

**School Building Committee Coordination Meeting**  
**Monday, February 12, 2024, from 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.**  
**Remote Meeting**

School Building Committee Members: Andrew Baker (absent); Mark Barrett; Michael Cronin, Vice-Chair; Charles Favazzo Jr.; Julie Hackett; Jonathan A. Himmel; Carolyn Kosnoff; Charles W. Lamb (absent); Kathleen M. Lenihan, Chair; Alan Mayer Levine; James Malloy; Hsing Min Sha (absent); Joseph N. Pato; Kseniya Slavsky; Dan Voss

Members from Dore & Whittier: Jason Boone (absent); Steve Brown (absent); Mike Burton; Mike Cox (absent); Chrsitina Dell Angelo; Erica Downs, Brad Dore (absent); Elias Grijalva; Rachel Rincon; Chris Schaffner (absent)

Members from SMMA: Brian Black (absent); Martine Dion (absent); Lorraine Finnegan; Anthony Jimenez (absent); Anoush Krafian (absent); Rosemary Park (absent); Erin Prestileo (absent); and Matt Rice

The minutes were taken by Sara Jorge, Office Manager, to the Lexington Superintendent.

The School Building Committee Chair, Kathleen Lenihan, began the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Mike Burton reviewed module 3, the feasibility phase. We are working on the preliminary design program (PDP), which will be submitted to the MSBA at the end of May 2024. This document is typically 1,000 plus pages and looks primarily at the existing conditions, which will be looked at today. It also includes the educational program and the space summary, which is what we think the overall size of the building will be, along with conceptual cost estimates that will be used to compare the options.

Julie Hackett introduced one of the Student-School Building Committee (S-SBC) members, Nitsa Argarwal, to give an update from the last S-SBC meeting. At the last S-SBC meeting, members reviewed the Owners' Project Managers' (OPM) job. We were split into groups to discuss what we had learned, and Dr. Hackett answered some of our questions. The plan is to match students from the S-SBC to members of the OPM team and the SMMA Design Team based on their areas of interest so that they can learn and explore in person.

Julie Hackett updated the team on a possible trip that is in the works to see Academies of Loudon, which is right outside Washington, D.C. We are looking to take a small group of School Building Committee members, students, community members, educators, etc. This school has a lot of interdisciplinary work happening, which is part of the work we've been doing regarding the Ed Plan and thinking about the future of Lexington High School, so that's interesting. They also have a one-hour lunch period, which isn't what it sounds like. We'd all love a one-hour lunch period, but they integrate it with the social-emotional side of things, clubs, activities — we have I block, which kids appreciate. Tentatively, the trip is scheduled for an early flight on Thursday, March 7th, and a return the next morning. We plan to speak to the architects of the school and talk to students who attend the school, along with staff and community members.

Alan Levine offered to meet with the Student-School Building Committee to give an update on the project.

Erica Downs: The issue is that the energy credits are upgrading, so if we register before the end of February, we'll be locked in under the current thresholds. If we wait until after that, we will be bumped into those new thresholds. You'd see a much better outcome for the same energy performance than if you wait till even March 1 to register, so we're pushing projects to get locked in now. Any information that we use for registration can be edited later, except the zip code.

Mike Burton explained that the School Building Committee does not need to vote on LEED registration and that it was an update to keep everyone informed.

APPROVED

Lorraine Finnegan explained that she has not received many comments or edits on the LHS draft existing conditions report, except from Alan Levine. Does reading through this document and submitting comments and edits by Thursday, February 15th, give everyone enough time to do so? This is in case you notice something we missed, like part of a renovation or something that was proposed and never pushed forward. It's important to read the report because as you're asked about the need for a new building or renovation, you can talk with a sense of understanding of the systems and what those structures are like. We will ask the School Building Committee to approve the existing conditions report on February 26th.

Julie Hackett mentioned that she is meeting with the LHS Department Heads on Friday and will also ask for their input on the existing conditions report.

Lorraine Finnegan explained that they met with the MSBA last Thursday to go over how to see and receive the space summary regarding the PDP. During that call, we discussed the desire for a standalone fieldhouse and potentially a stand-alone pool. We will have several space summaries that get reviewed and submitted. MSBA would like us to generate a baseline, which is just the school with no additional field house, no additional Central Office, and no additional pool. This is so that when they compare, they can understand what the school needs first. They also asked for a new construction scenario that would include demolishing and renovating the existing field house if this building committee desires to do it because they do not participate in field houses. A new construction scenario for a field house would need to be a separate contract, with separate plans and utilities completely outside the scope of an MSBA project. It was clear that the construction of the new school building would need to take priority over anything else. It does not necessarily mean they cannot be concurrent, but the high school must be ready first, and we need to demonstrate how so. It can't be the pool coming online before the high school; they want to see the priority on the high school. A pool would be similar to the field house; would need to be completely separate, not bundled as part of the same bid package. We discussed renovating the existing fieldhouse and what renovating means, like saving the slab and making it bigger during the renovation. MSBA said we'd need to show comparative costs, advantages, and disadvantages. They want to ensure that it wouldn't inhibit the proposed design and the final preferred project, as they will always focus on the high school building first. MSBA did agree that with this population, we'd be looking at an 18,000-square-foot gym, so that is something that we'll be putting into space summary as we move forward. They did acknowledge Central Office as well, and many communities do build those offices into their projects but again asked us to create that baseline so that both the MSBA and the Town understand the difference between what's necessary for the high school building and then what might be necessary for the Town as a separate entity.

Mike Burton: It sounded like if we could prove the need for the Central Offices, the MSBA would go along with it; it would not be reimbursable space. The MSBA acknowledged that part of planning is the building, its location, and potential locations for a field house and a pool, and those could remain studied through schematic design. If you have these large structures on site, we need to at least plan for them to understand where they will be from a site and building perspective. For the pool and Field House, there must be a clear need and display of community support for both items.

Jim Malloy: Are the space summaries going to be segregated by the items necessary for replacing the existing school at the size it needs to be? Then, a host of these other projects, such as the pool, field house, or other amenities? There would be two lists, a need-to-have versus want-to-have for the community. Do I understand this correctly?

Lorraine Finnegan: Yes, the MSBA asked us to create two space summaries. One is just the high school programs. So that would not include central office, that would not include a pool. The Fieldhouse makes it a little tricky because the fieldhouse exists today. They don't want that on the school's proper version if it was a standalone fieldhouse. They want to ensure the Town understands this is what we need for the school and what we need when we add on other pieces.

Joe Pato: I heard you say that the utilities would have to be separated for each project, so how does that all  
APPROVED

factor in?

Lorraine Finnegan: MSBA said that the utilities have to be completely separate from the building, which includes water, sewer, and drainage.

Dan Voss asked if we want a pool and fieldhouse, which would be separate projects. Would D&W and the SMMA Design Team continue to participate in the design and oversight of both projects?

Lorraine Finnegan: Yes, that is what we're doing with another community, but they understand that for planning purposes, we need to plan all of them through the study phase. Then, if it continues through Town Meeting and the Town supports the school and the other spaces, you just need separate contracts.

Chuck Favazzo asked if the 18,000-square-foot gymnasium covers only the activities we currently use the gym for or both the gym and the fieldhouse.

Lorraine Finnegan: When you enter the approved population of 2395 students into the MSBA space summary spreadsheet, it auto-calculates the gymnasium size. It auto calculates at 12,000 square feet. However, the MSBA knows that their formula doesn't have the right size when you get above a certain population, so 18,000, which is three full cross courts, is what they allow for the student population, and that does not include alternative PE spaces like fitness and aerobics or a multipurpose room. We analyzed the master curriculum and the schedule, so we've come up with what we've determined to be the number of stations required. An 18,000-square-foot gym would give you three cross-courts, so you need those other spaces. You need the fitness room, a multipurpose room; you've carved away space under the bleachers in the Fieldhouse, which is your weight room. So, we must determine how many spaces and stations will be provided for physical education. MSBA does not care about athletics. They care about physical education and will tell you they are not in the business of funding or granting any money towards athletics. So, we must demonstrate physical education needs during the school day. With a renovated Field House, where we would assume that they would still allow an 18,000 square-foot gym, they will tell us whether or not they will accept that. Still, we need to demonstrate to them the need, which we do through the analysis of your master schedule and your enrollment.

Julie Hackett clarified that the Central Offices would be an add-on tab, not part of the baseline.

Lorraine Finnegan: Correct, that is not part of the baseline. MSBA did say that Central Office is something that they have accepted in other communities and to expect that.

Julie Hackett: At what point does this group talk about these options? We have had some conversations happening through focus groups about these options. Still, I'm curious about the School Building Committee and getting a sense of people's feelings about the school field house.

Mike Burton: Based on the information we got from MSBA on Thursday, we needed to pivot a little bit, but we had hoped to produce that document today. I would like to walk through the next steps. A meeting is set up with LHS Department Heads this Friday to give the final look overview. We hope to issue that either this Friday or Monday morning. We will move everything down a week regarding when we need a vote to approve.

Lorraine Finnegan: Based on the slight shift in schedule, we have the School Building Committee reviewing the focus group recommendations, and we added the proposed space summary to that for the March 4 meeting. The School Committee will vote on the ed plan and space summary on March 12th. The School Building Committee will vote on the space summary on March 18. We added the date for the School Committee to review the space summary on February 27. We have a School Building Committee meeting on the 26th, so we will introduce the space summary then.

Julie Hackett clarified that the School Committee will preview the space summary on February 27th and vote on March 12th.

Lorraine Finnegan: Yes, there are a few spaces that we want to review with staff to confirm because not APPROVED

everything is as clear, and we want to make sure that all spaces are accurately represented for what they are in their existing condition. I also want to add that even though you accept the space summary, it does not mean you can't change it. This is an iterative document until we submit it to schematic design, which is when the MSBA accepts it, and that is the contract by which we have to design the project through construction.

Julie Hackett: Just so members of the School Building Committee know, I reviewed the space summary with SMMA; we got about halfway through it and to your point about it being an iterative process. It's nice because we can say, what about this, or have you considered this?

Jim Malloy: Are we at a point where we can start making decisions on things because I don't know that we've been given all of the information we need actually to be able to start getting to that point? It is one thing to say you want this or you want that. Still, unless you look at the actual design space and its associated cost, I'm not sure you can make much of a decision other than a very preliminary one like this. Still, there's got to be a lot more information before we can make some of these decisions and recommendations. I was surprised to hear how quickly some of this will be presented to the School Committee.

Lorraine Finnegan: The space summary, which looks at the school, goes before the School Committee. Other categories, like a pool, a standalone fieldhouse, and a central office, would be discussed in this group.

Jim Malloy: If you're putting effort into looking at a pool, will it cost 10 million or 100 million? I am going to guess it's in the 50-70 million to put an indoor pool. I don't know how we can say that we think you should be working on these items or not if we do not at least have some ballpark cost estimates of what some items cost.

Julie Hackett: During one of the ed programming meetings, we did not put in a pool or fieldhouse; we focused on the basic program. From my perspective, the read would be that people might be leery of a field house and a pool, and I want to clarify that is not the direction coming from the schools at all; that is a community conversation for sure.

Kseniya Slavsky: To present anything to the community, the design team would need to do the work to frame what is possible, like cost and where it would be located for a pool or a fieldhouse. We need to be clear in our direction to the design team if we want them to do that work.

Jon Himmel agreed that having some range prices for discussion would be helpful.

Mike Burton: As Lorraine pointed out, the space summary will start with a school only, then a school with district offices, and a school with a fieldhouse, so we will ask for pricing on all of these different scenarios on March 25th from estimators. We will be able to start talking numbers in mid-April.

#### Public Comment:

Dawn McKenna: I want to start by responding to a question regarding the current state of the fieldhouse document I sent. It was prepared by the high school coaches with the support of Athletic Director Naomi Martin, and all the photos and videos have been done during this current winter season. I want to applaud the efforts made and identify each department's needs and what needs to be done to provide cutting-edge facilities going forward. However, the draft space summary review is not on the website, and you need to post that so people can see it and provide comments, especially if you want comments By Thursday. The order in which Mike Burton just described the priorities may or may not be the right order of priorities in terms of starting with the baseline for the High School and then going to each of the other items. For example, figuring out different alternatives for the school administration building is easy. It's not as easy to figure out different alternatives for those parts that are part of the program. The other thing I'm really curious about is the MSBA's conversation regarding the fieldhouse because it has been part of the school program since 1965, so it is an existing condition. So when you talk about the high school, you are essentially saying that every other program will get what they need going forward, and this program will be diminished. And I don't think that's the right message you're trying to convey. So, I'm wondering how the MSBA says it's not part of the existing conditions.

And quite frankly, it's very different from the school administration and the pool, and I'm not saying I'm not supportive of either. But the fieldhouse is currently attached to the high school, and people go in and out of it all day. They use it as part of the educational program. So I'm concerned about the way it's being conveyed to them.

My other understanding is that the current fieldhouse is 33,000 square feet. While I'm happy that the MSBA will go from 12,000 square feet to 18,000 square feet for a gym, it's still significantly less square footage altogether than we currently have, and what we currently have doesn't meet the needs. Given the governor's interest in sustainability, I imagine a new fieldhouse would provide more solar options on a flat roof, and we could use that to make it happen. I'm talking about the fieldhouse; we would not leave out a stage for the music department or for the theater and drama that takes place. Then, we should be able to provide the right athletic facilities as part of the physical education program. The fact of the matter is this Town will pay for anything that we feel we need. We should look at what we need as part of the program instead of eliminating something because of the potential costs. There are many people out there who are willing to help figure out the financial piece and even the design piece of it. But we should not be thinking about taking away a program that already exists, which is what we're talking about, and we need to package it better and talk about it.

Julie Hackett pointed out what Lorraine Finnegan stated earlier: the MSBA is not in the athletic business. They will support physical education, which are the spaces that occur within the base of the building.

Bob Pressman: I am just passing through the materials. Many new high schools are in the area, and some have features that would also be good to visit. A few meetings back, Ms. Lenihan asked what a good rough estimate would be for the cost of a pool, and the answer for something described as short of an Olympic-sized pool was 10-15 million. I asked offline what would be a rough estimate for the fieldhouse, and the rough estimate was \$20 million, but it could be a little more depending on features. The rough estimates for the high school are in the Town budget, and it has been approved by the Select Board, to which it goes to Town meeting. It is a very large number, along with the Town having plans for five other public facilities in the next 10 years.

Julie Hackett acknowledged that many new high schools are coming on board, and we plan to take some tours.

Jim Malloy made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:07 p.m. Kseniya Slavsky seconded the meeting. Ms. Lenihan took a roll call vote, passed 6-0.