

MEETING MINUTES

Project: Lexington High School
 Subject: School Building Committee Meeting
 Location: Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)
 Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No:
 Meeting Date: 7/20/2023
 Time: 2:00 PM
 Prepared By: A. Place

	Name	Affiliation		Name	Affiliation
✓	Katheleen Lenihan*	SBC Chair and SC Member	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Michael Cronin*	SBC Vice-Chair and LPS Facilities	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Julie Hackett*	Superintendent of Schools	✓	Mike Cox	DWMP
	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager		Steve Brown	DWMP
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair	✓	Aidan Place	DWMP
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Project Manager	✓	Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair	✓	Jason Boone	DWMP
	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair	✓	Brad Dore	DWMP
✓	Andrew Baker*	Interim Lexington High School Principal			
	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager			
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative			
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative			
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee			
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee			
✓	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee			
✓	Marie Cavanaugh				
✓	Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer			

* SBC Voting Member

Item No.	Description	Action
1.1	Call to Order & Intro: 2:02 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 10 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
1.2	Dore + Whittier Introductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Lexington SBC Committee introduces themselves to the team. ➤ The Dore + Whittier team follows by introducing themselves. ➤ M. Burton begins with introductions of the D+W staff and consultants who are not present. Presents a slide that has the whole team directory with titles. 	Record
1.3	Previous Topics & Approval of May 04, 2023, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to approve the 5/4/2023 meeting minutes as submitted made by K. Slavsky and seconded by M. Cronin. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – Yes - M. Cronin – Yes J. Hackett - Yes - J. Pato – Yes – M. Barrett – Yes – C. Favazzo Jr. – Yes – A. Baker – Yes – H. Min Sha – Yes – K. Slavsky – Yes – D. Voss - Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, minutes approved 	Record
1.4	Designer RFS Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo reviews the RFS process and the designer procurement timeline. The RFS was due to the MSBA on June 6, 2023, then the MSBA comments were received on June 16, 2023. The ad was placed in the “Designer Services Section” at the Central Register on June 22, 2023. The Ad appeared in the central register on June 28, 2023. The Designer walkthrough was on July 12, 2023. The applications are due to the district on August 16, 2023, followed by applications due to the MSBA on August 24, 2023. DSP Applications review on September 12, 2023, with the DSP interviews on October 3, 2023. She presents a slide of all the firms that were at the walkthrough. ➤ J. Hackett talks about the project. Congratulates D+W on coming on board and wishes them good luck. ➤ C. Dell Angelo goes over the DSP process and the members from the town(Jim Malloy, Julie Hackett, and Mike Cronin). ➤ M. Burton discusses the DSP process and what it entails. M. Burton shares he expects a lot of proposals. ➤ J. Hackett asks if everyone will have a chance to review the proposals? M. Burton says yes, a link will be shared with all of the SBC members for them to review. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Dore talks to the process as well, and says it is important that the SBC members voice their opinion on who they prefer as the DSP does listen to the owner and values their opinion. ➤ J. Hackett asks about the interview process. M. Burton responds saying they will guide them through the process. ➤ C. Dell Angelo says the first meeting is to narrow down the choices to the top three, then the following interview is the selection. 	
1.5	<p>Schedule Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton reviews the schedule timeline slide and walks the SBC through the MSBA modules 1-9. The Lexington High School project is currently in module 2. The design team will come on board and begin learning as much as they can about the current building/existing conditions and educational program. Talks about the project budget and what the process entails in coming to a final number. ➤ M. Burton then talks to the Feasibility and Schematic Timeline. He says this will be roughly 2 years. PDP would begin in October 2023 and go until June 2024, the PSR would begin in May 2024 and go until January 2025. Module 4 would last roughly 10 months and would conclude with the SD submission going to the MSBA in October 2025. ➤ D. Voss asks about the start of the educational program and shares that it is a key milestone for the design. M. Burton says the educational program is a requirement to be submitted with the PDP. ➤ A. Levine asks about MSBA imposing constraints on schedule and what happens if they need more time? M. Burton responds that there is a constraint in module 5 (120 days after the MSBA approves schematic design submission). Module 9 is 3 years after the job is over. ➤ J. Hackett asks about the MSBA stating that this phase should be 18 months and D+W has it as it at 2 years. M. Burton explains this project is going to have a lot of input from the community, which will take time. J. Boone follows by saying they want a lot of quality input, and that process cannot be rushed. The MSBA mandated a 12-week window from PDP submission to PSR submission, due to districts rushing through this before and 18 months is the average window but some projects take more/less time depending on its complexity. Says when they move officially into module 3 there will be a feasibility study agreement that has a time limit and expires which is typically a 24-month period. However, districts have petitioned the MSBA to receive more time and they have given it before. B. Dore says it is better to take a little time to make sure they get it right and receive all the input needed. 	Record

- C. Lamb asks if the town meeting vote is to approve a debt exclusion? Says his understanding is the FY25 appropriations on the order of \$8 million and the FY26 appropriations on the order of \$12 million. Asks if the referendum vote would become between the two appropriations and not after. M. Burton responds saying he agrees and would like to figure out who the group is to figure out the process. C. Lamb says they don't want to take on eight digits of tax levy debt without a debt exclusion in hand knowing they can convert that tax levy to exclude the debt. He suggests starting with the Town Manager and C. Kosnoff.
- K. Lenihan says the best time for having a debt exclusion vote/campaign is October/November for making it work logistically. She also thinks about the timeline in terms of getting students into the building which is currently inadequate for the education they provide. The longer they take the more the students they have going to a high school in a building that is inadequate.
- K. Slavsky says she is interested in having the kids in the school in a timely manner. She has worked in communities where they had to repeat the feasibility phase due to not adequately involving the community and failing the vote. She stresses the importance of giving time for community input. Says the better the community process the better off they will be.
- J. Hackett clarifies that they included appropriation 2 and 3 on the timeline with the help of finance. M. Burton says yes, he has worked with DPF in getting the information. The design team will be losing money on the appropriation due to 2 years of work and the funding being inaccurate. Whether they need 1 or 2 appropriations, they can flesh out later. He thinks it is worth having discussions. M. Cronin says that the three-month window is critical for key move in dates for the school.
- M. Barrett says they had three appropriations for Hastings and Estabrook.
- M. Burton asks about community input and poses having a community meeting in September. The community meeting would be a D+W introduction, along with a review of the MSBA process. This can set the tone for project and expectations over the next two years. We could then have another community meeting in November when the designer comes on board, to introduce them and present an updated timeline to the community.
- C. Dell Angelo says they have found that hybrid meetings have been successful in reaching a large audience. Also sending out flyers to abutters, posting on the website, senior centers, and wherever they can to get the word out to everyone.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Lenihan says the third or fourth week in September would work for a community meeting ➤ D. Voss asks if D+W will pull together a RACI chart to review the input from the different groups? M. Burton says yes that was the plan and mapping out when they would like to see each of the groups shown on the slideshow. They would see most of the groups at the beginning of the PDP, then again at the end of PDP. Then go back again during the PSR to refine the preferred option. D. Voss would like to see the RACI chart the team puts together. ➤ K. Slavsky says there will be two types of input from the public. One being the public giving their input without any framework yet for the project. Getting to hear that in September is key. The other kind of input is when the team gives the public something to look at design wise. She thinks it's too soon to ask about the timeline for those meetings due to needing a designer. M. Burton says if they were to do the September/ November meetings they would do two more after this that would coincide with the PDP and PSR submissions. He sees there being a minimum of four meetings. K. Slavsky asks if they will introduce public comment? M. Burton says yes there can be and K. Lenihan mentions there is public comment at the end of today's agenda. ➤ C. Dell Angelo says there can be forums with staff or with a group for community engagement. The consultant can use a program to facilitate what matters to the staff and engage them during the meeting. J. Hackett emphasizes the importance of all voices being heard, not just the loudest ones. 	
1.6	<p>IDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Schaffner goes over the Lexington IBD (Integrated Building Design). There are three tiers of requirements for sustainability and energy they will see on this project. The first being the state energy code and Lexington has approved the opt in codes. The next tier, which is the MSBA code requirements, followed by the most stringent tier being Lexington's own goals being the IDP. ➤ J. Pato says that the MSBA has added additional financial incentives for the sustainable and green design. M. Burton says it is very likely they will achieve the full 4% with this project. ➤ J. Boone mentions the new advisory stating if there is any third party funding, that will impact the grant. ➤ C. Schaffner discusses the IBD checklist shown in the slideshow. Says the new MSBA requirement is meeting the stretch code green community standards and be LEED silver. They can get an additional 3% 	Record

	<p>funding by meeting the Opt-in Specialized Code. Also, an additional 1% for measures around indoor air quality. His opinion is they will be able to get all 4% due to the Town of Lexington's policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ H. Min Sha asks about the percentage of project cost or the grant? M. Burton responds saying it starts out at a base reimbursement at 31% then add that 4% to it and an additional 1.8% for maintenance. Then talks about effective reimbursement which due to ineligible costs makes the reimbursement rate much lower. M. Cronin says Hastings was a 34.8% reimbursement rate but in the end was closer to 24-25%. M. Burton says the MSBA edited the 3011 used to calculate the rate, so they will run some models on it to forecast it. ➤ C. Schaffner continues with more energy code in the slideshow. Talks about the Opt-in code that requires them to follow an all electric building which they have at Hastings. They also have the option for a mixed fuel pathway which allows for future electrification. He doesn't think this aligns with what Lexington wants to do. Shows a slide that talks about Net Zero and Low EUI buildings and the incentives for it. ➤ D. Voss wants input from certain groups when it comes to this topic of energy and code. Says the goal (if there is an opportunity) is to achieve above net zero in order to give excess energy to other facilities. He also asks how they integrate other issues such as bus parking given in next 10 years there will be a massive mobile fleet storage. Says other towns are struggling now that they have these big batteries on campus and now are trying to figure out how to retrofit. C. Schaffner responds saying those are all good points and will make sure they will review them. ➤ C. Favazzo Jr. asks if the Designer RFS had the IDP code compliance attached to it. M. Burton says yes it was. 	
1.7	<p>Educational Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton talks to the educational program. Says the designer will come in to help further refine the educational program. Wants to use this time from now until the designer comes on board to refine it for when the designer comes on board. ➤ J. Hackett says they have a draft of the educational program that may need to be refreshed but they have started it. Also want to collaborate with the community on it. ➤ M. Burton continues with the educational program. Saying it is a critical document. The educational program drives the size of the school. The designer will assist with putting together this document. Shows the 	Record

	<p>standard write up that the MSBA provides on the slideshow regarding this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Boone says that the plan should be looking as far into the future as they can with the project. How well they vision into the future will impact the building that they create. Emphasis on not trying to just solve the issues of the past but to look to the future as well. ➤ M. Burton shows a slide regarding what some other schools have done throughout the country for examples. The links are included in the slideshow. 	
1.8	<p>Goal Setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo talks about the goal setting process. Says this is helpful in establishing goals that are used to help with decisions down the road. D+W will send out a questionnaire regarding goals to get feedback on what the committee wants. ➤ M. Burton says when gathering this data, they do find common threads to create a mission statement of sorts for the project. 	Record
1.9	<p>Website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo talks to the project website. Knows they already have a website dedicated to the project. She and A. Place will be reviewing the website and come back with any questions. Meeting Minutes/Agendas/Presentations will be posted to the website. It is evolving and can be formatted how the committee sees fit. ➤ M. Burton says they are reviewing the website and will come back with any comments/questions. 	Record
1.10	<p>Article 97:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton talks about the parkland that falls under Article 97. They had an initial discission with the town council. Town council said any change in purpose requires 2 things: first being 2/3 town vote, then after that 2/3 legislative vote. The Town Council says it takes about a year to get through legislative process. The next steps are to set up a time to review the timeline for the project and Article 97 process. Also, to begin community outreach. ➤ B. Dore says the sooner the better to address this process. 	Record
1.11	<p>Lessons Learned from Hastings and LPD:</p>	Record

	➤ M. Burton says M. Barrett has started a spreadsheet with lessons learned and will report out on when it is complete.	
1.12	Upcoming Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton goes over the next meetings. Says they want to establish having meetings for the third Thursday of each month. Also aiming for an 11:00am start on the meetings. Says they are thinking of September 14th for the SBC Meeting No. 3 and the first community meeting. ➤ K. Slavsky comments that the daytime meeting is going to be tough to get public comment. It is not common to have these meetings in the middle of the workday and would like to see it closer to the end of the day. M. Burton says that they may want to think about a night meeting, and they are flexible in that regard. J. Hackett says the thinking was to have it to close to lunch time and have it hybrid so people could join remotely but, they will take a look and see what will work best for people. ➤ The November 16th SBC has been moved to November 30th. 	Record
1.13	Q&A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Slavsky asks about the topic of school security and would like to request it be added as an agenda point for future meetings. 	Record
1.14	Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
1.15	Public Comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None 	Record
1.16	Adjourn: 3:40 pm A motion was made M. Cronin by and seconded by K. Slavsky to adjourn the meeting, Discussion: None. Passes 10-0.	Record

Sincerely,
DORE + WHITTIER
Aidan Place
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.

