

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	09/03/24
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
	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair		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*	Interim 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 Department
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment		Cindy Arens	Recreation Department

	Andy Oldeman			Melissa Battite	Recreation Department
	Kelly Axtell	Assistant Town Manager			

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
11.8	The “Plan B” Discussion	J.Pato	J.Pato & K.Lenihan
11.8	Added line for bus spots	D.Voss	SMMA
1.8	Ask MSBA for a review of the student enrollment count	A.Baker	Project Team

- Please click [here](#) for the presentation
 - o This will be referenced in the meeting minutes with slide numbers called out to refer to.

Item No.		Description	Action
11.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:01 pm	Record	
11.2	Approval of August 19 - 2024, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion to approve the August 19, 2024, Meeting Minutes made by J.Pato and seconded by M.Cronin • Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Absent, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Absent, H. Sha – Absent, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 8-0-0.	Record	
11.3	Introduce: Ground Floor Program & Footprint Area, Total Gross Square Footage, "New Construction on Fields" Massing Options & “Phased in Place” Massing Options, and new addition/renovation option B.4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black Introduced the total gross square footage for the existing high school versus the proposed options via tables and charts (Slide 9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o L.Finnegan noted that the non-program area is everything that is required to allow the building to function and is roughly 1/3 of the total square footage • B.Black Introduced the ground floor program and footprint area through adjacency bubble diagrams and floor plans (Slide 13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o B.Black noted that 7,000sf could be saved from the footprint if the gymnasium goes to the 2nd floor 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black Introduced the process for selecting one of the new constructions on the fields options (Slide 17) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Lexington High School educational criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom configurations that promote collaboration • Adjacencies of different curricular areas for a wide variety of interdisciplinary learning • Flexibility to organize school in different ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.e.: Small learning communities, Schools within a School, Freshman Academy) • Accessibility to and shared hands-on learning opportunities of Innovation Labs/ Makerspaces • Organizational and character-defining elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library / media center (centralized) • Student dining (centralized) • Auditorium • Outdoor student space similar to existing LHS Quad • Active hallways • Ease of way finding • Reduced student corridor passing time • Outdoor learning opportunities • Ability to reduced impacts of open campus • Promotes student agency ○ B.Black reviewed the current New Construction on the Field options including the floor plans, pros & cons, and the educational criteria for each proposed option (Slide 21) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted that all new construction can fit he allotted 500 spaces without structural parking • B.Black reviewed the existing buildings at the current LHS. Black also introduced the current phased in place options, both addition/renovation and new construction phased including the floor plans, pros & cons, and the educational criteria for each proposed option (Slide 45) 		
11.4	<p>Confirm: Parking Quantity and Location, Driveways and Circulation, & Current Use and Anticipated Impacts of Fields</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo shared the updated parking count tables and location for all the proposed options (Slide 98) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Pato noted that the select board should be approached to ask for permanent parking along 	Record	

	<p>Worthen Road to help reach the 500 spots for the phased in place options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SBC agreed J.Pato will bring this forward to the select board ● C.Lamb noted there is signage on Baskin Road that currently says no parking during school hours ● Confirmation received from the SBC for removing the 30 spots from the 500 counts for the phased in place options ● Confirmation received from the SBC to proceed with 500 spots at grade for the new construction on the field's options ● E.Prestileo shared the key aspects of the driveways and circulation (Slide 102) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Separate school bus, LABBB van, and parent drop off loops ● Neighborhood impacts: minimize use of residential streets for school access ● Bus traffic in and out of Worthen Road ● Queue length: ability to keep queued vehicles off public streets ● Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety: prioritize student circulation, access, and movement ● Confirmation received from the SBC ● E.Prestileo shared the current used and anticipated field impact plans for both new construction on the fields and phased in place options (Slide 104) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirmation received from the SBC 		
11.5	<p>SBC Discussion on the Designer Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● J.Pato noted there is no current option that is easy, but he heard regarding the C.5B option it is possible to mirror the space to extend a different way to save the baseball field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted they will review it again and look ● A.Levine thought the building was bigger than 324,958 square feet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted that the field house is not included ● A.Levine asked where the "+"s came from on the educational criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Baker noted that these came from himself and the team at LHS to identify which schemes were extra strong in categories as they all meet the educational criteria ○ A.Levine asked for a written explanation for why the schemes received a + where they did. ● A.Levine asked in the general floor plans on the schemes how the middle row of classrooms get access to daylight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted they will get light from the corridors through glazing but will often be spaces that are not occupied 		

	<p>constantly through the day such as bathrooms, shafts, teacher planning, or breakout spaces as an example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R.Park noted a few months ago a diagram was provided that showed spaces in the school that would benefit from borrowed natural light ● A.Levine asked for the phased in place schemes such as B.1 is in the recreation land and will that require Article 97 approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted yes it will require it ● A.Levine asked if the field house is extended and renovate if that will also require a new vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted they are working on this with the MSBA as they have not provided a concrete answer, but they are hoping for it after the PDP response is provided back to the MSBA ● A.Baker noted in the B.1 scheme the administration office are really pushed to the back and not in the life of the school which is something Mr. Baker would not support. Baker also noted that the central office spaces are laid out in an office manner than may not work will for classrooms as Lexington High School is already over 2400 students as of this year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Lenihan noted het takeaway is that the renovation options are not meeting the educational criteria nearly as well as the new construction on the fields and for the town to spend this much money it does not seem worth it at all ● B.Black wanted to add that the current math building is currently sitting 3-feet below the grade of the rest of the existing high school ● M.Burton asked how long the auditorium would be offline for in the B.4 scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted in Winchester it was roughly one year that is was offline for. Finnegan also noted that the kitchen and loading will be offline for some time that will need to be temporarily replaced. ○ B.Black noted that the B.4 scheme phase 5 will be the trickiest as well ● J.Himmel noted when they visited other schools, they saw the central core and he thinks it works very well as it also saves space on exterior walls. ● J.Himmel wondered if they could go back to the Waltham High School to visually see a lot of the places in person ● J.Himmel offered a large thanks to the SMMA team for taking his request to dive deeper into the renovation option and what could be saved din the existing building. Himmel noted even if there is a cost saving in the renovations it may require a larger square footage to complete ● J.Himmel noted that the two lighted baseball/softball fields should be looked at to stay together so the lighting is not moved closer to any abutters ● K.Slavsky noted when thinking about the new construction on the fields and how they recreate these fields on the other sides next to 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>the abutters. Slavsky is wondering if the design team can show how these fields would still feel connected or how the abutters impact would be mitigated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan asked for the SBC to complete the criteria matrix prior to the next meeting • J.Pato noted he is concerned about the fields being close to the abutters when they are moved. Pato also noted he is greatly concerned with the scale of growth as Lexington is already at the pace that was discussed with the MSBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted they will add something in the PDP comments to the MSBA 		
11.6	<p>Communications Working Group Update (K.Lenihan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan noted they discussed the FAQs as a group and turned those over to J.Miller who is the Director of Communication in Lexington and they should be online soon. • K.Lenihan noted the September 18th community meeting will still be at Cary Memorial Building at 6:30 p.m. Lenihan noted there will be a short presentation on cost at the start followed by a Q&A. She also noted the flyers being produced will have a QR code linked to the video prepared by M.Burton at Dore & Whittier. Lenihan also noted that handouts were discussed to share information with the community. • M.Burton noted there has been a lot of discussion about providing bite size videos of information. Burton noted he shared something with DPF about a company who creates information videos and often on MSBA projects. 	Record	
11.7	<p>Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.Kelley 24 Forrest st; Kelley noted the fields should not be touched it is a nonstarter and they should not be touched. Kelley asked why SMMA has not considered what they proposed in 2015. Kelly thinks there is plenty of opportunity to build a new large field house that could incorporate the 18,000sf gym. Kelley agrees with J.Pato about the influx of housing and people coming into Lexington. He also noted they are so far away from being legitimate with MSBA that they should step back from the timeline • T.Singh 40 Hancock st: Singh noted she is very grateful for the comments brought forward by the SBC. The students would be very impacted by the phased in place options and there are 1000s of them. She noted that a large part of the hesitation from the Select Board of 	Record	

	<p>moving the fields was the light mitigation and managing that could really move the needle in town</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.McKenna 9 Hancock st: McKenna noted that if the gym was on the second floor it would be more difficult for the community to use this as it is also used with the fields and field house at the same time. She thinks it is a strong idea to talk to the MSBA and how the state participated in the original field house construction. She thinks the town leadership should engage in this conversation. McKenna asks if at the next meeting it can be shared if the new 72,000 sf field house has to be included through PSR to keep working on it in Schematic Design. McKenna has a hard time accepting the fact that the educational criteria have a + even when the field house is not included in this. • N.Sykes 12 Bellflower st: She noted she is the head of the PTA at the Hastings school, and her children lived through the Hastings construction. Sykes noted that it was very disruptive to her students and the community around the parents in town are not in favor of the construction in place options due to the disruption to the students 		
11.8	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Baker noted that building off the last comment made, he noted that he was doing walkthroughs of the classrooms, and the air exchangers are very loud. Baker noted that it is already hard for the student to hear properly in the existing building, and this is without construction • J.Pato requested to post the memo he sent out • J.Pato asked for the town to look into what taxpayer impact and mitigation would be • J.Pato noted that a more in-depth cost of doing nothing/plan B needs to be reviewed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Pato asked who would be working on this • D.Voss asked if a line addressing the on-site bus storage parking can be added to the table. Voss noted it can be labeled as zero, but it should still be recorded for the future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted they will add it • K.Slavsky is very concerned about the new enrollment numbers as they are already very high. Slavsky noted that when phasing and the cost of doing nothing are being concerned the SBC should also be thinking of mitigations that are necessary for increasing space between now and when construction would be finished. She notes that space and money may need to be reserved for this going forward. • J.Himmel noted that along with the buses the batteries should be shown as well even if it's zero, so it is recorded. Himmel also noted that the current two-hour meetings may not be enough time to really get informed and discuss enough to make decisions. Himmel noted another format may be required 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine noted it would be good to get an answer to what the minimum cost will be to make the current field house usable for the next 5-6 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted they will work on that number • K.Lenihan asked who will be diving into Plan B and the costs associated with it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ J.Pato noted that between DPF and the Superintendent's office they have got some elements, but they needed to transform it into a more consumable format • M.Burton wanted to provide an update that at the MSBA board meeting they have proposed to increase the cap from \$550 to \$586 and it will be voted on at the next MSBA board meeting. 		
11.9	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:03 was made by J.Pato and seconded by M.Cronin</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Absent, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, J. Malloy- Absent, Mark Barrett - Yes 10-0-0.</p>	Record	

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.