

Date Prepared: June 29, 2012

Project Name: Martin Luther King Jr. School

Project Number: 47930.00.0

Subject: Community Meeting #3

Meeting Location: Martin Luther King, Jr. School Auditorium

Meeting Date: June 21, 2012

Prepared By: Alicia Caritano

Contact Information: T. 617.449.4000 F. E. a.caritano@perkinseastman.com>

Participants

- Richard C. Rossi - Deputy City Manager
- Michael Black - Construction Project Manager
- Jim Maloney - CPSD Chief Operating Officer
- Dr. Jeff Young - Superintendent
- Dr. Carolyn Turk - CPSD Deputy Superintendent
- Fred Fantini - School Committee
- Marc McGovern - School Committee
- Gerald Yung - Martin Luther King Jr. School - Principal
- Mirko Chardin - Martin Luther King Jr. School - Principal Upper School
- Brendon Roy - Assistant Project Manager
- John Pears - Perkins Eastman
- Jana Silsby - Perkins Eastman
- Mark Boyes Watson - Boyes Watson Architects
- Community Members

New Business	Notes	Action by
1.01	<u>Goals for Meeting:</u> Rich Rossi, as Deputy City Manager, thanked attendees and outlined Community Meetings to date – this was third.	Record
1.02	<u>PE presented:</u> - FS process Recap - Selection of Preferred Option is new construction (Pi Option) - 3D computer model analysis of why not re-use existing building: • Program as per Ed Spec does not fit • Seismic issue require extensive demolition - Table showing issues/concerns raised in prior public meetings: • Column showing issues/concerns accommodated in current FS (Feasibility Study) phase • Column showing issues/concerns to be accommodated in SD (Schematic Design) and later phases - Matrix comparing features of 3 design options: • Existing Modified • Clover	Record

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Date: June 29, 2012
Project Name: Martin Luther King Jr. School
Project Number: 47930.00.0
Meeting Date: June 21, 2012

Page 2 of 5

- Pi
- Scoring matrix comparing 3 design options (Existing Modified 28; Clover 38; Pi 46):
 - Cost
 - Sustainability
 - Net zero
 - Open space
 - Parking
 - Schedule
 - Urban design and zoning
 - Pedagogy and Organizational Principals
- Preferred Option presented:
 - Site plan compared to existing building
 - Enlarged site plan described the following features:
 - o Lower School, Upper School, Preschool, Community spaces
 - o Drop-off and pick-up for busses and parents
 - o Location of entrances
 - o Parking
 - o Outdoor spaces
 - Ground Floor Plan showing re-use of existing basement for very economical underground parking
 - 3D computer massing models comparing Preferred Option to Existing Building – multiple views from all public streets, both high (bird's eye) and low (street eye-level)
 - Sections comparing height of Preferred Option to Existing Building
 - Table ranking Sustainable Opportunities of 3 Options - Preferred Option (Pi) highest score by small margin
- Next Steps:
 - FS Report being prepared which will recommend Pi as Preferred Option
 - City of Cambridge Project Website up and running
 - o 4/5/12 & 5/10/12 Community Meeting Presentations and Meeting Records posted
 - Brief discussion about approvals:
 - o Preferred Option must still be designed during Schematic Design
 - o Additional neighborhood meetings during Schematic Design
 - o Special Permit through Planning Board
 - Brief discussion about Schedule:
 - o FS study report due end of July 2012
 - o Schematic Design starts in August 2012
 - o Design/documentation process will last 13 months till September 2013
 - o Submission to Planning Board expected January 2013

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Date: June 29, 2012
 Project Name: Martin Luther King Jr. School
 Project Number: 47930.00.0
 Meeting Date: June 21, 2012

Page 3 of 5

	o Construction anticipated to be completed by August 2015	
1.03	Comments from Members of the public:	Record
	1) Why not re-use existing building "as-is", with deep energy retro-fit? As per MIT engineers, this building can be re-used as a school (no-change of-use to trigger seismic upgrade). a) Program for new schools do not fit in existing building and natural light is inadequate which requires changes and additions in excess of 30% work area which triggers seismic upgrades per the Massachusetts Building Code (CMR 8 th Edition) that adopts the International Existing Building Code (IEBC) with MA Amendments in lieu of the old Chapter 34 provisions for treatment of existing buildings.	
	2) Statement that analysis will always lead to requirement for new building. a) Response that current other Perkins Eastman school project Forest Park MS in Springfield, MA underwent same process of analysis that lead to retention of multiple joined buildings because program fit within existing envelope and classrooms were right sized.	
	3) Want to understand the "nature" of the parking shown on Kinnaird? a) Only 20 spaces on-grade, mostly internal to site, Rossi will set up separate mtg with neighbors to discuss parking in detail during SD.	
	4) Massing on Magee – how high is it? a) 3 stories and approximately 45ft.	
	5) How many play areas are there in the new design? a) Intend basketball court, 2 playground areas (swings plus equipment), recreation field, plus enclosed preschool play area, similar to existing, will be designed properly by landscape architect in Schematic Design phase.	
	6) Want "virtual" drawings (and a physical model) to see how project will look from all angles. a) 3D computer model views were shown in presentation, but of massing only as project has not yet been designed – will occur in Schematic Design phase.	
	7) How high is the building in relation to Hayes Street? a) 3-stories in "middle", 2-stories at both sides.	
	8) What provisions have been made for artwork relocation to new building? a) Design team will work with City and Art Council in Schematic Design phase to determine best overall solution for new and re-use of art.	
	9) What changes are proposed to the pattern of traffic on abutting streets? a) No changes to the exiting traffic patterns are currently envisaged, but more detailed analysis will be done in Schematic Design phase.	
	10) Is it predetermined that demolition of the existing school building will occur? Followed by statement that "if so, it should be reconsidered" a) The Preferred Option calls for demolition of the majority of the existing building and retention approximately 20,000gsf of the	

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Date: June 29, 2012
 Project Name: Martin Luther King Jr. School
 Project Number: 47930.00.0
 Meeting Date: June 21, 2012

Page 4 of 5

	ground floor to be used for underground parking.	
	11) Statement was made by international preservation group that the existing building should be retained and preserved as an example of the body of work of renowned modernist architect J.L Sert, who also designed Peabody Terrace across Putnam Avenue.	
	12) Retiring staff member with 35-years of service to the MLK Jr. School made statement that the building "always had problems from the start", "the kids deserve better", and "to have a school that functions properly and is not as a museum".	
	13) With the two main entrances to the Upper and Lower Schools planned on Putnam Avenue, are any entrances going to be close to the bus/parent drop-off on Magee and/or Kinnaird? a) The Preferred Option shows entrances on Magee and Kinnaird Streets with an internal, enclosed, glass-roofed "main street" linking them to each other and to both Lower and Upper Schools, Community functions and the Pre-school.	
	14) Statement made that the proposed energy reduction measures and Net Zero Energy goals were admirable, but that an analysis of the Embodied Energy lost by demolition of the existing building should be weighed against the Energy Savings afforded by a new better oriented and designed building over life expectancy of the new building to determine the "overall" energy picture for the building.	
	15) Statement made that "function should come first", and that the students should not become "slaves to history".	
	16) Statement made that "a strong community must come first".	
	17) Statement made requesting "respect for the school and the community center nature of the building".	
	18) Statement made that "Innovation Agenda program must fit into the building".	
	19) Statement made that J.L.Sert was "not infallible, and this was one of the worst and ugliest of his buildings".	
	20) Statement made to "go for brilliant – do not settle for a compromised building".	
	21) Statement made by neighbor "I have attended all 3 public meetings and the design team has listened to our comments, shown consideration and responded to community concerns – this is much appreciated".	
	22) Statement made that key is "integration of school and community" and "aim for best practice and best outcome".	
	23) Statement that John Pears was dishonest as he had promised that he would provide a full energy analysis including Embodied Energy and that City was withholding information	

Next Meeting:

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Date: June 29, 2012
Project Name: Martin Luther King Jr. School
Project Number: 47930.00.0
Meeting Date: June 21, 2012

Page 5 of 5

City to provide Next Meeting date.

cc: City / CPSD / Community Members via Michael Black
John Pears, Jana Silsby, Sean O'Donnell, Erik Dalen – Perkins Eastman
Mark Boyes-Watson– Boyes-Watson Architects
Consultant Team

Attachments: None

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.