

MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: September 4, 2024
 Project Name: Lexington High School
 Project Number: Click or tap here to enter text.
 Subject: Site, Safety and Security Focus Group Meeting #5
 Attendees:

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Kathleen Lenihan	SBC Chair & SC Member	✓	Vincent Lerow	AV Technician
✓	Michael Cronin	SBC Vice-Chair & LPS Facilities		Marissa Liggiero	Lexington Engineer
	Julie Hackett	Superintendent		John Livsey	Town Engineer
✓	Cynthia Arens	Sustainable Lexington Committee Chair		Ross Morrow	Lexington Engineer
	Suzanne Barry	Select Board Vice Chair		Patricia Moyer	Tree Committee Co-Chair
✓	Melissa Battite	Recreation Director		Karen Mullins	Conservation Commission
	Joanne Belanger	Director of Public Health		Glenn Parker	Appropriation Committee Chair
✓	Chris Bouchard	Project Engineer		Joe Pato	Select Board Chair
	Christian Boutwell	Recreation Committee Vice Chair		David Pinsonnault	Director of Public Works
✓	Don Chisholm	Assistant Fire Chief	✓	Todd Rhodes	Sustainable Lexington Committee Vice Chair
	Ralph Clifford	Zoning Board of Appeals Chair	✓	Mark Sandeen	Select Board
✓	Mark Connor	Tree Committee Co-Chair	✓	Deepika Sawhney	School Committee Vice Chair
	Frederick DeAngelis	Recreation Committee Chair		Derek Sencabaugh	Fire Chief
	Carolyn Dooley	Campus Monitor	✓	Tom Shiple	Lexington Bicycle Advisory Committee
	Lisa Giersbach	Permanent Building Committee	✓	Nancy Sofen	Tree Committee
	Philip Hamilton	Conservation Commission Chair		Nishanth Veeragandham	Student
	Kristena Hankins	School Resource Officer	✓	Dan Voss	Sustainable Lexington Committee
	Jon Himmel	Permanent Building Committee Chair		Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA Project Manager
	Wendy Krum	Permanent Building Committee	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA Project Architect
✓	Timothy Lee	Design Advisory Committee Chair	✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA Landscape Architect
	Sheila Page		✓	Erin Prestileo	SMMA Civil Engineer
✓	Susan Barrett	Transportation Services	✓	Brian Black	SMMA Design Architect
	Lisa Giersbach		✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA Asst Project Manager
✓	Jacob Greco	Dore + Whittier	✓	Mike Burton	Dore + Whittier
✓	John Albright	Dore + Whittier	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	Dore + Whittier

Agenda Item	Description
-------------	-------------

1.	<p>Introduction: Refer to attendees list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMMA shared a presentation that will be referenced throughout these minutes, please view it HERE
2.	<p>Recap Discussion Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site, Safety, and Security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss site design for traffic, circulation, safety and security. Includes conversations about parking, driveways and circulation, fields, and offsite improvements and coordination with Town Departments. M.Rice reviewed the current project timeline (Slide 6) M.Rice reviewed the recap of the discussion topics (Slide 8) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Balancing Open Campus Tradition & Community Access with Safety Concerns Encouraging Multimodal Transportation Incorporating Green Infrastructure Attempting to Minimize Disturbance Footprint Managing Parking, Traffic and Circulation Ecologically Valuable Communities on Site Ensuring Student Safety During Construction Creating a Unique Sense of Place and Site Design Aesthetic Grounded in Your Community <ul style="list-style-type: none">
3.	<p>Review Current Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B.Black reviewed the current options that are present in the Preferred Schematic Report phase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please view the details for these in the linked presentation starting on Slide 10 These included Renovation & Addition - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B.1 B.4 New Construction - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.2 New Construction - On the Fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.1b C.2b C.5B M.Dowhan noted all these options are a snapshot in time and are not final by any means
4.	<p>Discussion</p>

- N.Sofen asked what Article 97 is
 - E.Prestileo shared how Article 97 is Massachusetts program that preserves open space and requires a legislation process at the state level with MEPA to undergo a land swap
- T.Shiple Asked what the motive was to produce the newer B.4 option
 - B.Black noted they were asked by the SBC to produce a new addition/renovation option that captured more of the existing building on the renovation side of the project. Black also noted they took another look at the existing building and what could be used/for what program
- T.Shiple Asked if there is a hard constraint in place for classroom size and ceiling height
 - B.Black noted at the SBC meeting yesterday (09/03/2024) it was discussed what size rooms would be able to be placed in the renovated spaces along with the constraints associated with it. There are no specific heights for classrooms, but the ideal height is 9'6" to 10'.
- V.Lerow stated how everything in the performing arts space in the auditorium needs renovation and expansion and if that space will be expanded
 - B.Black noted that they are not in a level of design yet for that but it would not make sense to tear down the walls and expand them in the renovation as it would be better to just build new
- C.Arens asked what elements of D.2 are being saved as listed in the pros?
 - M.Dowhan noted this is a mistake on his part and nothing will be reused not even the foundation
- N.Sofen asked where the temporary modular classrooms would go in the phased in place options?
 - E.Prestileo noted they are still reviewing the options but potentially on the fields north of the basin
- C.Arens asked if there will be basements.
 - B.Black noted that no there will not aside from below the boiler room and associated crawl spaces
- T.Shiple Asked how the triangular lot in option C.1d
 - M.Dowhan noted it will be from Worthen Road
- M.Battite asked how the fields being relocated have they been tested for appropriate solar orientation and connectivity. She also noted that this is a community park that is going to be lost and turned into a campus which will completely reorganize the summer program.
 - M.Rice noted thank you and these are the type of comments they are looking to hear from everyone's viewpoints
- D.Sawhney asked in the new construction on the field options with there be a pedestrian access to connect these without having to navigate through bus lanes. She also asked if the vine brook the cuts through the campus will affect the structure and building
 - B.Black noted that all the current schemes are avoiding the culvert
 - M.Dowhan noted there will be a proper connection between the two sides
- M.Battite asked if these connections would be lit to match the use of the park
 - M.Dowhan noted that that is in the future but yes, they'll be lit as needed for safety

- N.Sofen asked if gender equity is involved in which fields get the better orientation
 - M.Dowhan noted yes this is important and one of the reasons that field C2 is not being touched in the new construction on the field options as it is already a new and nice field
- D.Voss asked if there is a table that shows the projected or expected canopy solar which each of these schemes
 - E.Prestileo noted that yes this has been created and it will be shared and the MEP & Sustainability Focus Group tomorrow
 - D.Voss asked this to be shown on all slides that are discussing the site
- C.Arens noted that all the new construction on the field options that the LABBB parking could be traded with field C6
 - E.Prestileo noted that there is a lot of flexibility on where the parking can go on the site
- M.Sandeen noted that the massing visual should also include rooftop solar not just canopy solar
- V.Lerow noted solar canopies could be added above the bleachers also
- M.Battite noted that the parking could be taken in the new construction schemes instead of the fields for laydown and temporary parking and such
- D.Voss noted that the orientation of the parking and clustering can have a 30% impact on the solar capacity for the same # of parking spaces
- M.Sandeen stated we will also need to discuss site issues regarding energy storage placement
- T.Rhodes noted that for all the new construction on the fields options there was some references earlier about refreshment stands and ticket stand and bleachers as the football field is a structure and not just two dimensional and this should be depicted
 - M.Dowhan noted they have taken this into account for saving room and will show this as a vertical element in the future
- N.Sofen asked where the gym is located in the C.2b option
 - M.Dowhan pointed it out
- D.Sawhney asked how the square footage is calculated and if there will be a lot of fire exits at the first floor and will LABBB have more assistance in entering and exiting the building
 - B.Black noted yes there will be plenty as they have to be compliant with code. He noted there would be stairwell shafts that go vertical throughout the whole building
- C.Arens asked why the field house is not connected to the building in several of the schemes
 - B.Black noted this is because some of the schemes have a challenge where they are actually able to connect the two buildings
- E.Prestileo shared the presentation for the parking, site circulation, and field use/impacts
 - (Slide 28)
- C.Arens clarified that for the addition/renovation options the 470 parking spots is a decrease from the new construction on the fields total of 500 it is still an increase from the existing parking count

- E.Prestileo noted yes this is correct with the addition of the central office there are a required 60 new spaces
- S.Barrett noted that there should be some plan created for trying to reduce parking and driving in place
- K.Mullens noted that it looks like the new construction on the field options involve wetland and/or land subject to flooding alterations, and these should be noted with the amounts
- M.Battite asked for the project schedule to include the end date for the fields being ready to go
 - E.Prestileo noted that the current schedule does include this
- M.Sandeen noted his assumption is the ground source heat pump numbers are conservative so the amount of fields shown may be more than needed. Sandeen is wondering if there is some type of way to show the error bars or the best/worst case scenarios
 - M.Rice noted they will review how to properly show this in an honest manner
- M.Burton noted the intent is to get a shovel in the ground in July but the goal is to wait for the fall sport season prior to taking over any fields
- M.Sandeen asked if the project team thinks that the phased in place options also have wetland impacts or if it's just the new on field
 - E.Prestileo noted that the phased in place options do not have the same impact as the new construction on the fields
 - M.Burton noted that the existing high school currently sits on Article 97 land so that would have to be taken care of
- C.Arens asked what the differences are between the wetland impacts from the two different site locations
 - E.Prestileo noted there are two kinds of wetlands on the site and they are working to get those approved with the town and in the schemes that have wetland impacts they will stay below the threshold to have to involve the state
- T.Shiple asked what type of parking rations for bikes they are thinking of
 - M.Dowhan noted they start with what is required for the LEED point and then discussions can be had with the town to add more or less
 - M.Rice noted it will be good to get a current number of how many bikes are there on a peak day
- M.Sandeen noted he heard SMMA say they have an ideal "star" shape and why they are focusing on that and why it is ideal
 - B.Black noted the star shape normally comes from the idea that a lot of classroom space is needed in bar elements, but it is important for it to all feel connected and have easy way finding. The best way to do this is to have a central common that connects all these places.
- T.Lee noticed in all the schemes the loop drive that comes off of Muzzey St still remains in all the schemes and it disconnects the wetland pockets in that corner of the site and was wondering if the fire department can have access
 - M.Dowhan noted that moving this will allow to create a better access for pedestrians
- T.Rhodes noted that it seems like the plan is to narrow down the options are the two site locations and thinks the choice to choose the site location should be the priority

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black does not disagree but as Designers they have to let the process play out. Black noted they have time to integrate all the best ideas into the selected option for each site location ● C.D. Angelo wanted to note that the next community meeting will be held on September 18th to review the high-level timeline and the costs for the project and how it compares to the other high schools (video that has been posted on the website) ● O.Guttag asked if the B.1 and B.4 options are built new or renovated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted both are addition/renovation
5.	Close

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Jacob Greco

Assistant Project Manager

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.