

CABOT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE (CSBC) + DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) JOINT MEETING				MEETING MINUTES	
Newton Education Center, Room 210					
October 16, 2014					
6:00PM					
ATTENDEES:					
NAME	ASSOC.	PRESENT	NAME	ASSOC.	PRESENT
Margaret Albright	SC	Y	Peter Barrer	BOA	---
Susan Albright	BOA	N	Arthur Cohen	DRC	---
Arthur Cohen	DRC	Y	William Eldredge	DRC	---
Mary Lou DiBella	CSBC	Y	Robert A. Franchi	BOA	---
Diana Fisher Gomberg	CSC	Y	Tom Gloria	DRC	Y
David Fleishman	CSBC	---	James Freas	DRC	---
Ruthanne Fuller	BOA	Y	Jonathan Kantar	DRC	Y
Sandra Guryan	NPS	Y	Andrea Kelley	DRC	---
Matt Hills	CSBC	---	Ellen S. Light	DRC	Y
Maureen Lemieux	CSBC	---	Marc Resnic	DRC	---
Joshua Morse	NPB	Y	Scott Ross	DRC	---
Emily Norton	BOA	---	Steven Siegel	DRC	---
Cynthia Paris Jeffries	CSBC	---	Eve Tapper	BOA	---
Angela Pitter-Wright	CSBC	Y	Carol Chaftez	NPS	Y
Nicholas Read	CSBC	---	Jonathan Yeo	NPS	---
John Rice	BOA	---	Jeffery Luxenberg	JLA	Y
Andrea Steenstrup	CSBC	Y	Tom Murphy	JLA	Y
Alex Valcarce	NPB	Y	Kiersten Mailler	JLA	Y
Setti Warren	Mayor	---	Ken DiNisco	DDP	---
Karen Wasserman	CSBC	---	Donna DiNisco	DDP	Y
Dori Zalenik	CSBC	---	Leno Filippi	DDP	---
Michael Cronin	NPS	Y			
Ouida Young	ACS	Y			

Newton Public Schools called the meeting to order at 6:05PM.

1. Introductions

- a. Newton Public Schools (NPS) began the meeting with introductions; roles within Joslin Lesser Associates and greeting of DiNisco Design Partnership
- b. NPS noted that they are open to hearing other thoughts about outreach to the community and expresses need for careful submissions to the Board of Aldermen (BOA), and opportunity for public forums. Desire was expressed to make it easy for

the public to understand the project and to provide transparency. NPS requested that JLA provides a communication plan.

2. JLA Introduces Organizational Chart

- a. The Working Group (WG) is likely to meet one Thursday each month. JLA presented an organization chart for the project and noted that the proposed was to establish a WG that is a subcommittee of the School Building Committee (SBC). The Design Review Committee (DRC) will meet jointly with the SBC but the DRC has specific technical tasks and will sometimes meet separately with the design team. School Committee and Board of Aldermen will sometimes meet jointly and sometimes meet separately. There will be user group meetings related to specific elements for technical design aspects.
- b. Concerns and responses
 - i. A member of the BOA raised a concern regarding the effectiveness of the WG on this project. It was noted that by making the WG public would undermine its quality and effectiveness as a place to speak freely during the early phases of the design process. It was expressed that the Angier process was a true collaboration, and there is a concern about the size of the Cabot working group allowing for that kind of discussion in addition to being required public meetings
 - ii. JLA noted that they have attempted to get each board to designate one member for the WG to avoid the potential quorum issue and have not been successful in doing so.
 - iii. A member of the BOA suggested that the SBC representatives of those groups meet with their committees in an effort to designate an individual member.
 - iv. The Law Department commented that a WG must have no more than seven (7) voting members of the CSBC to avoid a quorum. If a quorum of members is present the meetings must comply with open meeting law standards and this was considered a priority.

3. Schedule

- a. JLA presented to the SBC and DRC an overall project schedule with particular attention to the Feasibility Study phase. The milestones and submissions to the MSBA were outlined showing the submission of the final report to the MSBA in February 2015. There was some concern from the BOA about the tight timeline.
- b. The next steps for the design team will be to meet with the WG and the SBC and the DRC to develop the components that will be included in the first report. Some of the design parameters have already been established, such as the student enrolment number which NPS noted is set by the MSBA. Additional parameters and guidelines will be established during the design process through design tools including the criteria evaluation matrix.
- c. JLA outlined next steps: 1. Create Criteria Evaluation Matrix, 2. Review with Working Group, 3. Review with DRC, 4. Review with School Building Committee.
- d. A member of the BOA raised concern about timing and whether three months is sufficient for the Feasibility Study phase. JLA explained flexibility of the schedule: Much of the program is already defined and some of the work can occur concurrent with the MSBA preliminary review. DRC requested more time is spent upfront on Newton's specific design needs, in addition to the MSBA's required documents. Concerns were

raised about this critical time in the process. It was noted that the schedule can be adjusted and the one that was distributed during the meeting is to serve as a roadmap.

4. Explanation and Vote for CM-At-Risk v. Design-Bid-Build

- a. JLA presented advantages and disadvantages of the CM-At-Risk and Design-Bid-Build construction delivery methods. The BOA inquired whether this item needs to go before the Finance Committee and whether enrollment had been shared with the Committee. It was noted that the enrolment was provided to the BOA as it was previously included in the SOI. Although it was agreed that the enrolment numbers should be redistributed to the BOA, a formal presentation to the Finance Committee is not required.
- b. **MOTION:** D. Fisher Gomberg moved, seconded by M. DiBella that the Committees vote to approve C-M-at-Risk process. **Votes were unanimous.**

5. Design Criteria Evaluation Matrix

- a. JLA presented a matrix template and explained the process. JLA requested feedback from Committee members and the public. It was noted that some design elements could not be adequately captured in a matrix and that the matrix is only used to determine benefits and feasibility of three options in order to guide decisions: Addition/renovation, Complete Rebuild, or a New Site. Some suggestions included: Reconsideration of wording (optimizes v. improves), consider park space and its relation to the site, security, historical preservation, lifecycle costs, existing conditions, design context and circulation. JLA asked that additional suggestions from members be forwarded to Tom Murphy of JLA at tmurphy@joslinlesser.com.

6. Upcoming Meetings

- 11/13/14 Working Group Meeting 9:00AM Ed Center, Room 210 (*To be confirmed*)

7. No Public Comments, Meeting Adjournment

7:50PM

Respectfully submitted,

Kiersten Mailler
Joslin, Lesser + Associates, Inc.

[End of 10/16/14 Meeting Minutes]