has a lot of study items. I don't remember how many items there are. So once the study is completed and we come up with a recommendation for change what is the process and the Board of Aldermen cannot do anything right now. Anything that comes out has to be recommitted to the Design Review Committee, who then brings it back to us and I had hoped that this would get shared with everybody but it came to me confidentially.

Ald. Schnipper: Most of us got it.

Ald. Johnson: We can make recommendations to the Executive Department, who will submit whatever they want to the Design Review Committee. Once they have blessed it so to speak, it comes back to us. Nothing is in our hands, we make recommendations, as best I read this and I had quite a long conversation with Mr. Funk.

Ald. Schnipper: There is a difference between something we are going to agree on and changing the Board Order. Not every change that happens needs to be part of a Board Order. There can be...

Ald. Johnson: What I heard you say Ald. Schnipper was in the Board's hands but it is not necessarily in the Board's hands. It needs to be really clear what is or is not in our purview versus what needs to go through them or through the Executive Department. I think we need to be really careful especially because we have a vote coming up and the public is watching, so I think we need to be clear.

Ald. Lappin: These value engineering changes, cuts or trade-offs that we are seeing today, is this presented by the Design Review Committee?

Arthur Cohen: We are not presenting anything.

Ald. Lappin: Where do these come from then?

Ald. Schnipper: What you are going to see is... We all know the range that has been put out as the cost of this building, \$140 to \$165 million that has been talked about for a long time. The

Mayor has come back and said he believes the City can afford through the financing plan that has been put forward....

Ald. Lappin: So the choice of these value engineering came from the Mayor?

Ald. Schnipper: No decision has been made. The list is generated by a lot of people. No decisions have been made as to which of those is going to be adopted.

Ald. Lappin: And Design Review has not discussed them.

Arthur Cohen: We have discussed a lot of them. We have not made a decision on them. As an example, there are items in there you will see like removal of the sloped roofs from the top of the building, well we are not going to make any recommendation on that until we understand the full range of all the possibilities, to get our arms around the entire budget and the entire value of the building.

Ald. Lappin: That makes sense. What input can we give before we get a recommendation from the Design Review Committee?

Ald. Schnipper: Because there may be things that we see on that list that we feel so strongly should not be on the list that we make that as a statement and ask them to reconsider.

Ald. Lappin: Okay, usually we get a recommendation from the Design Review Committee.

Ald. Schnipper: That is true but what people have specifically said over the course of months is that they are not happy getting the recommendation because they have not had a chance to have any input into what it is. So they asked to be involved earlier on and you know it is a mixed bag. The Mayor asked that the number come down to approximately \$141 million. The design team has come up with some things that they see as possibilities. I know Design Review has asked them to look at other things that they see as possibilities and my sense is that there is some feeling is that some of the things that they have suggested would be preferential, understanding what is going on, which of these ultimately will be recommended.

Ald. Lappin: We are going to see all of that tonight.

Ald. Schnipper: We are going to see a lot of it but it is an ongoing list.

### **Design Team Presentation**

#### **Web links to presentation:**

<http://www.ci.newton.ma.us/Aldermen/Public%20Facilities/2007/01-10-07%20Part%201%20of%202%20Design%20Team%20Presentation%20to%20Public%20Facilities.pdf>

<http://www.ci.newton.ma.us/Aldermen/Public%20Facilities/2007/01-10-07%20Part%202%20of%202%20Design%20Team%20Presentation%20to%20Public%20Facilities.pdf>

John Prokos: This evening we would like to review briefly the program changes that have been made since you last reviewed the plans, the current site plans, the building plans and move through some elevations and models and things then we will go over the value-engineering list and some alternative site plans. The square footage has stayed at just under 400,000 sq. ft. for the building but there have been some shifts in the program. We have reduced the size of Main Street a bit; there is a smaller lobby space. We have reallocated some space within the basement due to some ground water and geotechnical concerns that have come up with rock excavation. Again, not changing the program, just moving the basement around a little bit. We have changed some storage areas. There have been improvements to the teacher areas and the head of the school's office. We have worked with the maintenance staff on storage facilities for the building. We have changed every other programmatic elements within the building. We have added to the academic support centers, the teacher areas. We have modified the dance/wrestling room to create an enhanced weight/exercise room for the school and for the public. We have expanded the elementary lunch prep area, which serves the entire city, we've taken chair storage out of the main cafeteria space, we are going to store chairs folded up against the wall, and we have enhanced the guidance counseling offices within the building. That is a summary of some of the program changes.

The site plan, this is the one that the Design Review Committee and the Aldermen had previously approved – Option 5A- with the ceremonial drive here and the drop-off here, that has been developed further as we have been working on the design with the engineers. The building footprint changes a little bit due to some of the programmatic changes we are able to tighten things up creating a nice setback off Hull Street, but basically, it is the same plan. Moving into the building, that is where there has been more modification within the interior. As you may recall when you saw the schematic design drawings, this is the basement. The dotted line is the footprint of the building above. This is underneath the athletic area and this is underneath the core academic area. We took the athletic locker rooms, which used to be in this area of the Simulated Outdoor Area (SOA) and rotated it around 90 and located it here because that gets it out of some rock that came up through the geotechnical borings and sub-surface condition investigation. There was also more groundwater in this area, as you pull away from the hill the groundwater drops lower into the ground. Therefore, by putting the athletic basement here, it gets it out of the rock and the groundwater. It works pretty well too as you are coming across from the academic core you can come down this stair into the locker rooms, change go back up this stair and you are right in the middle of the athletic part of the building. This is a small mechanical basement room down below the loading dock and the service area for the building. Going up to the first floor of the building, this is the main entry off the ceremonial drive; we have tightened up the lobby space by making it narrower. That still leads out to the playing fields in the back here. This the athletic part of the building with the SOA, the performance gym, the swimming pool, lockers for the swimming pool, other support space is over here, nurse's office and preschool in this area too. There is a lecture hall accessible right from the main lobby. This is the main administration area of the school. If a visitor comes in they can be greeted here and come back to meet with the principal in this area. It is a close proximity to the

main entry. As you come across into Main Street, to the right, the cafeteria is here. The Tiger's Loft has a view out over the soccer field here. The art classrooms are in this area, they overlook the outdoor courtyard. This could be sculpture in this area. There is also an outdoor classroom area here. The main loading dock is here. This is the career and tech ed with the auto shop, electrical, carpentry all in this area with service to the outside here. This is the performing arts wing of the building with music, flexible theater space, main theater and support spaces, seam shop, stage back in here. This is the north entry with the other drive here. Therefore, the two major entry points are at either end of the building.

Going up to the second floor, you have the openings to the SOA below the performance gym and swimming pool. Spectators would come up this stair from the main lobby, come into the spectator area here, which overlooks the swimming pool or into the performance gym with bleacher seating, which overlooks that. There is a nice separation between the athletes on the first level and spectators on the second level. Here is that larger exercise/weight room, which is accessible right from the drop-off, either coming up this stair or coming up this stair to the weight room, wrestling room, the upper part of the lecture hall here. Coming across the entry lobby below – this is the beginning of the classroom area of the building on the second floor, with the library being right here in heart of the academic core and that looks out over the front entry and the soccer field. Classrooms march around the building this way. The green areas are faculty areas, so there is supervision throughout the building. In each corner of the building typically there are faculty areas where they can supervise what is going on in the corridors. The upper level of the theater is here with a fly loft going up in this area.

Going up to the third floor – this is a typical classroom level – a very efficient lay out with a double loaded corridor. The classrooms can be configured in different ways depending on if it is a humanities classroom or a math classroom and again we have adult supervision at corners of the building to keep an eye on things in this part of the building. The fourth floor has the science labs in here, the blue areas. They are larger than a typical classroom below. You can see a science lab with the lab benches, the teaching area and a shared prep space between two science labs and these were put on the upper floor to simplify the exhaust and mechanical appliance would go right up the roof and we don't have to shafts up through the whole outer stairway. The basic module for the building is based on the classroom. This is a typical classroom and it was layed out to maximize the efficiency of the room. The seating, two teacher's desks, they share a classroom, storage for those teachers' files, projection on the wall here. This is a section through the space, with an overhead projector and a teaching wall and we have two windows in every classroom that would be operable. This provides enough daylight to supplement artificial lighting.

Ald. Sangiolo: What was the size of the classroom?

John Prokos: 780

Ald. Salvucci: Not the labs

John Prokos: This is a study. We looked at the classrooms. We built a model, we looked at different types of windows in the classrooms, and we settled on the two windows because we felt

that gave a more even distribution of light. This is a computer simulation to see how much daylight comes into the room without any artificial illumination within the space. Elevation – you can see those double windows in each classroom are grouped here. So two windows in each and that creates a pattern across the façade. The science classrooms are up here. They have bigger windows, bigger spaces more natural lights. On the lower level, there are the special spaces: art classrooms, the Tiger's Loft, the main entry lobby.

The model study of those classrooms again you can see how two floors are grouped together to create more of a reading of a three story building, as opposed to a four and sections through the building show Main Street with a view over into the cafeteria from Main Street and on the other side on the upper level corridor where the library is. There is plenty of space for artwork on the walls. That is one of the nice things about the existing school as you go through it. The walls are really covered with a lot of the students' artwork. We looked at further reduction to the size of Main Street. This is a study to squeeze Main Street a little bit more. You can see the main entry lobby going over to the gym coming through Main Street in the upper floor of the building. We looked at portions of those spaces if we did narrow it up a bit more and you can see that this is a section through the academic building – the first level, the library on the second level, typical classrooms up above, the cafeteria over in here – at its narrowest point Main Street would be about twenty feet wide and some forty feet wide at its widest point. It still has a very comfortable scale. You can see the width of that and looking at the entry lobby where we have also narrowed that up and at its narrowest point it is 32. When you come into the main lobby here is that stair up to the performance spectator level of the gym or over into the academic building. We think that 30' wide passage still provides is wide enough to go out to the playing fields from the ceremonial entry.

This is what the building looks like in total now. This is looking from the corner of Walnut and Elm. This is the back of the auditorium – the seam shops over here, the flexible theater space. This is the academic core. Your art classroom would be right here. They overlook this courtyard. Tiger's Loft and the library overlook the soccer field in this area and you can see the athletic building behind. Moving around looking at the north entry – this is the drop-off on the north side of the building – entry right here into the theater lobby. This is the tech ed – four stories of building. The tech has its own service area here. Here is the main loading dock for them and the cafeteria. This is looking towards the ceremonial entry drive in here and the main entry lobby in this location. In the gym over here, you can see the hipped roofs on the gym like the current library here in Newton, proposed clear story on top to bring light down into the athletics. Here is the four story academic building with the Tiger's Loft in this area, science labs on the upper level. Here there would be rooftop mechanical equipment and some rooftop screens above the academic core. This is looking from up on Hull over the athletic facilities. You can see the three roofs one for the SOA, performance gym and the swimming pool and the academic building behind.

This is a little hard to see but it is the value-engineering list, which I think you have all received copies of and the only thing on this list that we are reassessing right now is the mechanical system. There was a million dollar savings or so to go to a unit ventilator scheme, which in terms of a life-cycle cost analysis does not appear to be very efficient over the long haul, so we are going to review that with Design Review tomorrow night and go through the life-cycle costs

for all of the mechanical choices and we hope to narrow that down. If you have questions about any of the value engineering items, I would be happy to walk you through it.

Ald. Schnipper: The question that people wanted to know the answer to was who generated this list and has this list been added to.

John Prokos: It is a valuable document. It is changing; we have looked at adding additional things to the list, looking at simplifying some of the lighting in the building. We are looking at the auditorium itself – ways that it can be simplified a bit and what the savings would be. This really never stops throughout the process. You are always considering different options. What is the most cost effective, what has the best life cycle cost in it. When we bring the construction manager on board, they are going to have input into this list. The list was really generated by everyone involved in the project – the engineers, the architects, the city, the cost estimator, and the various consultants. Everyone had some input and ideas. Design Review has thoughts and suggestions about what could be added to the list

Ald. Lappin: Is that on the list or not?

Arthur Cohen: Some of them are but a number of them that he mentioned they are still looking at.

John Prokos: It is an ongoing process and it really will continue throughout the design phases of the project.

Ald. Schnipper: Could you share with us how the decisions will be made, which of these things will be implemented?

John Prokos: Ultimately, the city has to decide which ones are acceptable to them and which aren't. We can make our recommendations about the viability, the long-term life-cycle cost of some of these things but the city is going to have to decide which ones they will accept and which ones they won't. To hit the \$141 million target though we have to have a list, which adds up to at least this amount. If we take things off this list, we have to add other things back on in order to get to that target.

Arthur Cohen: There would be nothing wrong to have items that as we go through (inaudible) this when we are pricing it and maybe even bring it down a little bit lower so there is some flexibility in terms of bidding as well. You have to weigh that against making sure that you do not take anything out that you want.

Ald. Salvucci: Would there be a list of the types of materials that are going to be used within the building?

John Prokos: We have a list of the finishes.

Ald. Salvucci: Are we going to see that in Design Review soon?



John Prokos: Sure and that was in some of the early documents that went out and we could redistribute them.

Ald. Salvucci: I think it is important to know, at least from my experience going through Newton South, some of the things that I witness that the kids punch holes in the walls and so forth and I just wondered if we could have a list of what types of material. What type of materials we are going to use on the floors for example that we had difficulty with at Newton South and things like that. I would like to see a material list. Can we have some input to what we see as possible changes and if they can be implemented and if not, why not?

John Prokos: Sure and also there are a couple more slides that we wanted to show you.

Ald. Samuelson: One of the opening comments you made is that you are reducing the cooking lab. What are you suggesting to reduce it from what to what?

John Prokos: There are three workstations in there now. I would have to check to see how many stations there were in the original part of the program.

Rob Juusola: There were three more teaching cooking stations in the original and it has been reduced to three.

Ald. Samuelson: And I see on your list there that you are changing the granite curb throughout the site to concrete. What is the life cycle of concrete?

Arthur Cohen: That is one of...that is why we have not made any decisions yet. Those are the kinds of things that we would like to not have to take and as Ald. Salvucci has said going drywall in places, where materials that are more durable should be placed is not a wise decision in order to just get to the target you are trying to hit. Therefore, we are trying to explore all the possible things that can get us where we want to be from a first plus point of view in order to....

Ald. Samuelson: When you look at the whole list, so than you are going to critique it and make some recommendations.

Arthur Cohen: Yes but it is going to be a process. It is not like a list where you are just going to check it off. We are going to have to have some discussion about it.

John Prokos: The biggest issue right now is the mechanical. We want to settle that. What mechanical system are we using? I think that is the highest priority. The very first decision that has to be made because the design cannot progress any further without the mechanical system being finalized.

Ald. Salvucci: Can you mention the fact that the things that may incur as a result of which mechanical system is picked. We can lower the buildings and so forth if we do not need duct work and all that. I think that is something that should be understood too.

John Prokos: The most critical thing with mechanical systems is not first costs but what is it going to cost you over twenty years to run it.

Ald. Yates: I have several questions on the changes. Some of this stuff is new to me. May be I missed it. Why are we putting in a credit union? Is there a credit union in North now?

Nick Parnell: Yes

Ald. Yates: This is so the staff won't have to leave and do their banking somewhere else.

Ald. Schnipper: I don't know the answer to that but I think people would like to have an answer to that so could we get one please.

Nick Parnell: there is one now, it has citywide use, and I will get further information.

Ald. Yates: There was some reference made that the dance and wrestling was being reduced in order to make up more room for fitness and weight. Was that asked by the School Department?

John Prokos: Yes, any change to the program is really initiated by the School Department. After our initial recommendations about the size of all of these spaces, working with Frank Locker who is our programming consultant we came up with overall programming recommendations for every space in the building. That is how we totaled the 399,140 but as the various faculty members and administrators have worked on this with us, some of the spaces have been tweaked. Some of the spaces are changed a little bit when we show how the furniture lays out within them. So they may ask for...now we need a little less space now that we see how it actually works. It is a give and take process as we develop the design and we have had some 100 meetings with the faculty and administrators on this project.

Ald. Yates: That is what kind of confuses me. That seems pretty ...You need this much space for dancing and wrestling and now there is more fitness coming in. It doesn't sound like the School Department has quite gathered their thoughts on this previously. I don't understand the change. Maybe you can get back to me on that. You refer to a performance gym. Is that opposed to some other kind of gym?

John Prokos: It is where you would have a basketball game and spectators would watch it. It is really a spectator gym.

Ald. Yates: Is there another non-spectator gym where you do other stuff?

John Prokos: Yes, the big SOA gym.

Ald. Yates: I was surprised to hear that they do all the cooking for the elementary schools in North.

Ald. Schnipper: Yes, there are no places in the elementary schools to make the hot food. It is all made in one location then distributed.

Ald. Yates: Have they ever considered buying it from one of the local vendors.

????: They do.

Ald. Yates: You were referring to the ducts. I have heard that there are some buildings that the ducts are exposed and are fully accessible and certainly, since a big part of the problem with fixing the current place is that you have to rip half the building apart to fix any of the ducts. Therefore, are you considering the accessibility of ducts as part of your mechanical thing?

John Prokos: Yes

Ald. Lappin: I must have heard wrong because did you say the public was coming into the fitness center?

John Prokos: It would be accessible.

Ald. Lappin: The fitness center where the kids work out or you mean this other performance...

John Prokos: It could be after school. Well that is obviously a school issue to decide how they want to do that but it is a possibility.

Ald. Lappin: So anyone can just go in and work out. The ceiling height of the classrooms where does that stand.

John Prokos: We originally started at 10' but it has been discussed and it is thought that we should go to 9.6'. It will probably end up at 9.6' but if we had our druthers, we would rather keep it at 10' because with a higher ceiling we can make the windows a little higher and bring more light into the classrooms. Ten feet is really the ideal.

Ald. Sangiolo: Did we ever get a cost breakout for the football/ multi-use stadium?

John Prokos: Yes, the premium for the artificial turf is about \$1.6 million

Ald. Sangiolo: But for the whole thing – to do the field, to sink it – what was the cost?

John Prokos: We do have that. I can't remember what it is off-hand.

Ald. Sangiolo: Could we get that.

Ald. Albright: I saw a number of \$5 million is that....

Ald. Schnipper: We would clearly like to have a breakdown on the stadium.

Commissioner Parnell: I thought that information had been released. I think it is around \$3.5 million but I will get that out. I will also give you the set of plans.

Ald. Albright: Where is the TV studio going?

John Prokos: The school is debating whether they want the TV studio in the program and they are considering trading off one of the other program spaces for the TV studio. It is still in play. The School Committee needs to decide that.

Ald. Albright: It is hard for me to understand what the theater cuts really mean here but I know that there are many things in the theater program that are lacking now. Personally speaking they have received (inaudible) in the theater program.

John Prokos: The cuts on the list right now do not change the program at all. They defer some of the equipment. So you would not buy as many theatrical lights, you would not buy as many microphones that sort of thing.

Ald. Albright: But that is what happens. When you do not get it originally, you don't get it. It does not come later because even though there is supposed to be all this money. I don't know who makes the ultimate decisions for this. The lighting, all the amenities, the microphones, and the sound equipment do not come in the beginning the chances of getting it later are slim to none.

Arthur Cohen: This is an incomplete list and those are the kinds of things that should be saved for the last cuts not the first cuts.

John Prokos: And that is a good thing to have as an add alternate too. Something that can be bid as funds allow.

Ald. Weisbuch: I don't hear any talk about wiring or modern wiring. Could you please explain how this building is going to be so much more advanced?

John Prokos: we do have a technology consultant on the team, they have been meeting with the School Department to finalize that program, and it will have a sophisticated infrastructure to deal with wireless communication, computers throughout the building. There is a completely separate program for the technology of the building.

Ald. Weisbuch: We are just talking about hard costs. We are not talking about savings of soft costs.

John Prokos: These numbers are marked up to include inflation and that sort of thing. So there are some soft costs in these numbers.

Ald. Weisbuch: Has anyone reevaluated the estimate of \$3 million to tear down the old building and any savings that can be used from the old building. It just seems that was a number thrown out a long time ago but can money be saved in re-estimation of that cost.

Commissioner Parnell: We are going to recycle as much as possible of that building and we are going to review a lot of the (inaudible)

Ald. Weisbuch: Isn't \$3 million expensive to tear down a building.

Commissioner Parnell: No, not that building.

Ald. Burg: Is there is any discussion about not depressing the football field.

John Prokos: There has been a lot of discussion about that. If it should be depressed, how much it should be sunken into the ground and it is still our recommendation that we do sink it a bit. It helps us with the cut and till balance on the site. We need some of that soil to put underneath the building. It seems to be an economical approach to sink that a little bit and exactly how much we sink it is still under discussion.

Ald. Burg: Is it related to the geotechnical report?

John Prokos: Yes, it is related to that. Where it is right now, our civil engineer is confident that it works but we may want to raise it a little bit more out of the ground to just be certain that we don't have any problems with groundwater later.

Ald. Schnipper: One of the things that the Board had asked to be looked at and I know that it is an additional cost and right now, you are looking at reducing costs but the issue of some level of basement. Either for storage and I know that the School Committee feels that they have more storage built in all of the other floors than they have in the current building so that it might not be needed but the issue also, to where the mechanicals are going to be, whether they are going to be on the roof. Is there an advantage to having them in the basement in terms of extending their usable life and also less impact on the neighborhood if they are not visible? I don't know whether or not there has been discussion about some level of basement and I would like you to have that discussion even if you can't recommend that you come forward. That is one of the things we would like to know has been discussed.

John Prokos: We are budgeting approximately \$150 a square foot for basement space. There is plenty of room for it. We can build as big a basement as you would like under the academic part of the building but that does change the total project cost. For each square foot of basement we add, we have to find savings to offset that.

Ald. Salvucci: We are not talking about building anything in the basement. Put up the walls, pour the slab and get out of there. Is that \$150 a foot?

Arthur Cohen: You cannot do that. You have to sprinkler, you have to light it and you have to heat it.

Ald. Salvucci: I understand that you have to do all those things but as far as any other materials...

John Prokos: No elaborate finishes or anything. Just concrete slab, ceiling, no partitions.

Ald. Salvucci: Right, if they need it they can put it in later. I don't know how many Aldermen have discussed this with me already but I think it is important to dig that cellar under the academic portion of the school. If you don't dig it now, you can't dig it later.

Ald. Schnipper: One of the things that has been discussed amongst Aldermen in the past, it has not been my issue, but it has not been raised for those people for whom it is an issue, reducing the number of spectator seats at the multi-purpose field, as a potential for cost savings. Is that going to be discussed at some point in time?

John Prokos: That was an option considered early on. I don't believe it is on the list right now, to cut out half of the spectator seats or add them in the future but that is certainly easy to do. That is also something that could be an add alternate because whether you buy the seats or not is something you can decide at any point in the project.

Ald. Schnipper: I think that potentially on the list as opposed to some of the other things that seem to have been put on the list.

Arthur Cohen: You are talking about reducing the number of seats.

Ald. Schnipper: Yes, less stands

Arthur Cohen: Those are items that the Design Review Committee has asked to be evaluated along with the football and the justification for it not just on the basis of cutting and tilling and all the other things associated with it.

**THIS PORTION OF THE REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE ON TUESDAY EVENING.**

Ald. Schnipper: I don't want to be playing one team against the other here but is it possible for us to see a list of some of the things Design Review has asked to be looked at. Are they incorporated?

Arthur Cohen: We are not keeping our own list, we are just itemizing.

Ald. Schnipper: Are they being incorporated into this list?

Arthur Cohen: They are not on this list yet.

Ald. Albright: Maybe the Project Manager has that list.

Commissioner Parnell: There will be a list of everything that gets discussed. It goes through a process there is no one individual that is going to make a decision on this.

Ald. Schnipper: How will the decisions be made?

Commissioner Parnell: I think there is a consensus of the design team, you know, the best bang for the buck and still keeping the value of products and when we talk about the dry wall on Main Street. We are not going to put dry wall on Main Street. There are some things that are not going to be on the table and some things that are going on the table.

Arthur Cohen: As an example, it sounds like lets just add some basement but the basement space, lets say for arguments sake that the first floor of the area that might be basement space is 40,000 sq. ft., which I can't imagine that (inaudible) with that amount of square footage other than eventually have program creep into and you will have used all of the storage space. The building is quite large as it is that at \$100 a sq. ft. is \$4 million dollars, at a \$150 a sq. ft. is \$6 million.

Ald. Salvucci: Don't due the whole area.

Arthur Cohen: Yes, but some people will say do the whole basement. Those things have to be on the same value-engineering list and they are not minuses, they are pluses and that 2/3 of the items here that have been identified as potential savings wiped out with one decision. So, we have to be careful.

Ald. Mansfield: On the same tack, a few moments ago you talked about one of the reasons that it would be not desirable to not to sink the all-purpose field is because you can use the earth that is excavated there under the building. It is not because you have to raise the grade. Is it because you have to remove contaminated and unsuitable soil and replace it with better soil or is it simply because there is not a basement. If you built out the basement, would you need the fill from the field?

Commissioner Parnell: Probably not, because you would have the fill from that area.

John Prokos: We are reaching the building note to get it out of harms way. We do not want any potential for flooding, so we are raising the building in that part of the site a couple of feet above the existing grade. It is to get it high enough so that any storm water doesn't come across from Walnut and run into the main lobby of the building. We want to pause it and drain it away from the building.

Ald. Mansfield: But you can raise the building if you are excavating for a basement level by just raising the fill that much above the grade. If you don't have that excavation than you need the fill.

Ald. Sangiolo: I was also wondering if there is any consideration of reducing the number of 2,000' in the pool area

John Prokos: No

Ald. Sangiolo: Has there been any discussion about core classroom sizes, with the 780' or are you all set with the 780'. I know we are under the grandfather guidelines but I also know that the new state guidelines call for the 950'.

Ald. Schnipper: Not at the high school level.

Arthur Cohen: There has been no discussion. Those discussions have been going on between the School Department and the design team. It is program, they are deciding what the program requirement is, and once they decide that they are reviewing the designs to see how that program is going to (inaudible) they are not establishing the program.

Ald. Sangiolo: Lets say going forward for any kind of additional classroom spaces, ten years down the road, whatever it is, do you have to then go under the new regulations, whatever they are. Would you go under the new regulations?

John Prokos: If we were adding on to the building?

Ald. Sangiolo: Yes

John Prokos: I think that is definitely something we would have to look at in the future, depending on what was going on with the current regulations. We have allocated space on the site and

Ald. Sangiolo: Near the courtyard, right?

John Prokos: Yes, six classrooms on three levels.

Ald. Sangiolo: Six classrooms based on 780'?

John Prokos: Approximately, yes

Ald. Yates: Follow up, maybe from the School Department afterwards in writing on those things that I guess I never noticed before. How many people do you use the credit union? How much space has been added and where to accommodate it? How is the food transported from the central kitchen that I never realized existed and is there some back-up from the Athletic Department as to why the term simulated outdoor environment and performance gym are used because they just sound like silly jargon to me?

Ald. Schnipper: I wanted to at this point share with the Committee that as a result of the Board Order, which as we were writing it back over the summer and into the very early fall, one of things that was clear that remained an issue for many people, for parts of the community, certainly for Design Review etc..., was the traffic flow around the building. We clearly put in broad conditions to allow for a continuing study and I wanted to share with you that Ald. Baker and I have met with the design team and I don't use this word often, but instructed them to think outside the box, to look at alternatives and that we, the School Department and the Police Department and the Traffic Engineer, etc... A very broad group people would look at these newly generated things throw a lot of them out; take other ones that seem to warrant some level of discussion, etc... This has been an ongoing process. At a point in time, we invited the Ward Two Aldermen to join us to look at a few ideas, which had been generated with a very clear



statement that no decisions have been made but to see whether or not any of the things that had been generated met any of the concerns and warranted further study, etc... What you are going to see are three that are out there. I can't say this strongly enough, there have not been any decisions. These are just ideas that either you will like and want to possibly modify or see alteration on them or you will discard completely as "why would we ever consider that." If at some point, there is something that has a lot of support than we would be taking it to the next step, which would be sending it to Design Review to review and see what their feelings are about it and it would go through a process. The driving force in doing this was concern that many of us heard about potential congestion on Walnut, safety on Walnut, Walnut being such a heavily trafficked street, increasing the number of drop-offs around the site and one of the things that was clear, would have to be considered, was an alternate use to Elm, that was going to be the only way that we would potentially be able to look at altering the traffic pattern and also where the buses are going to be because if you remember the original plan that was before us much of Elm was taken up with the buses queuing up. John Prokos will share the slides. A few of us have seen these before but not in way in terms of decision-making.

John Prokos: This is looking at...The site plan itself has not changed it is how we use the various drop-off areas and pick up areas around the site. We began here by taking the yellow school buses and stacking them along Walnut much in the same way that they currently stack up here along Lowell. So the buses would come from the north heading south, they would pull into a drop-off lane. To do that you have to push the parking and play field closer to the high school and you need to create a separate strip to separate the bus drop-off from the automobile lane so when a bus stops and puts out its red stop sign, we don't stop all traffic on Walnut. All the buses can fit in this area. What that means is that the accessible vans would stay here at the north entry, Elm Street could stay opened up here. Now, parents could come in on Elm Street in the morning and drop off in this area, and then they would continue out. Probably right turn only when you come out of the site and you could loop back around or head south. The main ceremonial entry would remain in the afternoon for athletic buses, those are the red buses in here and for parent drop-off for the preschool only in the morning and visitors, there would be no other parent drop-off at the main entry. It would all happen on Elm or at the other areas around the site. We have two drop-off areas for parents here on Hull and a drop-off area on Lowell and the circulation intent is to spread the load out around the site, have multiple drop-off points for convenience and also to ease traffic around the site. As we reviewed this option with various stakeholders, including the Police Department, the city Traffic Engineer and our own traffic engineers, the concern was that it would exacerbate conflict in the ceremonial entrance area with buses pulling in and out of those areas and be somewhat problematic in that regard. This was an option, we looked at many, and I would like to walk you through a couple of others and then come back and talk about the pros and cons of each.

The second option was if they felt there were going to be conflicts at these locations on the site and conflict with traffic on Walnut was to bring the yellow school buses in the ceremonial entry. So they can all stack in this area in the morning. That keeps the accessible vans here and again keeps the parent drop-off on Elm and in these other locations around the site. We were concerned, though once we did this that when for a few brief times in the morning and the afternoon there is a lot of activity that is going to happen at this entry as those buses pull in and out and it creates a bit of a conflict with the athletic buses because there would be a point in the

early afternoon when the school buses are coming in and the athletic buses want to drop off and they don't all fit in this area. We have some athletic buses up in here on Hull Street and you have to use the stair down to the gym areas and that entry.

Ald. Baker: Is the entrance off of Walnut wider too?

John Prokos: Probably could stay a 24' drive with the buses going in and out there but if we had to stack this many buses right in this area it has to be widened. Not for in and out but just to stack buses.

Ald. Yates: Is this before they pick up? Is when they drop-off

John Prokos: When they are waiting to pick up in the afternoon. From that, we went to what would happen... You remember originally all the buses were stacked in this area, what would happen if we brought them down into the north entry because particularly in morning they don't all arrive at one time. The ones that are here could all fit inside the drop-off, so they could be stopped letting students off directly at the entry. Parents can still drop-off and move through without being effected by the buses with their stop sign out. We put the accessible buses in the ceremonial entry in here. They all fit nicely without widening the drive. The accessible buses are fewer and smaller than the school buses so we can still fit the athletic buses in here and keep the accessible vans in this area. This seemed to provide a pretty good compromise by getting more parents off of Walnut here for drop off up in this area. It provides a large area of drop-off for parents on Elm, it gets the school buses closer to the entry, which we felt was desirable, it gets the accessible vans very close to the main entry, which was also viewed to be something positive and still accommodates athletic buses with a slight change in the configuration of this drop off on Elm. There is really no net change in the landscape buffer for this because we take a little bit out of one area and add more in another area, so it is about the same amount of green space in that area of the site.

Ald. Lappin: The parent drop-off goes all the way through and where would they drop their kids off?

John Prokos: Yes and they drop their kids of here on Elm. Also, the buses typically come earlier than the parent's drop-off. The school buses are there at about 7:30 a.m. and I know when I drop my kids off, usually they are late, so you are coming right around 7:45 and by that time the buses are out of here. Once the buses are out of this area, the parents could pull in and drop-off.

Ald. Lappin: The problem that we were having with this before or what we were told was the problem before was that parents would drop their kids right in front and they would cross over where the buses were.

Ald. Schnipper: Can I just share some things that some of you may not have picked up. All three of these have a significant change in that Elm becomes a through street. One of the things in the original plan is that parents were entering off of Walnut and turning around. One of the issues there because of the special needs vans were right up where the door is, where you are seeing yellow now, so that the bigger buses had to stack all the way back along Elm almost to

Lowell. By separating the special needs vans, you are able to bring the buses much closer up but Elm is a through street.

Ald. Lappin: Right, but we were told before....

Ald. Schnipper: One-way with some parking however the width would be such that should at some point in the future there be a decision to eliminate the parking it could be two ways but it certainly would not start out that way.

Ald. Lappin: But we were told that the reason that parents could not go through there when the buses there was because they did not want the kids crossing the street in front of the buses. So even if it is one way and they are going past the buses wouldn't the parents stop right in front of the door and kids would still be walking in between the buses.

Ald. Schnipper: No, they won't be permitted to until the buses are out of there. The parents will have to drop-off a little bit further up and then take the outside loop, as opposed to the inside loop. I don't think that it would be wide enough for the parents' cars to fit through while the buses are stacked there.

John Prokos: No, that would be prohibited. The parents would not be allowed in there when the buses were there. The buses would have their stop signs out so the cars could not drive through there.

Ald. Albright: I think the key to making this work, Ald. Lappin, is that the buses are not dropping off at the Lowell end; they are dropping off in front, that is the key to making this plan work.

Ald. Gentile: Wasn't the one thing that the people on Elm Road were asking was that we not make this a through way all the time. Wasn't that their most overriding concern?

Ald. Schnipper: There is no question that...

Ald. Gentile: We were looking at reducing the width of Elm Road and increasing the buffer...

Ald. Schnipper: The buffer does get increased in this but you are absolutely right. I mean what you are looking at is the potential of a trade-off and this is why no decisions are going to be made. Should there be an interest in exploring this further, certainly, we would be hearing from the residents on Elm Road. To take some of the traffic off of Walnut, the only way that some of us could think of that happening was to have greater use of Elm.

Ald. Baker: Let me add just one other thing. I think part of the study...The Board Order requires a study of the traffic and circulation including Elm Road and including the buses in front. All this is doing is responding to that study request. So it is not a decision; it is just saying what has the design team in consultation with their other experts been able to imagine that could be an alternative. It may not be a preferable alternative to what we have. We voted in favor at least 16 of us in favor of the other design but it did include in the Board Order to ask

people to come back and look at these options, so this is partially to respond to that study request that the designers have given this and then if there is interest in this then it really does have to go to the Design Review Committee for further study and the neighbors have to be involved and people have to know about it so they can weigh in.

Ald. Mansfield: Could you elaborate, either you or Mr. Prokos, on the statement you just made, Madam Chair, about the fact that this also increases the buffer for Elm.

John Prokos: On Elm Street, you can see the middle where the green is shown, there would be a landscape buffer to separate the new Elm Street, which is actually pulled in to where the school parking lot is now. So there is a separate road in front of the homes in this area. See they can come in this way and there is a separate road that services these driveways in this area. There is a landscape buffer...a large area of landscaping on this corner to screen any of these homes to the school and new landscaping in this area also. There is a pretty substantial buffer in here and there is some new planting up in here for these homes.

Ald. Mansfield: That is different from what was in the site plan originally.

John Prokos: No, there was always landscaping in that area.

Ald. Mansfield: But there is more now?

John Prokos: No, I would not say that. The budget for landscaping is still the same but we have an area to accommodate that landscaping and at one point we were asked to study what would happen if we made this narrower in this area and we have not done that. This is still showing the width to allow the city the flexibility to decide to have parking on both sides and one way traffic or two-way traffic. So, you have some flexibility on how this street is used.

Ald. Mansfield: Is that parking on both sides that is factored into the required parking for the site?

John Prokos: It increases the parking for the site.

Ald. Mansfield: Over and above.

John Prokos: Yes, initially we proposed that during the day you not allow any parking here and only in the evening when there were special events going on in the gym or theater. So, that is a question the city has to decide. I think with this option you could keep parking in here during the day because now with the buses dropping off in here, there is less of a conflict between people parking and the buses but that is really a question for the city. There is a net gain of 67 spaces if we allowed parking in here during the day.

Ald. Gentile: Maybe I am missing something here but if the goal is to try and reduce the traffic on Walnut Street than for the life of me I can't understand why we would want to open up Elm Road more than what we had originally planned and encourage people to come from Lowell down Elm and go onto Walnut Street. I don't see the wisdom of doing that and secondly, I

continue to believe that people that are coming from the south that are coming to drop their kid off at school are going to take a left on Hull Street and they are going to drop them off at the entrance that is right there that we are talking about covering, so that they don't have to deal with the mess down here and they can go down Hull and take a left and head back to the south side of the city. I thought that is always what we had anticipated happening.

Ald. Schnipper: You have to remember that 70% of the kids are coming from the north. The original plan has people turning into Elm off of Walnut, turning around in that circle and coming back out onto Walnut, so you have twice the going in and the coming out and the potential for a real conflict point there. I am not saying this is better.

Ald. Gentile: I am just saying that I think it makes it worse for us to say, "Okay, we'll give you a straight shot through if you are on the Lowell Avenue side. I would think we would want to discourage people from having a straight shot all the way across onto Walnut because we are trying to...

Ald. Schnipper: as I said the designers focused on one thing, we were saying try to think outside the box, and see if there are alternatives. These three slides are alternatives. What I will try and get some sense of is whether or not people want to continue studying any of these anymore or are there other things that they could suggest. Remember the plan that we approved is the plan that is in place. It is only if there is significant interest in an alternative that we continue studying it and see whether or not it gets the support.

Ald. Weisbuch – As people talk to me about the site plan, their interest in voting against it is the lack of an entrance along Lowell. This suggestion of allowing entrance from Lowell is excellent. I would suggest however that people coming from Lowell and entering at Elm have the possibility of reversing direction and going back out to Lowell, at least on the first part of Elm Road.

Ald. Schnipper stated that the designers would look at that and come back.

Ald Gentile asked what is wrong with dropping students at Lowell and Elm. Walking from there is not a terrible thing.

Ald. Yates stated that this option C warrants further study. In response to Ald Gentile's concern, you would have to make Elm a right turn only. If you have the ability to go left, it will gum things up. In thinking outside the box, the real problem is that there are too many kids dropped off by their parents. We need to do everything we can to get the kids on the buses if it is too far for them to walk. We should drop the bus fees and get the kids in their without their parents dropping them off. We should encourage the environmental movement and make a contribution to the environmental quality of the city by using the buses and making the city a better place.

My concern with the green drop off is how far the kids are going to have to go. On bad weather days, it may be too far. They might beg their parents to drop them someplace else. You need to look very carefully at what you are asking the kids dropped off near the depressed stadium to do,

and are they going to do it? Is every kid going to have to go to the academic core to go to their homeroom everyday? Is that a little further than they are going to want to go?

Ald. Gentile noted that the kids may be going to almost anywhere in the building including the athletic area first thing in the morning.

Ald. Linsky stated that this shows two-sided parking because sometime it will be used at night. It certainly should maintain the flexibility to loop back through all the way to Lowell. If you have North bound traffic, it would aid them turning back out.

Ald. Samuelson commended the plan as it makes the most sense of any that she has seen. It cuts the number of trips on Walnut by 50%. If the majority of the traffic is coming from the North side, it won't have to go through Newtonville square. I think it is perfectly appropriate to have the kids on the buses being dropped at the door and the parents dropping in other places. She applauds the design.

Ald. Hess-Mahan stated that he agreed with Ald. Samuelson. He asked about the Ceremonial Entrance and whether the designers thought about right turn in and out of that entrance.

John Prokos stated that with the light there for pedestrian safety, the light would facilitate left turns in and out, if the city wanted left turns in that area.

Ald. Hess Mahan asked how you get into the parking lot by the theater.

John Prokos stated that if we want to be consistent and have that one-way off Lowell you would have to come in off Lowell. That lot gets filled by the teachers before the kids arrive. We debated if we should have the lower part of Elm still be two way and we thought it would simplify everything if we had everyone come in off Lowell. The intent was to try and get cars off of Walnut.

Ald. Burg agreed with Ald. Samuelson's statements and would like to see this explored further.

Ald. Schnipper asked if there was any interest in the other two.

Ald. Salvucci stated that option C was not a bad plan because you have to have some entrance from Lowell. He wanted to know what was the conflict with the one in the front.

Ald. Schnipper stated that the safety people did not like the buses lined up there at the entrance from Elm. When the cars and buses are trying to get out there may be a stream of buses trying to get out at the intersection.

Clint Schuckel stated that putting the bus drop off that far from the building is as much of a wrong as the safety concerns up at Elm. Thinking about what we want to encourage the kids to do we don't want to leave the airport-style pick up and drop off at the front door, it sends the wrong message. Don't push the bus away from the school. You have to look at four things with any of these plans. 1. Give the buses a better or equal service as the car. 2. Use all four sides

of the site as best you can. 3. Do what you can to separate the bus and vehicle traffic. 4. Try to relieve traffic on Walnut Street, which we tried to do by using Elm Road for that purpose.

Option C is the closest to this line of thinking. From a citywide perspective, it may be useful to look at the use of Elm Road for general pick up from Walnut to Lowell. In terms of car capacity, getting people out onto a main street is harder than getting them in. If 70% are coming from the North, then it creates a right turn into Elm and a right turn out to Lowell. One problem with this is that the kids will cross where the buses are coming through, but the option is heading in the right direction.

Ald. Baker stated that if the cars come down Elm then there will need to be some calming measures built into the roadway so that it is not high speed. Second, when the buses exit the site they may have to go left onto Walnut in order to get to their next run.

It is also important to maintain the light at Trowbridge and he understands that it can be actuated as needed, but it is important to maintain the left turns in and out to facilitate athletic activities at different times. You must have some flexibility. There is also the ability to have a warning light up the hill to signal that the light is red. The design of the entrance is only two lanes so there is no left turn lane built into it. Because of this redesign, the nearest neighbor gains a little distance from the paved area.

Ald. Baker also stated that Mr. Prokos had indicated that there is landscaping but he was sure that we could find some more room for landscaping to protect the Elm Road abutters.

Ald. Mansfield stated that Clint's four goals are all important and supportable and Option C meets all the goals that Clint has mentioned. He offered a fifth goal: to discourage airport style drop offs. If we want to add an Elm Road as depicted there, we have to do something to discourage the parent who wants to drop off as close to the door as possible. We need to discourage people from dropping off in the ceremonial entrance. He would also like to see that those that enter from Lowell have the option of exiting at Lowell.

Commissioner Rooney stated that the lane created in the Salvucci option would only be used for 15 minutes a day when the buses are dropping off. He felt that this was not the best use of the infrastructure compared to the other options. It would also place the fields and parking lot closer to the building. The site infrastructure will not have to change with Option C.

Ald. Sangiolo agreed with Ald. Mansfield about the turn around and to eliminate parking and would like that looked at further. She agreed with Ald. Gentile that once you get the cars off Lowell it doesn't make sense to put them on Walnut. She also asked if the police detail was still needed in the morning.

John Prokos stated that the police have said that right now they do not anticipate having a detail under any of the options.

Ald Schnipper stated that they were hearing from the police that they were not interested in having it, but that they did not need it on this one.

Ald. Yates stated that if the traffic has to enter from Lowell, half of the traffic will have to cut across traffic and a detail will be needed.

Ald. Schnipper stated that if there was interest the police could respond to this. We did have police representation at some of these meetings and they did not have a problem with this, which is one of the reasons that we brought this forward.

Ald. Sangiolo stated that if we go with this option, who is going to use the ceremonial entrance other than the handicap? Is it just for Preschool?

John Prokos responded that it would be the preschool.

Ald. Lappin stated that when we first saw this site plan, one of the issues that was raised was whether we could do a turn around like what we have at Newton North now and we were told that it could not be done, so I am a little surprised that we can now do it.

Dori Zaleznick stated that when we first looked at cars coming in to Elm we were trying to keep cars and buses from coming in together. What has allowed this plan to move forward is the appreciation that the buses are gone by the time that most parents are arriving to drop off their kids. We will still not be intermingling buses and kids

Ald. Samuelson asked if the buses could have something to trigger the light when they are coming out onto Walnut.

Clint Schuckel responded that it was a possibility.

Ald. Samuelson asked if the entrance were from Lowell, why is the landscaping on the field side of the street not on the house side.

John Prokos responded that it was private property on the house side.

Ald. Samuelson asked if the road could be shifted to put landscaping on the house side.

John Prokos responded that because of the fields it was only wide enough for about a sidewalk on the field side.

Ald. Samuelson would still like to see some of the buffer on the other side.

Ald. Fischman supports option C, but asked for clarification if the ceremonial was limited to sports and early childhood drop-off.

Ald Schnipper asked for thoughts and comments.

Ald. Albright stated that she had spoken with individuals from the Brookline and Newton Chestnut Hill Neighborhood Association who were working on the traffic issues at the Brimmer and May School and that they had a wonderful three years of long-term relationship of working



out traffic problems. Ald. Albright stated that this was a wonderful model and it was the model that she was trying to put forward here. Where there is a group of concerned people from the neighborhood, the Aldermen, the schools, the school committee. All of the concerned stakeholders getting together to work together and make recommendations on traffic patterns and access. They would make their recommendations to the School Committee or the Aldermen depending on the issue. The Ward 2 Aldermen would like access to the Ceremonial Drive restricted as much as possible allowing only handicap parking, vans, and handicap access. However, it would be up to this liaison committee to make recommendations to the interested parties as to how to use the site and how to make recommendations as to traffic flow. This type of committee could be involved in conversations like we have had tonight as it moved forward and looks at the options.

Ald Lappin stated that some of the elementary schools have traffic councils. Does Newton North have one of these? Committee members responded that they were only at the elementary level.

Ald. Albright stated that they tried this idea out on the school committee to see if it would be useful to them. We had some positive reactions.

Dori Zaleznick stated that this sort of idea would allow people a place to go if there were concerns that arose during construction or if there is a problem after the school was open. As long as it was a balanced group of people who were trying to reach consensus, the school committee felt that it would be a positive way of handling issues that might arise.

Ald Gentile asked once the liaison committee gets up and running you don't limit it to issues of parking but should also include litter, kids congregating, you will have other things. We did this at Lasell. The premise behind it is that you address small problems before they become big problems.

Ald. Baker – The concept is a good idea and is used in a variety of places. Ald. Baker presented a list of the various liaison committees have been used. The committees have different functions and roles and one of the challenges here is to get it thought out in a way to have the right kinds of decisions to emerge. He thought that the operational questions and construction issues could be undertaken. We should form a subcommittee with the Ward 2 Aldermen to work this out and come back to the Public Facilities Committee with a plan that responds to these various concerns. Ultimately, we have to make sure that this succeeds as a school.

Ald. Johnson stated that when she spoke with Dori Zaleznick of the School Committee a few days ago she mentioned the items that Ald. Gentile had brought up tonight. There are a number of issues that are a problem today, including litter and athletic busses where they are not supposed to be, that can be addressed now. She would like to see this group formed sooner rather than later to address issues now, as well as during construction and beyond.

She would like to get this group involved in how traffic flow is going and to have a real dialogue between key stakeholders who can come back to this committee with solid recommendations.

The Ward 2 Aldermen would like to start the conversations with this group around the ceremonial entrance.

Ald. Vance commented on Ald. Gentile's comment regarding the scope of this group, he wants to work out how this group relates to the school council and how they work together. These groups should not stumble over one another. With clarification, the two groups could work together. He cautioned that people may still say that they have not been heard because the recommendations that the group puts forward may not do what they want.

Ald. Berg: One of the best ways to deal with issues is open communication. It does not mean that everyone will agree or that we will adopt what people want.

Ald. Schnipper suggested that she, the vice-chair, and the Ward 2 aldermen meet to discuss and refine some of the ideas.

Ald. Yates suggested that an item be docketed.

Ald. Baker stated that there is a continuing item that would cover this and suggested that the subcommittee decide how this should be done.

Ald. Schnipper stated that the charge to this group is important. This group will be advisory and will not be making the decisions. The decisions will be made by people in other roles. We should talk about composition and not delineate what they can talk about.

Ald. Mansfield suggested that the subcommittee look at the guidelines that have been developed for other committees of this type. Some have gone beyond the construction issues to operational issues. The structures of those committees have been given a lot of thought.

Ald. Schnipper recognized Jane Frantz who stated that a neighborhood group had been meeting with Jennifer Price at the High School and has been talking with her about parking issues and other incidents around the High School.

Ald Yates moved HOLD on the two items.

Vote was 8-0

Respectfully submitted,

Sydra Schnipper, Chairman