

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	6/24/24
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		Steve Brown	DWMP
	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager		Mike Cox	DWMP
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair		Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Manager		Jason Boone	DWMP
	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair		Brad Dore	DWMP
	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair	✓	Jacob Greco	DWMP
	Andrew Baker*	Interim Lexington High School Principal		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
✓	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager		Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative		Rosemary Park	SMMA
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee	✓	Brian Black	SMMA
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee		Erin Prestileo	SMMA
	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee		Anthony Jimenez	SMMA
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment		Martine Dion	SMMA

	Andy Oldeman		✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
✓	Kelly Axtell	Assistant Town Manager		Michael Dowhan	SMMA

Item No.	Action Item	Follow Up
11.8	Dr. Hackett to coordinate other times for the “Retreat”	Communications Working Group
11.5	Dore & Whittier to add date stamps to financial presentation	Dore & Whittier
11.5	Dore & Whittier will add date stamps and page numbers to all presentations going forward	Dore & Whittier

Item No.		Description	Action
11.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:02pm	Record	
11.2	Election of Officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Pato nominated K.Lenihan as chair of the SBC, seconded by K.Slavsky Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy - Absent, Mark Barrett - Yes 9-0-0. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Pato nominated M.Cronin as Vice Chair of the SBC, Seconded by M.Barrett Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy - Absent, Mark Barrett - Yes 9-0-0.		
11.3	Approval of May 20 - 2024, June 3 - 2024, June 10 - 2024, June 17 - 2024, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the May 20 - 2024, June 3 - 2024, June 10 - 2024, June 17 – 2024, Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Himmel asked if there should be an Agenda item for what is outstanding from the previous meeting. 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett noted that this could be modified to include this. The project team does the minutes for the Full SBC meetings while the coordination meetings are just extra on top. C.Dell Angelo noted that some SBC teams have action items on their Agendas H.Min Sha agrees with the need for some sort of follow-up A.Levine noted that when doing minutes for the appropriation committee the easiest thing to do is transcribe what is heard in the recording. Condensing the minutes is extremely time-consuming, the end of each meeting should just have a quick summary of the action items. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Abstain, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy- Absent, Mark Barrett - Yes 8-0-1. 		
11.4	Review MSBA Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton shared that the MSBA has not returned PDP comments yet. Dore & Whittier reached out to the MSBA and heard that responses would be a "couple" more weeks M.Burton noted that comments must be returned within 14 days once received M.Burton shared that the PDP is a very large document and the MSBA sends sections out to a third party and then compile a report. 	Record	
11.5	Review Other High School Project Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Himmel noted on Slide 2 that the timeline slide should have a date on them for when they are shared. Himmel also asked for the green bar to say schematic on it as this is included in the Feasibility stage K.Lenihan asked if somewhere on these documents the PSR can share this is where the initial schematic is chosen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted that the Communication WG asked for this timeline to be simplified for the public A.Levine asked when construction actually starts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted where it states early site is when construction can start if the town uses the Construction Manager at Risk method. Burton shared that final bids are due in after the early package because the GMP is already set. The earlier side of construction, such as site work and steel, can begin while smaller trades are still being procured. M.Burton reviewed the package sent out to the SBC last week, this is linked to the agenda and on the Finance Page of the Project Website M.Burton noted that the goal of this was to get a real apples-to-apples comparison of other high schools 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are two main aspects of this, Time and Scope. Construction costs are escalated from when other projects have started. Project Scope adds cost as well for the Lexington Priorities. ● M.Burton reviews the below presentation and documents. (This is available for the publics viewing through the link in the Agenda or the Project Finance Page) ● Timeline Slide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Every grey vertical line indicates when cost estimates are taken for the project from estimators aside from the GMP as this is based on market prices. ○ The PDP is based on a cost per square foot from historical costs, this is gathered based on the provided narrative from SMMA. This Is not based on drawings. ○ The PSR phase will start introducing drawings and floor plans, the more detail that is provided to the estimators will increase the accuracy of the estimates ○ In Schematic design the SBC will have chosen one option and great detail will be developed, this includes 100s of drawings and specifications. This is also when the grant with the MSBA will be finalized, this can only go down and not up. ○ Following this town vote will happen and the town will be locked into Scope, Timeline, and Cost with the MSBA. The estimate will still be viewed three (3) times (once at the end of design development, end of 60% documents, and 90% documents). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This is useful to check if the scope is increasing as the cost cannot go over the agreed upon value and some value engineering may be required ● The PDP costs The costs for the various PDP Options indicated below are intended to be an analysis of the relative costs between options and NOT a prediction of the actual final cost of any individual option. Major variables such as geotechnical, site grading, wetland determination, structural system and final MEP systems have yet to be designed and costs will vary significantly from the benchmark cost estimating included as part of this PDP cost analysis. The costs outlined in this report should not be represented as the FINAL construction budget and have a +/- 10% degree of accuracy. ● Conceptual Pricing Slide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This slide acts as a reminder for the costs of each option as presented at the last community meeting. ○ This was used to get an average project cost ● Comparison to other High Schools Slide 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The escalation of construction costs for Arlington, Belmont, Revere, and Waltham is shared. These finances are taken from the MSBA, this is linked in the slide 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel noted that the dates for the high schools show the start of construction whereas Lexington is at the mid-point of construction ○ M.Burton noted when the public is doing research, they should keep in mind the square footage and student enrollment as both of these add project cost. • Escalation Slide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on the Turner Market Index (based in Boston, MA) the escalation of each year since 2009 is shown. ○ The green arrows show the other high schools' starting point of escalation to the mid-point of the Lexington project (The mid-point is recommended by estimators). This puts all the projects on same timeline • Comparison to other High Schools Slide 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This slide shows these projects escalated to the current Lexington Timeline • Lexington Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This chart shows the scope items included in the Lexington PDP that are labeled as priorities and adds a Dollar/Per Square Foot value to each item. ○ Items such as all electric, net-zero, battery storage, >25 EUI, ETC... • Comparison to other High Schools Slide 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The green color is showing that this high school did have the same "Lexington Priority" item as Lexington. The red color is showing that this high school did not have these values and then this items Dollar/Per Square Foot will be added to the total ○ Revere, Waltham, and Lexington are all around the \$1,300/SF range ○ Arlington and Belmont are lower in total Dollar/Per Square Foot but were pre-covid projects ○ As an example of how different every high school is Revere's project did not include the cost to demolish their old high school, something that Lexington will be doing. • Other Cost Considerations Slides <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This document from SMMA shows how the \$/SF can be broken down in each construction category • MSBA Policies Slide was reviewed by M.Burton <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This slide shows the Caps/Limits that are enforced by the MSBA along with what costs are ineligible per the MSBA ○ M.Burton noted that importance of the "Building cost funding limit up to \$550psf of eligible building gross square footage" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burton noted that this was around \$335 dollars a couple years ago, so has been a \$200 increase that Lexington was not expecting. This value could go up while Lexington is still in design. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that these caps are all for eligible costs, if there is a subject that goes over the MSBA guidelines in the Space Summary the MSBA will not fund any of that square footage difference ○ MSBA Caps and Limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Building cost funding limit up to \$550psf of eligible building gross square footage ● Sitework cost funding limit up to \$55psf (roughly 10%) of eligible building gross square footage ● Soft cost reimbursement eligible up to 20% of construction cost ● Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FFE) up to \$1,200 per student ● Technology up to \$1,200 per student ● Owner's Contingency Capped at .5% ● Construction Contingency Capped at 1% ● OPM/Designer Fees capped at \$550psf of eligible building gross square footage ● MSBA Ineligible Costs ● Any education program SF above MSBA guidelines (Space Summary) ● Designer, OPM, and Commissioning agent fees associated with ineligible SF ● In-Building Hazardous Material Abatement (Existing school) ● Costs associated with Article 97 or MEPA filing ● Legal costs ● Costs associated with temporary modular classrooms ● Anything outside the immediate property line ● "Other" Project costs such as mailing and moving <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any non-educational programs or anything over size limits per MSBA ○ The MSBA is here to support the Educational Program and not any extras (Field House, Swimming Pool, District Offices) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● These must all be a separate vote and have separate funding. The High School must always be the priority ○ The following spaces are subject to Size Limits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Auditorium shall be no more than 13,300 nsf (based upon upper limit of 1,000 seats) ● Gymnasiums – The district may choose to build a gymnasium and associated spaces, but in no event shall the gymnasium exceed 18,000 nsf. The MSBA will participate in a gymnasium of up to 12,000 nsf unless adjusted by the MSBA to increase teaching stations for enrollment and/or the educational plan ● Ares in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be at the <u>sole expense</u> of the district. 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Community support must be demonstrated</u> prior to MSBA approval of a district's proposed project scope and budget • The MSBA will exclude from its grant the cost of the total gross square foot ("gsf") above guidelines for these areas. Total NSF over MSBA limits x 1.5* grossing factor. This amount will not change over the term of the grant even if the bids come in at a lower amount. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Grossing factor to be determined at end of schematic design • M.Burton shared the drivers behind the "Lexington Priorities" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Geothermal – IDP ○ PV – IDP & Readiness for Stretch code ○ Battery Storage – IDP & Readiness for Stretch code ○ >25 EUI – IDP (equivalent to 30% better than ASHREA) ○ Passive House – Optional pathway in the base Stretch code (could eliminate and would follow the ASHREA pathway) ○ EV - 4% in IDP (2% per LEED); 50% readiness per Bylaw Chapter 135 Par 5.1.13 (10% readiness per Stretch code) <p>Other considerations: \$4M in hazardous materials - Bldg. and Site and soils</p> • Incentives Slide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton touched on the possible rebates that could be achieved from following some of the "Lexington Priorities". This value could be in the range of \$55 million • M.Burton noted that currently Lexington is spending \$1,15 million a year on utilities. If the goals such as all electric and net zero are achieved around \$1 million could be saved, for the desired 75-year lifespan of the High School. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Burton noted that Life Cycle Cost Analysis for the project has started which will provide more information on the costs associated with the operational aspect of the High School. This is being conducted earlier as it normally does not start till the Schematic Design Phase • M.Burton shared that if the project cost is \$600 Million with all repeats and the MSBA the total could be as low as \$405 Million plus operational savings being evaluated now. <p>Comments from the MSBA on the Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine said it is not a valid comparison to extend it to the mid-point when the other high schools are not. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that when the final GMP bids are used these are already escalated to the mid-point of their timelines • M.Cronin asked if the \$/SF for the all-electric is the delta between fossil fuel usage and the electric 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that this was based on Lexington having to purchase millions of dollars' worth of gear per Eversource ● K.Slavsky noted that with the Life Cycle Cost Analysis the added costs of the new building must go past the 75-year goal and overcrowding ● K.Slavsky noted that based on her experience in this field Dore & Whittier has created something that helps paint a wider picture based on historical data. Slavsky noted this is a simplified version of how the estimators are creating these values in the first place ● H.Min Sha noted that these estimated costs are based on the other schools that have been built. They are not higher than other schools unless we choose to buy more items for our schools. ● J.Pato noted that these costs are all in the same ballpark range because they were what was used to create the Lexington Costs ● C.Kosnoff noted that the money saved by the town for use on the project has already been paid by the taxpayers, so it is not a complete subtraction from the total value. Kosnoff noted that there has been a lot of questions about the operating cost so it will be useful to learn what incentives and costs will be required to maintain the building ● J.Himmel noted concerns with the last slide not having any disclaimers or footnotes as nothing is finalized and the numbers are not vetted fully. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that this is a good point, and it will be added. ● J.Pato shared that with construction costs increasing the state stretch code has recently changed two years ago which will add cost. ● J.Hackett noted how the analogy of Volkswagen to Ferrari was used as other schools compared to Lexington. Hackett noted a better verbiage would be an SUV to a Hybrid SUV as Lexington is not getting a "luxury" school ● K.Lenihan noted that the "Lexington Priorities" total \$82 million but the town could be receiving roughly \$55 million in rebates plus the yearly cost savings in utilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Levine noted that the money savings on utilities could be used for investments in equities to return roughly \$30-40 million. ● A.Levine agrees that the enrollment number is not based on the building being used but it could attract new families if a new high school is built. ● A.Levine noted that the costs of replacing the athletic fields should be separated out as it does not directly connect to the Education Plan ● A.Levine noted that to compare Lexington to other schools the \$82 Million in "Lexington Priorities" could be removed if they do not have it. ● K.Slavsky asked if the incentive slide could be shared in a per square foot method as that is how everything else is viewed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted it is around \$125/SF 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Slavsky shared that when comparing schools across time and scope should also include the operating costs of these schools that did not choose the priorities that Lexington desires. • K.Slavsky noted that the comment made earlier about purchasing early packages before seeing the final cost is not accurate as the GMP and the early package all come after the town vote so finances will already be finalized. • H.M Sha noted that he is a "fiscal hawk" and he assured the community that he is keeping an eye out for anything that is above what the students need. H.M Sha noted that the net zero cost of \$80-\$100 million sounds way off and if true will not be supported by him. H.M Sha noted that this value needs to be addressed and a separate meeting may be needed to discuss the select board meeting. It should also be discussed about what aspects may decrease enrollment. • J.Himmel thanked the project team for this but noted it will need refinement as with everything. Himmel noted that all the other schools have a much higher square footage per student and would like that looked into. • J.Hackett noted that for the overage on the MSBA space summary in the Special Education is over a decent amount <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Rice shared that this is a special case and can be reviewed with DECI to try and get this as eligible • J.Hackett shared that on paper they are on a 32% reimbursement rate and asked if due to the communities served by LABBBB having a higher reimbursement rate this can be factored into Lexington's rate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted that the MSBA will probably say no but it is always worth asking the MSBA. 		
11.6	<p>Upcoming Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ C.D Angelo noted that the adjacencies of the high school are being reviewed ◦ C.D Angelo noted that the July 8th meeting may be extra-long due to the agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Pato noted that July 8th will have a conflict due to the Select Board Retreat ◦ K.Slavsky noted that a meeting to share what the consequences of a "NO" vote will be and when this can be integrated into the timeline • June 26th Communications Working Group 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 8th School Building Committee July 10th Communications Working Group 		
11.7	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bob Pressman: He has heard geothermal on the fields and a support for the building on top. Will the D option have as costly of sitework as the fields will? Pressman has heard about schools dealing with active construction but has not heard anything about how to mitigate this for the students. Pressman heard 3 select board members share their concerns for building on the fields and how this may share what the community is feeling Dawn McKenna: She thanks the team for creating this slide show. On the project costs slide it should say estimated costs, the MSBA reimbursements and everything else should be placed below it. McKenna agrees with Joe Pato sharing how the funds saved by the town are taxpayer money and could have been used already. She agrees that a new high school will attract students and the team should ask the MSBA about LABB reimbursement. McKenna asked for each presentation to have the date/page number on every slide. Resident for 50 years: It will be good to see all the options before the final one is selected. He asked about structured parking for \$22 million and how many other schools have this? His suggestion is that once the square footage is known it will be easier to know the amount of parking required. Olga Guttag: She was involved in the construction of the renovation of 1990's high school. Her concern currently is that one proposal has a very high cost and that a less expensive option should be created. Geothermal can be very expensive to maintain as she has this in her house, and it can be very costly. 	Record	
11.8	<p>Reflection/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H.M Sha asked if we are allowed to build beyond 2,395 if the town absorbs all the cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Rice noted that we can build beyond this but can build for future flexibility. The classrooms could be made bigger but at the expense of the Taxpayer. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted he worked with a district that was not satisfied by their enrollment, but they pushed hard for more classrooms and it was not received well by the MSBA. K.Lenihan noted that this is what the central offices can act as K.Slavsky noted she has been thinking about if there is a cheaper option we could be studying and came to the conclusion that there is 		

	no other option as what we are studying now is the lowest cost option based on the required square footage. The only other option could be building a smaller new building for the overflow.		
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 – Absent , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Absent, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Absent, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy- Absent, Mark Barrett - Yes 6-0-0.</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.