

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	12/09/24
Location:	Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)	Time:	12:00 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	J. Greco

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Kathleen Lenihan*	SBC Chair & SC Member	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Michael Cronin*	SBC Vice-Chair & LPS Facilities	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Julie Hackett*	Superintendent	✓	Jacob Greco	DWMP
✓	Steve Bartha*	Town Manager		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board	✓	Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Manager	✓	Rosemary Park	SMMA
✓	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA
✓	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair	✓	Brian Black	SMMA
✓	Andrew Baker*	Lexington High School Principal	✓	Erin Prestileo	SMMA
✓	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager		Anthony Jimenez	SMMA
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative	✓	Martine Dion	SMMA
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative	✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee	✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee		Pete Timothy	A.M. Fogerty
✓	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee		Rick DeAngelis	Recreation Committee
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment		Cindy Arens	Sustainable Lexington Committee

	Andy Oldeman			Melissa Battite	Recreation Department

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
23.5	Update SD workplan	SBC	DWMP/SMMA
23.4	Finalize and Submit PSR Package		DWMP/SMMA

- Please click [here](#) for the presentation
  - o This will be referenced in the meeting minutes with slide numbers called out to refer to.
- Below is a summation of key points, please view the recording for full transcript.

Item No.		Description
23.1	<b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00 pm	Record
23.2	<b>Approval of November 12 - 2024, November 18 – 2024, December 2 - 2024 Meeting Minutes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A motion to approve November 12 - 2024, November 18 – 2024, December 2 - 2024 Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by A.Baker</li> <li>• Discussion: None</li> </ul> Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H.M Sha</b> – Abstain, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Absent, <b>S.Bartha</b> - Yes, <b>M. Barrett</b> - Yes 11-0-1.	Record
23.3	<b>Vote:</b> Recommendation to Proceed with Preferred Construction Manager at Risk  J.Himmel noted that the subcommittee spent a great deal of time deliberating and reviewing the proposals and firms and how much time and effort the firms must have put into the process. Himmel briefly discussed the process that took place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Himmel make a motion to accept the recommendation of the CM selection subcommittee and to authorized DPF to enter into an agreement with Turner Construction for the Pre-construction Phase services. Seconded by J.Hackett <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o J.Hackett asked if M.Burton used to work at Turner</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M.Burton noted yes, 14 years ago and also noted he was not a voting member.</li> <li>○ K.Lenihan asked for some reasoning for why Turner stood out over the other firms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Himmel noted that Turner felt like a good fit and they stood out as people he wanted to work with. He noted the experience the team has at Turner and together.</li> <li>• B.Black noted he agrees with J.Himmel and shared that their comfort level and ability to act as a team and present their experience along with the great sustainability people.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ H.M Sha asked if the vote was unanimous and if they looked at previous project management experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Himmel noted yes and yes they did review all the firms prior experience and also felt that Turner had the best estimating program to help get the right price. Himmel noted the high level of comfort that Turner provided in their ability to get to the right price and stay there.</li> <li>• M.Burton noted they received qualifications, proposals, and the interviews provided 1000 pages of information to review. They were all great firms and provided great proposals.</li> <li>• M.Barrett noted that he was impressed by the team that was there and how well they knew their roles, Barrett was very fond of the general superintendent from Turner.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ H.M Sha noted it is important to have these thoughts on the public record</li> <li>○ J.Hackett noted that everyone has relationships with these firms and it is an advantage as they know how they work</li> <li>○ C.Lamb noted they all passed and it came down to a subjective vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Himmel noted yes</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ D.Voss noted he will abstain as he works with some of these firms</li> </ul> <p>- A motion to approve Turner Construction as the Construction Manager at Risk for this project at this point was made by J.Himmel and seconded by J.Hackett</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes, <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H.M Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Abstain, <b>S.Bartha</b>- Yes, <b>M. Barrett</b> - Yes 12-0-1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A.Levine asked that now that this vote has happened when do they start participating in the process and meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton noted right away they will start a phone call today and work to execute with them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
23.4	<p><b>Vote:</b> PSR Submission to MSBA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C.Dell Angelo noted everyone should have the link to the PSR submission and she did not receive any questions. They will do a final pass to review everything after the meeting and hope to review the comments from the MSBA on the January 6th, 2025 SBC meeting</li> <li>• J.Pato noted that in the draft there was highlighted budget information is this updated?</li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C.Dell Angelo noted that they got this language from the C.Kosnoff and they can review it currently before moving to vote so everyone is aware</li> <li>● C.Kosnoff shared the updated language. She noted that they have never formally voted a Not to Exceed (NTE) and that the upper limit they are setting, which isn't a NTE, is the summation of Option C.5b, the field house, and the central offices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ K.Slavsky noted it is important to note for those who do not know the MSBA process that these numbers are not the firm project budget and that will not be set till after Schematic Design</li> <li>○ J.Himmel noted that these numbers are an escalated cost to the bid point and are not in today's dollars, this should be included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● M.Burton noted he understand where he is coming from, the schedule is included in this so it should be known but does not think it hurts to add it but does not think it is necessary.</li> <li>● Himmel noted it will be useful in case any tries to use this page standalone and not with the rest of the submission.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Motion to approve the Preferred Schematic Report as amended and to be edited per this SBC meeting for submission to the MSBA made by J.Pato and seconded by J.Hackett</li> </ul> <p>Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes, <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H.M Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Yes, <b>S.Bartha</b>- Yes, <b>M. Barrett</b> - Yes 13-0-0.</p>	
23.5	<p><b>Review Schematic Design Work Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A.Krafian reviewed the Schematic Design work plan starting on <b>page 7</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton noted that Lexington comes with a pre-set group of committees that are made for this process.</li> <li>○ M.Burton noted that many of the town committees are included in the TOL category</li> <li>○ A.Baker asked that any safety areas in the school department is included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J.Hackett agreed</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ J.Himmel noted he reviewed this and noted it is an approval document and assumes there will be a scheduled document to follow. Himmel noted they are about to embark on a five-month course designing the school. He noted it is a very detailed process. Himmel asked for DPF, the design team, or even the CM to review the schedule to know when they will be hitting each topic.</li> <li>○ C.Dell Angelo noted this is the first pass at the process and they are still reviewing all the other meetings</li> <li>○ M.Burton noted that as a big picture this committee has done a lot of work and completed the most important goal in choosing an option. He noted they wanted to get a schedule of having the SBC on the third Monday of each month after the PBC meetings the week before. Burton noted that closer to June there may even be need for two a month.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D.Voss asked for a column for Sustainable Lexington Committee as otherwise a lot of the town boxes would be checked. He noted that the SBC is the confirming body and the rest of our advisors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● M.Burton, noted full approval, is still in the SBC's court and the next big vote will be in August to confirm the Schematic Design and Budget. He noted that if everything had to go through the SBC, they would never get to the dates they need to meet.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ K.Lenihan noted that the outreach to stakeholders will continue</li> <li>○ B.Black noted that the weekly design workshops will have the experts for each topics brought in and early decisions can be made and be productive. Black noted another alternative will be focus groups as before, but they feel that the design workshops will be more productive.</li> <li>○ H.M Sha noted that this is tough, and it currently feels like a plan that will not have the right input, and he is skeptical of governmental processes. He noted that one big vote on the package will not be enough.</li> <li>○ J.Himmel understands H.M Sha's concern but notes that there is a progression in things that happen. Himmel noted that monthly meetings may not be enough. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● K.Lenihan noted they could use coordination meetings to review the process and choices being made at other committees and weigh in.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ A.Baker asked the school department to have say in anything that has a lived reality in the school as even small ones are important.</li> <li>○ K.Slavsky agrees with what the committee members have said and that if consensus for Schematic Design is built it has to be in the SBC and the community in general. She noted that this presentation appears to sideline a lot of people who want to have input. She does agree that the experts should have said and have a lot of faith in it. She asked for every design presentation to be made once and not repeated. She asked that the primary meetings be recorded where choices are being and to have the sent out and posted so the community can see them. Slavsky noted that this would not cover the discussion aspect of it though.</li> <li>○ J.Himmel noted that the group may be hampered by the pages of design. He noted that they should let the design team make a schedule showing the full process.</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that people may be getting caught up in the list of tasks. She noted that their job is to make sure everything that the town and wants and needs is captured in Schematic Design to capture it all in the budget. The list of tasks is what is the most important to impact the school and other large scale scope impacts.</li> <li>○ K.Lenihan wants to clarify that schematic design is locating the walls and the material and Design Development is what type of tile and color <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● L.Finnegan noted yes this is a way to look at it</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J.Pato wants to make sure the effects that choices have on the school users and community, any choices with cost implications come back to the SBC. He noted that deep technical issues should just be confirmations from the experts.</li> <li>○ A.Levine noted that if the SBC meets once a month there will be other topics that come up and derail the important ones. He noted that the SBC should be meeting at least once a week if not twice a week.</li> <li>○ J.Hackett noted she is thankful for the work that went into gathering all the information. She is thinking about what the role of the SBC is and finds once a month is appropriate if they understand their role correctly. She noted the CM selection vote is a perfect example of how the process works and how she sees the role of the school building committee going forward. She noted that if the project team is in meetings with SBC, they cannot conduct the work.</li> <li>○ C.Dell Angelo noted that the workshops would be blocked out for four hours, where they would meet with key experts and make decisions. She noted they can post agendas and take minutes if need be.</li> <li>○ B.Black noted he thinks they have outlined the significant topics on those slides and if there are any that should be checked please mark them up and send it back over to be reviewed. He noted that it is assumed that the PBC and SBC will always be included in the important choices.</li> <li>○ K.Lenihan noted that all members should review the boxes and send it to the chair of the SBC and she will send it to the to the project team.</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that a lot of these topics can be run concurrently with the programming</li> <li>○ D.Voss noted it would be helpful to circulate the more detailed schedule and knows that Dore + Whittier understands the Lexington building process but noted the last three years SLC has been at every PBC meeting.</li> <li>○ K.Slavsky noted that transparency is the key word, and they should not want to halt the design process. Slavsky asked for the weekly design workshops to be recorded as it is easier to digest than written minutes.</li> <li>○ J.Himmel looks forward to the detailed schedule that is to come and the presentation along with it. He also is looking forward to how the community will interact with it.</li> <li>○ J.Hackett asked for the summer dates to be locked down so people can plan around it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● M.Burton noted that 8/18/2025 is the most important</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ M.Burton noted that this is the phase to roll the sleeves up and get work down and he is viewing the SBC meetings as more of a report out on what has been happening and what will be going forward.</li> <li>○ M.Burton noted that on June 4th everything has to be given to the estimators on what is in and what is out.</li> <li>○ K.Lenihan noted that the big vote will be the summation of the decisions made throughout the whole process.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan asked for any comments on the tasks and schedule to be submitted to K.Lenihan by this time next Monday 12/13/24.</li> </ul>	
23.6	<b>Public Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To review public comment please view the recording <a href="#">here</a></li> </ul>	Record
23.7	<b>Reflections/Action Items</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● C.Dell Angelo reviewed the Do's and Don'ts of supporting a project, this can be viewed <a href="#">here</a></li> <li>● A.Levine noted that the SBC is really the best vessel for translating the information to the public</li> <li>● K.Slavsky noted that in the CM firm interviews she asked all the firms about turning over space early for helping the current overcrowding. She noted that they all said it is possible, but it has to be planned for ahead and there would be additional costs associated with it. Slavsky asked for this to be included on the next SBC agenda and in due time a vote be conducted. She noted in response to B.Pressman she would like to be able to watch the recordings as that means the community would be able to as well. She trusts the experts and project team to make economic decisions.</li> <li>● J.Pato noted that as part of the communications working group they are discussing how to interact with the community, and it is our (SBC) responsibility to bring the community along.</li> <li>● J.Hackett noted that this SBC is different than other communities SBC as they have elected to take on the role of communicating with the public</li> <li>● K.Lenihan noted that the Recreation Committee will be important for all choices regarding the fields.</li> </ul>	Record
23.8	<b>Adjourn:</b> Motion to adjourn at 1:47 was made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato  Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H. Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Yes, <b>S.Bartha</b> - Yes, <b>M. Barrett</b> - Yes 13-0-0.	Record

Sincerely,  
**DORE + WHITTIER**  
Jacob Greco  
Assistant Project Manager

Project: Lexington High School  
Meeting: School Building Committee  
Meeting No. 23 – 12/09/2024  
Page: 8

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.