

SCHOOL COMMITTEE / SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE 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: 3/18/24
Time: 12:00 PM
Prepared By: R. Rincon

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
			✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
			✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA

Action Item	Follow Up
9.5 – Send doodle poll for communications working group	DWMP

Item No.		
9.1	Call to Order & Intro: 12:04PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 12 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
9.2	Approval of February 26, 2024, March 4, 2024, and March 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to approve the 2/26/2024, 3/4/2024, and 3/11/2024, meeting minutes as amended by J. Himmel made by H. Sha and seconded by J. Hackett. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, 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. 10-0-0. 	Record
9.3	Design Update: Accept Proposed Space Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Lenihan highlighted that during the last School Committee meeting, both the space summary and the educational plan received approval from the School Committee. ➤ R. Park presented the space summary and requested that the School Building Committee also approve it. Several changes were made, all of which were explained. ➤ L. Finnegan explained that the MSBA wants a space summary that is only the school program (baseline). There are also “adders” (central office, new fieldhouse, pool, etc.). The reason why we are asking you to accept this today is because we need to be able to tell the cost estimators the baseline school is “X”. We will also ask the cost estimators to give a price for all the different variations. When we return the cost estimate to you, it will show the baseline cost of the school and the “adders”. For the entire course of this project the MSBA will require us to have a baseline only. ➤ L. Finnegan mentioned aiming to finalize decisions regarding the central office, fieldhouse, and pool by the second and third weeks of July. <u>Discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ H. Sha inquired whether the 85% occupancy is both standard. R. Park clarified that it's not about occupancy but rather the utilization of space. H. Sha questioned if there's room for flexibility. M. Rice responded, suggesting that there's some leeway between 85% and 100% that allows for flexibility. ➤ J. Hackett asked if adjustments could be made if the square footage remains unchanged. R. Park explained that minor edits and changes are typical and expected until the schematic design phase. ➤ H. Sha sought clarification on how today's vote would affect decisions regarding the fieldhouse and pool. R. Park noted that they understand the fieldhouse and pool decisions are pending for the building committee and the 	Record

town. Today's vote doesn't preclude decisions on items like a new fieldhouse or central offices.

- K. Lenihan requested clarification on whether the baseline school includes academic areas such as cores, arts, and music. L. Finnegan clarified that it encompasses spaces necessary to meet curriculum requirements.
- K. Slavsky summarized that the vote isn't solely about specific square footage for each area but rather reflects confidence in the process conducted by consultants and the school community. The extensive outreach and working sessions have been thoroughly communicated, instilling confidence in the work accomplished thus far.

Vote:

A motion to accept the proposed space summary made by H. Sha and seconded by K. Slavsky. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Malloy – Yes. J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes. 11-0-0.

Accept Site Development Requirements:

- L. Finnegan pointed out that SMMA had not received any comments. She mentioned a few missing elements, such as Canopy PV parking, which were subsequently added. Emphasizing that this is still a draft, she assured that amendments or changes are possible. Everyone will have another opportunity to review the complete PDP package when all sections are compiled. If any issues are noticed before submission to the MSBA, they should be brought to attention. The aim is to provide the package incrementally for easier digestion, considering that the complete PDP package will be a sizable 500–600-page document.

Vote:

A motion to accept the site development requirements made by H. Sha and seconded by J. Hackett. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Malloy – Yes. J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes. 11-0-0.

Review Concept Massing Alternatives:

- B. Black examined the conceptual massing alternatives and outlined that the table presented reflects SMMA's ongoing exploration of additional options aligning with the approved space summary's scale. There remains several weeks before a decision is required from Lexington regarding which option to advance. A total of 13 alternatives are under consideration, with those highlighted in red indicating new variations on options presented three weeks earlier.
- A. Code Upgrade

- B. Renovation/Addition
 - B.2 Addition/Renovation - Center Shift
 - Building Footprint: 246,800 sf
 - Floors: 2-4
 - Pros: more dense massing further from neighborhood. Preserves existing building G, and J concrete structures. Access to outdoors. Enclosed Courtyard.
 - Cons: Multi-phase construction. Displaces some athletic fields.
- C New Construction – One Phase
 - SMMA opted not to proceed with the C.3a option due to concerns regarding the challenging layout of outdoor spaces between the building elements. Additionally, the narrow configuration made it difficult to establish a clear sense of purpose and connectivity.
 - C.1 New Construction - Wide Academic Bar North
 - Base Educational Program
 - Renovated Field House
 - Floors: Varies – See Plan
 - Pros: Current building remains in use through construction. Solar Orientation. Access to outdoors. Generous entry at east
 - Cons: Fields separate from center rec complex.
 - C.1a New Construction - Wide Academic Bar North - 3 Stories
 - C.1b New Construction – 4 Story Academics
 - C.1c New Construction – 5 Story Academics
 - Reaching five stories will trigger high-rise code requirements.
 - C.2b - Wide Academic Bars West
 - Base Educational Program
 - Renovated Field House (Enlarged)
 - Building Footprint: 229,000 sf
 - Floors: 4
 - Elongated version of the existing field house.
 - Pros: current building remains in use throughout construction. Solar orientation. Access to Outdoors. 200m Track
 - Cons: Fields Separate from center rec complex. Monumental appearance, No direct field house connection.
 - C.4b - New Construction - Academic Village
 - Base Educational Program
 - Renovated Field House
 - Building Footprint: 232,750 sf
 - Floors: 4
 - Pros: Current remains in use throughout construction. Access to outdoors. Highly differentiated educational clusters. Enclosed courtyard
 - Cons: Fields separate from center rec complex. Mix of façade orientations.
 - C.5 - New Construction (New Shape)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Base Educational Program ▪ New 36,000 sf Field House ▪ Building Footprint: 206,000 sf ▪ Floors: 4 ▪ Pros: Current building remains in use throughout construction. Access to outdoors. Highly differentiated educational clusters. Enclosed courtyard. Direct connection to field house. 146m track. ▪ Cons: Fields separate from center rec complex. Mix of façade orientations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D.1 - New Construction - Phased with new Field House <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Base Educational Program ▪ New 72,000 sf field house ▪ Building Footprint: 279,000 sf ▪ Floors: 4 ▪ Pros: Current building remains in use throughout construction. Access to outdoors. Highly differentiated educational clusters. Enclosed courtyard. 200m track. ▪ Cons: Fields separate from center rec complex. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ B. Black emphasized that each scenario includes an 18,000-square-foot gym designed to support the school's curriculum. ➤ M. Burton mentioned that they are awaiting direction from senior MSBA leadership regarding the feasibility of constructing the field house, if it were to be a separate ballot vote and project, alongside the high school. The project team is seeking clarification before the upcoming community meeting on April 4th. L. Finnegan elaborated that the MSBA has stipulated their funding for a school project, prioritizing the school's construction. Any additional facilities, such as a field house, must be secondary to the school project, meaning construction cannot commence before the school project. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Favazzo questioned why the renderings showcased the field house but did not specify the locations for central offices and a pool. B. Black explained that further discussions are needed regarding the field house, while central offices can be incorporated into any scheme pending MSBA approval. ➤ J. Pato emphasized the need for accounting for a footprint accommodating 500 additional students in all designs. SMMA responded confidently, stating that expansion is easily achievable in any of the base schemes, with further exploration planned during the PSR phase. ➤ J. Malloy left the meeting at 12:53pm. ➤ A. Levine inquired about the rationale behind the 1-4 story progression in option C.2b. B. Black explained that the approach aimed to scale down the building towards the ground, potentially allowing for the occupation of terraces with outdoor programs. 	
--	---	--

- A. Levine raised concerns about separate votes for a new field house and a new school and recommended they not be scheduled on the same day to avoid design complications. K. Lenihan clarified that while the MSBA project requires its own vote, the select board decides how the debt exclusion ballot is structured. A. Levine stressed the importance of structuring the votes to ensure reasonable outcomes if the main vote passes and others do not.
- A. Baker complimented SMMA for capturing the idea of a quad in a new way with option C.5.
- K. Slavsky noted potential issues with the travel time and path length between classes in option C.5, suggesting the need for additional elevators.
- K. Slavsky discussed the balance between the building's monumentality and land use, highlighting concerns about the impact on the landscape and environment.
- K. Slavsky expressed concerns about the safety and visual appearance of learning spaces on terraces.
- H. Sha inquired about the red line references in option C.2b. B. Black explained that it signifies the connection via Muzzy Street, with plans for a symbolic building when approaching the school from that direction.
- K. Lenihan asked if scheme C.5 could include a renovated field house. SMMA confirmed it could.
- K. Lenihan asked if any high school has a 200-meter track. The project team responded no.
- SMMA mentioned the possibility of squaring off curves for cost-effectiveness.
- SMMA emphasized caution regarding stacking too many programs vertically to maintain efficiency without creating detrimental adjacencies.
- M. Burton asked about options with better site utilization or more fields. SMMA assured that all new construction options can achieve the same program, size, and field quality.
- D. Voss requested a rough order of magnitude (ROM) for solar capacity when combining parking lot and roof space. SMMA stated it would add up to the required 3.5 megawatts.
- J. Pato expressed confidence in option C.5 regarding students' travel time. He stressed that we should be considering the tall options early as they reduce foundation space and if expansion options are to increase height, building initially for tall building codes is preferable to retrofitting later. J. Pato would welcome any additional compact 5-story concepts.

Field House

- SMMA presented breakdowns of recent 200m track complexes, including prices and square footage.
- SMMA highlighted that for Middlesex League indoor track meets, all 12 boys and girls track teams compete simultaneously, totaling 24 teams, with approximately 30 athletes per team, resulting in 720 athletes at a meet, along with coaches and parents.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SMMA discussed the current availability of school field houses in the Middlesex League, noting that none currently feature 200m tracks. Some schools host indoor track meets despite not having regulation-size tracks. ➤ SMMA pointed out the advantages of a flat track, such as the ability to use the infield for other activities like a turf field or tennis courts, but acknowledged the drawback that races cannot run concurrently. ➤ The MIAA and IAAF have different standard indoor track specification requirements. ➤ SMMA reviewed additional private/out-of-state schools that have 200m field houses. ➤ Field House Approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing field house addition/renovation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200m track • 4 lane oval ○ Replace <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New stand-alone field house <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200m track • 6 lane oval ▪ New 18K NSF Gym incorporated into new/renovated main school building. ➤ M. Rice shared that there needs to be a clear separation between the gymnasium and field house. 	
9.4	<p>Community Meeting Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton presented a dollar-to-dollar comparison of previous projects completed before the onset of Covid, addressing concerns raised by the community regarding the costs of recently completed high schools. D+W will share this list once it is finalized. ➤ LHS Anticipated Project Timeline – Estimating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 2024 – Preliminary Design Program – Conceptual Cost Comparison ○ November 2024 – Preferred Schematic Report – Initial Estimate ○ August 2025 – Schematic Design – Estimate (Cost is finalized with MSBA, after this it cannot be modified) ○ November/December 2025 – Town Meeting & Debt Exclusion Votes ○ March 2026 – Design Development – Estimate ○ August 2026 – Construction Documents 60% - Estimate (Finish Design/Early Site) ○ January 2027 – Construction Documents 90% - Estimate ○ May 2027 – Guaranteed Maximum Price (Final Bid) <p><u>Discussion:</u></p>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Slavsky emphasized that the final cost estimate should encompass wetland relocation, temporary classroom facilities, and transportation if fields are not local. SMMA clarified that while temporary facilities will be accounted for in the project budget, the operational costs for the other requests will not be included. ➤ J. Himmel requested a Turner cost index. 	
9.5	<p>Communications Working Group Update (10 minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Dell Angelo mentioned that at the last meeting, they discussed the project website and reviewed recent updates. ➤ D+W would like to schedule another meeting to finalize the postcard to local neighbors for the upcoming community meeting. 	<p>Record</p> <p>DWMP</p>
9.6	<p>Upcoming Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Permanent Building Committee Meeting – March 19, 2024 Preview of estimate package, space summary review, massing study review ➤ SBC Coordination Meeting – March 25, 2024 ➤ SBC Coordination Meeting – April 1, 2024 ➤ Exterior and Interior Design Focus Group Meeting – April 1, 2024 ➤ MEP and Sustainability Focus Group Meeting – April 3, 2024 ➤ Community Meeting No. 4 – April 4, 2024 Focus Group report out, massing study update, alternatives review ➤ SBC Coordination Meeting – April 8, 2024 ➤ SBC Meeting #10 – April 22, 2024 Focus group update, review MEP/Sustainability, Design recommendations, refine MEP/sustainability requirements, taxpayer impact 	Record
9.7	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
9.8	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M Battite asked what has been the direct community outreach to the abutters of the park when soliciting feedback on the final building location, size, and field locations relative to the renderings as next steps? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M Burton noted they have begun the community outreach and have drawn a 1000-foot radius around the site. Dore + Whittier believes that an abutter only discussion should be held in April. We will also gather the abutters email addresses. As we get closer and closer to construction, there are the people who we think need an extra level of attention. ➤ B. Pressman asked have the recreational municipal employees and the recreation committee been shown the massings that were shown today with explanation about fields, and had the opportunity to ask questions? What are the rough estimates of the cost of the different field house sizes? Is the field house and swimming pool shown at Belmont High School rehabbed elements of the new high school that opened in 1970? L. Finnegan confirmed yes. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ S. McKenna shared that the field house working group will be submitting a presentation ahead of the next SBC meeting next week. He noted that limiting the field house for high jump, long jump, shotput is not ideal as they also practice weight throwing and pole vaulting. He also shared that their track and field team are 10% of the student population and want to provide a space for kids to grow together.➤ N. Finch noted she is a fan of the enclosed courtyard designs and hopes it would match the current size that is there today. She also commented that if parking spots are reduced it will overflow into the surrounding neighborhoods as seen in other areas of the town. She asked if the plan is for all teachers to have their own home classroom or rotate through the designated areas.	
9.9	Adjourn: 2:03 PM a motion was made by J. Hackett and seconded by H. Sha to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes. M. Cronin – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. J. Hacket – yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes. C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Sha – Yes. D. Voss – Yes. K. Lenihan – Yes. 10-0-0	Record

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Rachel Rincon

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.