

## Riley, Kate

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2019 4:09 PM  
**To:** Riley, Kate  
**Subject:** Fwd: Tobin School renovation

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** citymanager <citymanager@cambridgema.gov>; citycouncil <citycouncil@cambridgema.gov>  
**Sent:** Mon, Dec 2, 2019 4:21 pm  
**Subject:** Tobin School renovation

**To:** City of Cambridge  
**Re:** Tobin School renovation

Dear City Council members-

I have been a homeowner in Cambridge since 1995. Our two children went through the public schools here, participated in city sports, our older son had summer jobs working for the City, and we have been involved in various city projects. Suffice to say, we are truly invested in Cambridge, and intend to reside here for years to come.

We live on Alpine St, which abuts the Tobin School. I have no doubt whatsoever that the physical plant needs improvement, if not total replacement. What I don't understand is the process—at least as I've seen it so far, which has me confused, frustrated, and even a bit alienated. While I'm sure I have not read every word of the City's notices on the topic of re-habbing Tobin, I've asked other neighbors (including some who have been paying close attention) and haven't gotten the answers to (in no particular order):

- 1-What are the assumptions/presuppositions on which the Tobin's student population doubles? I know the numbers, I am asking for the suppositions behind those numbers
- 2-Related, how do those suppositions connect with the Innovation Agenda, a huge process that many of us participated in, which adopted certain principles and goals related to school population and organization?
- 3-In the 3 options presented, it seems like the City is treating the entirety of the school's property and the fields up to Concord Ave as the exclusive campus of Tobin, but is that accurate?
- 4-who are technically abutters, and what role do they have in the process?

The city presented 3 options a couple of weeks ago, but I don't know who to evaluate them without having these questions answered first. In addition, the short timeline given to us to review seems too hasty.

Overall, given the quarter of a billion dollar expense and five year timeline proposed, for those of us nearby as well as other Cambridge residents, the 'rollout' leaves much to be desired.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Domenitz  
[REDACTED]