

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	09/30/24
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
19.4	Add in 3D rendering of all required PV square footage	D.Voss	SMMA
19.7	Send out doodle-poll for November 4 th meeting	J.Hackett	J.Hackett

- 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
19.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:01 pm	Record
19.2	Approval of September 16 - 2024, September 23 - 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the September 16 - 2024, September 23 - 2024 Meeting Minutes made by J.Pato and seconded by M.Barrett Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Absent, 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 – Yes, J. Malloy - Absent, M. Barrett - Yes 10-0-1.	Record
19.3	Communications Working Group Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Pato noted that at the last working group it was noted that there was concern with 10/15 community meeting as the costs would be too fresh and the thought was to delay. Pato also noted that the working group continued to progress with the videos. M.Burton noted that the new date proposed would be 10/30 M.Burton noted that the first draft of the existing conditions videos will be here this afternoon J.Hackett asked if anyone is opposed to changing the community meeting date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no objections M.Burton noted that originally the plan was to vote for two options today but committee members noted that they would like to see the costs prior so this meeting will be a straw poll vote with the actual vote at the 10/15 SBC meeting 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Barrett wanted to confirm that the 10/16 abutter meeting is still standing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted that yes, the abutter 10/16 meeting will be kept as is • K.Slavsky asked during the straw poll vote today she hopes more time can be kept sharing the reasoning of the people's preferences • C.D. Angelo noted that it was also discussed for the 11/12 meeting to vote on the Preferred Schematic Report how much time is needed and what part of the day • A.Levine asked if the cost estimates coming will reflect the detailed phasing and modulars that have been shown <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted he does not expect the cost per square foot to change but he does think the durations and phasing to have added cost. ◦ L.Finnegan confirmed that the estimators do have the detailed phasing plans that have been shown and discussed • K.Slavsky noted that the working group had discussions about the thought exchange survey and noted that the results are not being taken in isolation and the group knows that this is not a perfect representation of the towns view <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ J.Pato noted that they have gotten messages from the public thinking that the thoughts from the community were directed form the SBC, but these are from the community 	
19.4	<p>Discussion: "New Construction on the Fields"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Krafian reviewed the current PSR timeline progress update (Page 7) • B.Black reviewed the updated PSR Construction Alternative Summary (Page 10) • J.Hackett asked what the average cost of modulars is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that each classroom is around \$400K but that changes with the more you have as they share utilities and spaces that reduced the overall cost • B.Black reviewed the option C.5b "Bloom" option and also reviewed two new locations for a large (72,000sf) fieldhouse on the "Bloom" option (Slide 14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ K.Slavsky noted that she thinks this mitigates a lot of the concerns. She also noted that 1 phase is not enough for any of the options as there is the second phase of demo and rebuilding the fields ◦ D.Voss noted that the representation of the solar canopies should be shown at a level where it actually meets the requirements as it will impact the views and circulations. He noted has he has requested this information in the past <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted they are working on updating the numbers and they are working with the site team to find where these would be located, and they will have one option showing the renderings but they are not ready for this meeting and they will not be shown on all 6 options. • D.Voss noted he does not know how he would make a decision without having these shown on the renderings • L.Finnegan noted it is a lot of work to update these renderings. She noted that she plans to have these ready for the next meeting as there are a lot of changing dynamics every week and the team is working very hard ◦ J.Himmel noted that just because we are building new it does not mean that construction will not be close to the existing school as it will still disrupting to 	Record

	<p>the students. Himmel noted that the phasing will also play a large roll, and he thanks SMMA for the work of adding details to each option. Himmel noted he visited the knoll on site and thinks that that space could be used if the tress were not just cut down but even relocate some. Himmel asked if they choose bloom could they do it in phases and move it over.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that doing this would move it to phased-in-place construction and not new which is not being priced currently. She noted they did review the revised bloom option that J.Himmel sent over and it is a very challenging plan which would require a lot of changes. • M.Dowhan noted that they would only be able to replicate 7 pf the 8 fields • J.Himmel noted he understands but just wanted it to be reviewed as this is the time to do it and he is not advocating it and noted it can be put to rest now • L.Finnegan noted they will look into the knoll and using this space as it is now learned that the area is not sacred and can be developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ H.M. Sha asked if among the options in the C category they have looked at moving some of the to the east and are these the only ones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted the current C.5b is the only one ○ C.Kosnoff noted she is leaning towards C.5b, but she is concerned about the curves and if they will be more expensive as noted before. Kosnoff one of the things she likes about the new construction is the lack of disruption to the students and she views that it moving closer to the school is a negative not a positive even though it saves one extra field. Kosnoff noted she does not think she is a fan of the raised courtyard as she heard they are hard to maintain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted there a different way to do curves in construction and they would look for a way to do it in a cost-effective way and asked the estimators to provide important. Black noted they have looked at ways to conduct this with fewer curves or just maintain the important ones ○ J.Hackett though there were three fields being preserved not 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Dowhan noted yes, the third is a combination of the two ○ J.Hackett noted she really loved the curve when visiting Waltham ○ J.Pato asked if the curve walls proved additional security in regard to line of sight down the hallways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted the current idea is to move away from long straight hallways whether the building is curved or not ○ J.Himmel noted he went on the Waltham trip last week and he noted that the exterior food court was very dynamic and would be good for the SBC to understand a fully executed space ○ A.Baker asked that for those who saw Waltham was the entrance to note if it felt like a vibrant student space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel noted they got to see the changing of classrooms and the sectioned pods. Himmel noted he likes the "Bloom" option because it opens the floor plan up for any adjacency program and vertical circulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan asked for any comments on the remaining new construction options 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C.Favazzo noted he thought they would spend more time talking about the field house layouts. Favazzo asked if they could do the full size track renovation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan noted yes but there is not much room for anything else in there ○ M.Barrett asked if the "Braid" option could move around to stay off the same fields as C.5b ○ J.Hackett asked about the Article 97 impacts for each New Construction option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan noted there will be Article 97 impact for each of the options to the same degree ● J.Hackett asked for a straw poll and for someone to suggest which option should be moved forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky suggested that they should keep the C.5b "Bloom" option as it solves the most problems and will even be preferred if they could get the others to solve some of the same options. Slavsky also noted that using modulars to solve overcrowding is not exclusive to the Phased-in-Place options and could be used in the New Construction options ○ H.M. Sha noted that the "Bloom" option is the most future proof due to the 3 curved sections and the flow of people in the building. Sha noted it also has the best civic visuals due to the curves which are worth some extra money to an extent. ○ C.Kosnoff noted she would be comfortable with eliminating the "Braid" option and would like to see the costs prior to getting rid of the "Branch" option. ○ C.Favazzo noted that in this current phase it is a space study and none of this is a design. He noted he is in favor of the modified "Bloom" option. Favazzo noted they could even go further to try and find ways to conduct the geothermal wells off the fields ○ J.Himmel noted it would be interesting to explore how the "Bloom" option expands in more depth. He noted at some point they will end up with too big of a school and wonders how big is too big. Himmel noted he prefers the C.5b "Bloom" option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● J.Hackett noted she currently thinks they are already in the too big category and if they ever do reach the 3000 mark, they would need to look for other creative options ○ J.Pato noted he prefers the "Bloom" option but does not want to rule out the "Branch" option in case there is a large cost delta ○ J.Hackett noted she is also in favor of C.5b ○ M.Barrett noted he is in favor of keeping both C.5b and C.1d for the time being till costs ○ A.Baker agreed with the M.Barrett and J.Pato. Baker noted that it is important to remember how the building makes you feel impacts how you learn. He noted there should be a balance of great design and cost-effective spaces ○ A.Levine noted he prefers the C.5b "Bloom" option ○ D.Voss noted currently he is in favor for "Branch" and "Bloom" and would like to see the PV renderings ● J.Hackett noted that currently based on the straw poll C.5b and C.2d are still on the table to C.2b being removed, although not officially 	
--	---	--

19.5	<p>Discussion: “Phased-in-Place Option”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T.Faust reviewed the phased-in-place options including the addition/renovation (Slide 25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.1 "Quad" (Slide 28) ○ C.Favazzo asked if every phase would have to maintain both the new systems and the old systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that yes both would have to be maintained, and the estimators will be accounting for this cost ○ A.Baker noted that with respect to the dead corridors the Fire Department will have to revisit the plan and egress will be more difficult <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T.Faust noted that yes this will be more difficult but the code regarding egress will always be met ○ K.Slavsky asked if the modulars in the estimates account for the need to alleviate the current overcrowding and the lost space during the construction. Slavsky noted that even rooms that are occupiable but share walls with construction might need them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that some of the overcrowding will be helped as they are larger classrooms, but it is not included to help the current overcrowding • K.Slavsky asked what would happen to the shared spaces • L.Finnegan noted that there will be no temporary accommodations, but they will do the best to schedule this for the least disruptive part of the year. • K.Slavsky noted that transportation costs will need to be included also for spaces lost ○ J.Hackett asked why the duration changed on these options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Burton noted he has observed confusion about the durations. Burton noted that with the new options everyone will be moving in the building in 3 years, but the total length will be 4 years. In the phased-in-place option they are much longer but you do get to start moving into some of the new spaces much earlier than the end date. Burton noted that there is a large level of complexity involved in this though • A.Baker asked what could go wrong with the phased construction • M.Burton noted that some examples are temp life support systems often go off and sometimes the old MEP systems conflict with the new options. • J.Himmel noted that you need to get multiple Temporary Certificates of Occupancy • L.Finnegan noted Construction Managers are especially important in addition/renovations to help with the phases and timelines. She noted that with the shorter phases delays can affect the project with more impact than New Construction • M.Burton noted that with the extension of construction there is a higher chance to see greater technology changes 	Record
------	---	--------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett brought this up because she is hearing people say how the add/reno are only a year longer and that is not true. ○ K.Slavsky noted that as a professional in this space she has no faith in the current schedules for addition/renovation and she will not until there is a construction manager on the team. She noted that it may be a good guess but there is a lot of variables that could impact it down the line. ○ J.Hackett noted she reviewed the last SBC meeting where it was discussed about how complicated the renovation aspect would be, and they do not seem like something she supports so she is leaning towards the D.2 option but now is seeing how much longer the duration is ○ B.Black noted that for the addition/renovation it is important to compare the challenges and what they provide ○ H.M. Sha asked if it is true that in B.1 and B.4 the floors will not line up properly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted that yes this is true ○ B.4 "Figure 8" (Slide 34) ○ J.Hackett asked what happens when they lose their common spaces and cafeterias and etc.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted they can keep modulares to make them into shared spaces. She noted the kitchen is different and they would have to look into outsourcing or creating a temporary one ○ M.Burton wanted to clarify that each classroom would be roughly around \$400k and the MSBA will not take part in reimbursing any of that cost ○ C.Favazzo noted that in the renovation/addition options abatement and mitigation will play a big roll and people need to keep that in mind. He noted that the high school is a sweet spot for dealing with this <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that they do know where all of this exists, and they have completed that survey. She noted they do this often, but it does change perception when people see these teams wearing the all-white suits. • C.Favazzo noted they "think" they know here it is but it could be much more • A.Baker noted if the cost will be the same between this in new construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted yes but there will be more costs for the phases as they will have to remobilize ○ D.2 "Weave" (Slide 40) ○ J.Himmel asked that are slide 41 for phase 1 if they know the square footage for that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Krafian noted it would be about 104,000 square feet ○ J.Hackett noted she will conduct a straw poll vote for the phased-in-place options and asked if anyone wants to choose one or remove two of them 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Pato noted he has been trying to balance the impacts and challenges along with what they will get for the next 75 years. Pato noted he thinks that both B.1 and B.4 are nonstarters. He thinks that D.2 is the only viable one <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett noted she agrees H.M. Sha noted that the B options are a mess for construction but will also be a pain for teachers and staff to use for the next 75 years A.Baker agrees M.Barrett agrees that renovating the options is worth it C.Favazzo noted he agrees, and the money should be spent on the school and not logistics J.Hackett noted she talked with M.Cronin and K.Lenihan and they also agree J.Himmel noted he agrees as D.2 would have the least disruption out of the three C.Kosnoff agrees K.Slavsky agrees with the comments but noted she sees a lot of value in the process they took to evaluate the renovation options D.Voss agrees A.Levine noted he agrees and is on board with D.2 being the least awful of the three options J.Hackett noted the consensus is to remove B.1 and B.4 options from the Phased-in-Place and keep D.2, although not officially 	
19.6	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> O.Gutttag: Olga thanks the SBC and team for incorporating the comments they get. She noted the MTBA zoning is creating lots of units that may impact the population and thinks a phased option will be beneficial to see how it grows. She asked if the overcrowding will be dealt with modulars immediately or not till the school is finished. D.McKenna: She noted she thought she would want to keep one of the B options but after today she does not think it will be a good idea to keep any. She noted that the Phased-In-Place options are more about keeping the fields intact and not the cost. McKenna asked if geo-thermal wells are required to meet all electric goals and if they could be added under park drive instead of the fields. She wants to thank J.Hackett for asking the questions about how to keep the field house in PSR, she asked what the requirements are from the MSBA to keep the large field house 	Record
19.7	Reflections/Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.D. Angelo asked for clarification on the 11/12 meeting 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Himmel noted that having other committees there would be beneficial but not on the day of the vote ● H.M. Sha wanted to note that the SBC is well aware of the enrollment issues and noted that they fought hard to get the increase once already. He noted that nationally there is a decline in high school enrollment. ● J.Hackett proposed to extend the coordination meeting on November 4th to four hours to have more discussion with the SBC and other committees ● M.Burton noted they should keep the longer four-hour SBC meeting on 11/12 and can always end it early if conclusions are reached. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Hackett proposed a longer meeting on the 4th with a shorter on the 12th 	
19.8	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:07 was made by A.Baker and seconded by J.Pato</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Absent, 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, M. Barrett - Yes 9-0-0.</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.