

SCHOOL COMMITTEE / SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES



Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	4/22/24
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
			✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA

Action Item	Follow Up
Add the goal of the PDP (how it is very high-level and about the program) to the website FAQ	DWMP

Item No.		Description	Action
9.1	Call to Order & Intro: 12:01 PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 12 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record	
9.2	Approval of March 18, 2024, March 25 2024, April 1 2024, and April 8 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the 3/18/24, 3/25/24, 4/1/24, & 4/8/24 meeting minutes made by K. Slavsky and seconded by J. Malloy. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Lamb – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss – Yes, J. Malloy- Yes 12-0-0. 	Record	
9.3	Important Clarifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Office Included in all Preliminary Designs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan discussed that there are additional alternatives that will be presented for the schemes. The central office is included in every option (excluding the base school as the MSBA wants one just for the educational program). There are also four variations of field houses and two for pools, as it is known the MSBA will not provide any reimbursement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett asked the SBC whether they understand that the central office will be included in all alternatives evaluated K.Slavsky asked what the need or “drivers” were for a new central office J.Hackett stated there was significant review of the current district office including a space study. The review was able to lower the needed square space to 17,000sf from the existing space of roughly 50,000sf. Through the planning process they worked with a master planning group and got consensus on the concept and brought it to the SBC. 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• J.Hackett noted that one of the main drivers of this was a quid-pro-pro as the recreational department can now gain more field space. Also, as the district grows the need for athletic space will as well as seen in the pandemic.• M.Cronin noted that this building goes back to the Harington project. It was promised that the district office building eventually would be converted back to recreational fields. There is a formal project outlined in the capital planning pipeline that will be at the next town meeting.• K.Lenihan noted that the current school committee must made this decision this not the SBC.• C.Favazzo asked whether the MSBA will participate in reimbursement of the district offices?• M. Burton confirmed that the MSBA will not participate in the reimbursement of an admin building but is willing to have it in the high school project• A.Levine noted that the "promise" that it would be turned into a field does not matter as there is a proven need that more fields to be required as documented by the recreational department. As the high school construction is underway it will be even worse for several years. If central administration was going to stay in their current building it would still need expensive renovations.• M.Cronin noted that this is correct as the building was evaluated by the capital building department, it received an "F" grade in 2020 and thinks it will be much more effective to include this in the LHS project. Renovations would be in the \$16 million range. This includes only upgrades of windows, mechanical systems, the roof,		
--	---	--	--

	<p>etc., and would not be an upgrade to physically anything in the building. The \$16 million range was given back in 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.M. Sha noted this discussion is important and for the record to capture this as it has only been discussed in other committees. Due to the size and impact of this project, all relevant facts and discussions should be included in this committee’s documentary record. • H.M. Sha noted that the SBC should use caution when referencing previous and other meeting channels as not everyone is privy to this information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pros & Cons of Addition/Renovation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ SMMA has heard a lot of discussion of utilizing more of the existing buildings ◦ B.Black noted that they have created a summary of the pros/cons of all the different construction options ◦ L.Finnegan has noted that they have been working hard to consider what the community has said. SMMA is working on new options to reflect this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that as they progress towards SD and in PSR they will take the aspects that are best from all the Massing Study Alternatives and use them to create a design. ◦ L.Finnegan noted that the PDP is about making sure the program is captured and not the design. Everything is still supposed to be very high level as none of these designs are final. ◦ J.Pato asked if any of these new alternatives consume the existing parking fields instead of the current athletic fields as he has not seen anything like that layout so far. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted that they will explore this, but it will create challenges for the existing high 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>schools traffic flow throughout the construction process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Malloy noted he has heard that the abutters would prefer a building near Waltham Street rather than towards the fields with a concern of bright lights. ○ J.Malloy noted that they have been receiving various emails from residents saying that the wetlands should just be moved to create designs with less restrictions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan stated that wetlands are an extremely valuable resource for any site. Simply filling and moving a wetland is not a simple task. BVWs, or Boarding Vegetation Wetlands (simply put are wetlands that have drainage connections), must go through MEPA (Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act) and could easily be denied by the state. There will be designs that do not touch the wetlands as there have been multiple triggers already (Article 97 & MEPA). L.Finnegan also noted that with BVWs the replication rate is 2:1 so it will limit the space even more for the project. ○ C.Favazzio noted that some of these wetlands have already been relocated from the prior baseball field project ○ K.Slavsky asked for the goal of the PDP (the PDP is about making sure the program is captured and not the design. Everything is still supposed to be very high level as none of these designs are final) to be added to the FAQ 		
9.4	<p>Focus Group Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the MEP systems & Sustainable Design Focus Group Recommendations: 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Rice noted there have been 13 focus group meetings to date between the four groups. What we will be going through today is the MEP (Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing) & sustainability design recommendations. ○ M.Rice noted that the columns read (left to right), the initial questions or suggestion, the recommendation given to the SBC, and then either a Green (Given), Yellow (Needs more discussion), or Orange (Faces considerable challenges and needs detailed discussions) color coding ○ The following Focus Group Updates were presented by M. Rice ○ MEPS 2-4: These dealt with the life cycle of the building. What the cost for maintenance and replacement will be. The MSBA requires a 50-year LCCA, but Lexington will have a 75-year LCCA ○ MEPS 6: The project will consider emerging technology but will not go too deep into it ○ MEPS 22 & 23: These discussed massing and how space will be used in the school, what departments are located where and what parts of the building can be separated for after hour activities ○ MEPS 26-32: These suggestions also dealt with LCCA, it will be conducted during early during the PCR phase and updated throughout the SD, DD, & construction documents ○ MEPS 50 & 51: The suggestion of gaining a net-positive goal will be reviewed and a 10% target goal will be set going forward. However, this will pinch the square footage available as it will require more additional space for. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.Voss noted that the net positive goal is estimating the load of the building and not necessarily the total project. It would be good to estimate it with the expected load for charging EV as well as it could be 50% and not just 10% due to future growth. • SMMA noted that they agree and can start tracking this though but noted it is hard to 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>estimate 15 years down the liner as the grid could be cleaner in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Slavsky asked that a good chunk of time be reserved in a future meeting to review this topic and the electrical load in general. There is a lot of discussion needed regarding this and if we are planning for net-zero/positive in today's climate or the futures ○ MEPS 54-59: These suggestions dealt with the electrification of the bus fleet and charging resources. This has been shifted over to the orange category as there would be 82 total vehicles (32 buses & 50 vans) needing to be charged plus parking for all the drivers. This amounts to roughly 1.9 acres of space. When this is factored into all the other space needed for the other additions (Field House & Pool) to the project it faces a challenge. This is not suggestions that these items should not happen in the future but that it will be very difficult to include this on the site of the school <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Jimenez also noted this would place significant additions on the electrical infrastructure and the goals of net-zero/positive • D.Voss noted that it could save money in the long run and should be reviewed further as retrofitting the system after will be much more expensive ○ MEPS 60-65: These suggestions need discussions for where electrical bikes/storages would be located and review with the Fire Department would be needed due to associated fires. ○ MEPS 78: The goal of having 24/7 HVAC and humidity control is feasible for specific locations/rooms but not the building as a whole. Which locations and what requirements need to be finalized but it will be given attention going forward. 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MEPS 80-82: The geothermal wells (how many, how deep, where) are still being reviewed. There are two (2) test wells scheduled which will provide more information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Slavsky asked when we will know if geothermal will be feasible, so we do not take the process too far. • SMMA noted that these scheduled test wells for June should provide all the information required and the prior test bores on site should suffice for passing the environmental factors • D.Voss asked if the heating/cooling load will be finalized when we learn about the geothermal production levels and to review the life cycle as we do not want to have to provide supplemental heating/cooling to the system in 20 years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A.Oldeman noted that they will keep this in consideration and provide analysis reports but also noted it is hard to predict that far in the future. SMMA will have a much better idea of loads in SD. ○ MEPS 87: Selected spaces will be provided with back up HVAC power, but more discussion is required to decide where and what locations ○ MEPS 91: The programming for the theater will confirm the required power needs, it has been requested to provide more than is normal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Slavsky asked if we are trying to design a theater that has more electrical needs than the traditional high school? • M.Rice noted yes. ○ MEPS 94 & 95: A.Oldeman shared how it could be beneficial to have the heating and cooling produced in a centralized location to save refrigerant instead of piping it to each unit. Heat pumps have self-maintenance on cold days where they will run in reverse to defrost the condenser coil. This takes roughly 5 minutes and does not 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>normally affect Fan Coil Units but will disrupt an Air Handler Unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin notes that with some of the current heat pump systems Lexington has installed will shut down when it is very cold (-8 degrees as example). • A.Olderman stated that the current systems are rated to -13 degrees but to take this with a grain of salt and discuss the pros/cons when reviewing this system. • A.Olderman noted that the preference is ground source heat, but the air sourced heat options are being reviewed as the MSBA requires a review of at least three separate mechanical systems. • K.Slavsky noted that state financial incentives have moved towards geothermal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MEPS 102-106: These suggestions compare energy savings to the health of the building and note that air quality and health should be prioritized. Air quality sensors will be provided in the school building, the ppm target goal has yet to be decided. There were talks of 600ppm which is an extremely low and safe number, there are studies that show a number higher than this is plenty safe and healthy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine said there should be a feedback loop for the system to automatically turn on/off based on the CO2 levels. • A.Olderman noted that CO2 sensors are often provided room to room to allow the ventilation to vary based on the CO2 levels in the room. The high end of the load must be considered to confirm the system will be able to provide enough load. • J.Hackett shared that during the pandemic levels of 1000ppm were noted as safe levels • D.Voss asked if the 600ppm was shared from the focus group of from a health organization 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.Rice stated it was from the focus group ○ MEPS 119-122: The sustainability study outcomes are to be shared with the noted stakeholders in a transparent manner to promote collaboration. Proposed additional goals, beyond the givens. • Exterior and Interior Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ EID 5: Develop a study to compare expanding vertical instead of horizontal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel asked if the estimating being done is considering the vertical expansion and the required foundations. • L.Finnegan noted that the foundations that cost estimation was conducted for are all roughly the same due to the soil conditions whether it is a 4 or future 5 story building. • A.Levine asked if vertical expansion would be more disruptive to the high school. • B.Black noted that the goal of this suggestion is to review all aspects of future expansion such as this question and noted that the building below the expansion does not have to be vacated. ○ EID 12-14: The suggestion to consider building materials and the envelop regarding environmental impact and embodied carbon ○ EDI 15: This suggestion is for the design team to be creative with where the footprint for PV can be located ○ EID 16: Include operational energy constraints in overall decision-making and LCC analysis. ○ EID 18: provided the notion of balancing the upper classman's ability to leave the school during free periods with security. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will ultimately be a School Committee decision. ○ EID 22-24: discusses breaking apart parking for the specific department locations (i.e. athletic parking, theater parking, etc.). SMMA will strive for this, but it will come down to site constraints. 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ EID 33 & 34: Requests to consult with the community in regards for uses of the auditorium beside just the basic educational needs. It also discusses the need for an orchestra pit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan noted that currently they only have a recessed location for the orchestra and not a full hydraulic pit. ○ EID 38: Provided the notion of placing separate entrances for the arts and athletics as they both could have concurrent activities with large groups of the public ○ EID: 42: suggestions creating food appropriate spaces, but the additional requirements of cleaning and waste reduction must be considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted that it will be a larger undertaking but saw it completed successfully in Virginia ○ EID 45: All proposed flooring materials will be reviewed by facilities and maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin noted that linoleum tile is not the issue, but the joining method has been problematic in the past. 		
9.5	<p>Refine the MEP Systems Design Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topics were covered in section 9.4, no further discussion. 	Record	
9.6	<p>Upcoming Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4/29/24 SBC Coordination Meeting • 5/2/24 Community Meeting • 5/6/24 SBC Coordination Meeting • 5/8/24 Abutters Meeting • 5/13/24 SBC Coordination Meeting • 5/20/24 SBC Meeting No.11 • 5/28/24 SBC Coordination Meeting 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Himmel asked for a review of the schedule at the 4/29 meeting as there are only 5 weeks left in the PDP section. Himmel shared that we are at an interesting crossroads as there are a lot of options on the table and the review process could bring up new approaches that may require more time or rework of the schedule. 		
9.7	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Criteria Matrix: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett shared that the evaluation criteria matrix has been reviewed and edited multiple times so far M.Cronin noted that there was discussion of how each item on the matrix does not have items weighted as they are all equal. M.Burton noted that the lack of weight on the matrix was discussed with a smaller working group. Burton noted that the team is hopeful to use this tool, and this is an exercise that will create discussion. Nothing completed in the matrix will be locked in. M.Burton noted that the 4/29 meeting will be very robust as first estimated costs will be presented so it will be beneficial to have this tool approved and used. J.Himmel shared that the tool should be used and approved as is but in the future, it may be beneficial to weight the topics further down the line A.Levine noted he was part of the working group and how trying to assign weighted levels ahead of time would be problematic and the total number on the bottom would be removed to just show the pros and cons via the colors. K.Slavsky said there are criteria that is required and others that are just nice to have. Slavsky noted 	Record	

	<p>that balance between these may have to be a criteria section within itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ H.M. Sha said he supports this, but it needs to be clear that some problems cannot be solved via quantitative methods. 		
9.8	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.Kelley (24 Forrest St.): Has noted that the ability to build on the current fields should be an absolute no and does not think the community would support this. Kelley stated it is a fact that land cannot be replaced. Kelley stated that what he is witnessing is not suitable for Lexington. In the 1990's Kelley was on an SBC and said they focused on the 42-foot Worthen Road & bus circulation loop. Kelley said that as this progresses the team should not want to risk the project health with a no vote if the community is sensing that the project is not in line with their goals. • M.Sandeen (10 Brent Rd.): Emphasis on learning the heating and cooling load as early as possible should be prioritized. Sandeen also noted that the 600ppm level for air quality is called out in the IDP (Integrated Design Policy) as preferred and is not just a random comment from the focus group and that the Lexington Board of Health is in agreement with the 600ppm or less in schools. • D.Pursley (21 Turning Mill Rd.): Pursley wanted to second the previous comments about understanding why some options may be better than others. Pursley asked about the canceled abutters meeting and the requirements to define the abutters. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ C.Dell Angelo shared that this meeting was moved back to May 8th ◦ M.Burton shared that the abutter level was decided working with DPF, and they provided a 1000ft radius along with some additional address added due to local knowledge 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Pressman (22 Locus Ave): The recreation committee has recently provided a 22-page memo and asked if there is a plan to engage with them based on what they provided. Pressman also asked why there has not been a recreation lesion from the start of the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ R. DeAngelis: Following up on the previous comments/questions from the public and shared that the recreation committee worked hard on the report submitted to the SBC and would encourage the SBC to engage with the recreation committee 		
9.9	Adjourn: 1:58PM a motion was made by J. Hackett and seconded by M. Cornin to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes. M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes. C. Lamb – Yes, H. Sha – Yes. D. Voss – Yes. K. Lenihan – Yes, J. Malloy - Yes 12-0-0	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.