

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	07/08/24
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		Jason Boone	DWMP
✓	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager	✓	Jacob Greco	DWMP
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Manager	✓	Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA
✓	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair	✓	Rosemary Park	SMMA
✓	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA
✓	Andrew Baker*	Interim Lexington High School Principal	✓	Brian Black	SMMA
✓	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager	✓	Erin Prestileo	SMMA
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative		Anthony Jimenez	SMMA
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative		Martine Dion	SMMA
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee	✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee		Michael Dowhan	SMMA
✓	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee			
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment			

	Andy Oldeman				
✓	Kelly Axtell	Assistant Town Manager			

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
11.4	The PSR timeline shown should be labeled “MSBA Timeline Requirements” and the SBC shall create a “Lexington Timeline”	J.Hackett	The SBC
11.5	A summit shall be held with all stake holders regarding the Field House & Pool Decisions	J.Pato	The SBC
11.8	Find out if the MSBA has room on their April Board Meeting agenda for Lexington’s PSR Submission	J.Himmel	Dore & Whittier

Item No.		Description	Action
11.1	<b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:01pm		Record
11.2	<b>Approval of June 24 - 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A motion to approve the June 24, 2024, Meeting Minutes made by M.Cronin and seconded by M.Cronin.</li> <li>Discussion:</li> </ul> Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Absent, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Absent, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H. Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Absent, <b>J. Malloy</b> - Yes, <b>Mark Barrett</b> - Yes 10-0-0.		Record
11.3	<b>Review Educational Adjacency Diagrams</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A.Baker reviewed the Adjacency Meetings from Lexington’s view <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baker noted that a large goal of this was to share and review the educational criteria</li> <li>Classroom configurations that promote collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacencies of different curricular areas for a wide variety of interdisciplinary learning</li> </ul> </li> <li>Flexibility to organize school in different ways:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● i.e.: mall learning communities, Schools within a School, Freshman Academy) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Accessibility to and shared opportunities of Innovation Labs/ Makerspaces</li> <li>○ Organizational and character-defining elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Library / media center (centralized)</li> <li>○ Student dining (centralized)</li> <li>○ Auditorium</li> <li>○ Outdoor student space similar to existing LHS Quad</li> <li>○ Active hallways</li> <li>○ Outdoor learning opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● At the ground</li> <li>● On elevated floors / rooftop</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Ability to reduce impacts of open campus</li> <li>○ Promotes student agency</li> <li>○ Ease of wayfinding</li> <li>○ Reduced student corridor passing time</li> <li>○ A.Baker noted this experience has been very eye opening for him to see the challenges that each option has.</li> <li>○ A.Baker noted that no matter what massing option is chosen there will most likely be more program than can fit in the new Lexington High School</li> <li>○ A.Baker noted it has been very exciting to look at all these options and how the maker spaces will be used to share spaces throughout the school and connect different programs</li> <li>○ A.Baker noted to keep in mind that these are still at a massing level, and these are not design or floor plans. These are ways of thinking where spaces will go and what they will be nearby.</li> <li>○ J.Himmel asked what "promote student agency means" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A.Baker noted it means to enable students to demonstrate their learning and how they can choose their own course of study</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● R.Park and B.Black reviewed the <a href="#">Educational Adjacency Diagrams</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R.Park noted that these meetings are very helpful because although the project team is an expert of designing high schools the Lexington School Department are experts on Lexington</li> <li>○ R.Park noted how a goal of this exercise is to visualize the space summary and how each program fits and interacts with the other programs</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li></ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R.Park showed the whole school bubble diagram and explained how it shows the rough correlation between all the different programs and locations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The epicenter of the diagram is the cafeteria and dining along with the Media Center nearby. Everything else radiates around it</li> <li>● This bubble diagram is used as a guide to place program in the massing studies</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ R.Park noted that the central offices will have their own dedicated entrance and elevator, so visitors do not interact with the students or school</li> <li>○ R.Park noted a large goal of this was to hit Lexington's desire for cross-department ability and connection of program throughout the school</li> <li>○ R.Park noted that there is a lot of programs that wants to be on the first floor but there is only a finite amount of room and some items had to be prioritized</li> <li>○ R.Park noted that the gymnasium has been located on the 2nd floor in most options. Both locations have pros and cons</li> <li>○ B.Black highlighted some of the major points of the massing study adjacency diagrams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B.Black emphasized that these are not floor plans</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Option C.1d - "Branch" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The solar orientation is very good on this option</li> <li>● Each option provides a multi-story open entrance</li> <li>● Outdoor courtyard on the 3rd level</li> <li>● Large group instruction rooms can be moved around</li> <li>● Media Center at Level 2</li> <li>● Gym at Level 2</li> <li>● Stacked Innovation Labs adjacent to Dining Commons</li> <li>● Outdoor courtyard at Level 3</li> <li>● Visual Art at Level 3</li> <li>● Gym may not be close to both main entry AND Field House</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Option C.2b - "Braid" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Gym at Level 2</li> <li>● Media Center at Level 3</li> <li>● Distributed Innovation Labs</li> <li>● Outdoor terraces at ends and middle of academic wings</li> <li>● Visual Arts at Level 2</li> <li>● Detached from Existing Field House</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Option C.5b - "Bloom"</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Media Center at Level 2</li> <li>● Gym at Level 1</li> <li>● Distributed Innovation Labs adjacent to Dining Commons</li> <li>● Outdoor courtyard at Level 3</li> <li>● Visual Art at Level 3</li> <li>● Allows Gym to be near Field House</li> </ul> <p>○ Option D.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Gym at Level 2</li> <li>● Media Center at Level 3</li> <li>● Stacked Innovation Labs adjacent to Dining Commons</li> <li>● Outdoor courtyard at Level 3</li> <li>● Visual Art at Level 3</li> <li>● Gym may not be close to both main entry AND Field House</li> </ul> <p>○ Option B.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Media Center at Level 2</li> <li>● Gym at Level 2</li> <li>● Distributed Innovation Labs</li> <li>● Roof Terrace at Level 3</li> <li>● Visual Art at Level 3</li> <li>● Gym adjacent to Field House</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● B.Black noted that this was a first pass at the ardency diagrams and more detailed/different versions will be created in the future.</li> <li>● J.Himmel noted it was very exciting to see this and how the SBC can ask questions as there will be a lot <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L. Finnegan noted they can create a document where questions can be asked and then the team will report out.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J.Himmel noted that one of the best parts of Somerville was the center "concourse" and how you can see a large amount of program when you enter. Himmel asked if the central space goes into the gross or the net square footage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L. Finnegan noted it will fulfill the need no matter what it is called and will be reimbursable</li> </ul> </li> <li>● C. Favazzo asked if the central office space was included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ B.Black noted it was labeled expansion space</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J. Malloy noted this was great information, but it would be more helpful if the entire packet was sent out to the SBC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Dell Angelo noted it was sent out to the whole SBC on July 3rd</li> </ul> </li> <li>● K.Slavsky noted that thought exchange could be used to receive feedback. Slavsky asked which field house is assumed on each of these options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ B.Black noted that they showed multiple variations to show how they are interchangeable, and one option does not commit to one field house</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● K.Slavsky noted multiple parts of each option set off alarm bells for her as they are not the most compact option that could be produced. How some buildings have two stories on one side and four on the other side. Slavsky asked if an option could be more compact and be full height. Slavsky noted that locations like cafeterias do not need to be double height although it does look good.</li> </ul>		
11.4	<p><b>Decision Timeline for Preferred Schematic Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● L.Finnegan noted that this timeline is a DRAFT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The timeline lays out when a topic will be introduced, when it will be discussed, and when a decision or confirmation will be made</li> </ul> </li> <li>● L.Finnegan noted a SBC meeting will be required every two (2) weeks.</li> <li>● L.Finnegan noted that focus groups will be restarted during this period and an "eco-charrette" will be held for the public community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This has been successful in the past</li> </ul> </li> <li>● L.Finnegan noted there is a legend in the bottom to show the various topics</li> <li>● L.Finnegan noted that the end of the timeline (11/12) is very important and will be when the SBC votes to advance the selected option as the team still has work to do before submission</li> <li>● D.Voss asked about the dotted lines on the sustainability topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that this is just for confirmation on the path as no decisions will be made until Schematic Design</li> <li>○ D.Voss asked that if the system is going to be decided by the chosen layout and land use does that therefore make the decision for us?</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that as an example the options would demonstrate the available roof &amp; land space and the PV placement will be decided in Schematic Design. There will be discussions about it prior to this that may impact the options, but it should not be the deciding factor.</li> <li>○ D.Voss noted there should be caution as in previous projects this item was put on the back burner until it was too late.</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that, as solar panels as an example, they have been showing this already and will continue to be reviewed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J. Hackett asked about public input on the PSR options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that there are community meetings listed at the top of the timeline.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine asked why the date of 11/12 was chosen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that the submission date to the MSBA is 12/16 (this was pulled in due to the holidays) as the MSBA has strict deadlines to allow the project to move forward and be at the next board meeting.</li> <li>○ M.Burton noted that if a deadline is missed it does not automatically mean there is room on the next MSBA agenda,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	<p>and the November 2025 town-vote has been driving the schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A.Levine emphasized he is very concerned about the project schedule and how the community and other groups need to be involved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J.Hackett noted that more retreats can be held</li> <li>● C. Dell Angelo noted that the communications working group shared that the community meetings should be more Q&amp;A focused</li> </ul> </li> <li>● L.Finnegan asked for feedback from the SBC on the presentation of the timeline</li> <li>● D.Voss asked that the parking confirmation must be made in September and what the difference is between a vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that a confirmation will be used as a guide and a vote on the topic will be held in Schematic Design. The purpose of trying to confirm the parking is to be able to price them for each option. Finnegan said she does not see room on this site for a bus depot.</li> <li>○ D.Voss noted this is an important decision for the Town of Lexington and that the SBC needs to think seriously about getting third party input on what should be accommodated on site in terms of transportation</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan shared that this will be good to bring up when this topic can be introduced, and she looks to town leaders to look into where else in the town these could be accommodated.</li> <li>○ A.Baker noted that there are only 25 parking spots for students on the site currently</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine noted that he is concerned about the schedule and the vote for building on the fields or off the fields. Levine thinks that the costs for the options not building on the fields are not accurate and that a cost comparison between the two site locations should be looked into. Levine noted that this could sway the people who do not want to build on the fields if it will cost \$50 million less to build. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton noted that the pricing for the 18 options was for cost comparison and now that we only have 5 options, the soft costs and extra costs will be examined in more detailed in this phase. These decisions on the schedule are important so the estimators can have greater detail in pricing the options.</li> <li>○ L.Finnegan noted that pricing for the modulars and phasing was built into the PDP pricing</li> <li>○ A.Levine asked when the new cost estimates will begin</li> <li>○ M.Burton noted the start of October, and they will be presented on 10/28</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J. Pato noted that there are a lot of misconceptions about prices in the community. Pato noted they may require more time, in months. To handle the "town process".</li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton noted that this is a draft and the point of sharing this was not get this feedback</li> <li>● H.M Sha noted that it needs to be looked at postponing a year</li> <li>● K.Slavsky noted that items like this need to be dated, Slavsky shared that this is a really great start, but it shows the commitment to the MSBA who is only funding 1/5th of the project. Slavsky noted there is a lot about what decisions are needed from the SBC, but she would like to see what the project team will be presenting and what deliverables will be shown. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ K.Slavsky also noted that predicting the future regarding parking, is hard but having open space is best as it is easily converted.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>J.Hackett noted that this timeline should be labeled MSBA, and another Lexington timeline will be created</p>		
11.5	<p><b>Pool and Field House Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J.Malloy asked the SBC if this should really be a SBC decision and topic or if the town should handle this as it will be a separate project with separate funding.</li> <li>● K.Lenihan agrees for a new field house but renovating the existing seems to fit more in the SBC</li> <li>● J.Hackett noted for consistency's sake the SBC should be handing it as it currently exists</li> <li>● J.Pato noted a summit should be held with the other committees as it is a significant decision, and the SBC needs to decide where they are devoting time. Unless the School Committee says a new field, house is part of the educational plan it should not be part of the SBC</li> <li>● J.Himmel noted that before this decision can be made the pool has to show up on the current options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SMMA noted they can show a footprint</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine said that the SBC should wait and see if the town wants these recreational items before time and resources are devoted to them</li> <li>● A summit should be held by September with all required stake holders</li> </ul>	Record	
11.6	<p><b>Recreational Fields Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prestileo shared an existing site plan that showed what is currently available on the site and how the site is used</li> <li>● E.Prestileo noted that after everything is accounted for there is around 6.8 acres left</li> <li>● H.M Sha asked about the land across the street from Worthen Rd.</li> </ul>	Record	



- E.Prestileo shared it is not viable space and has a lot of complications
- C.Lamb noted that this land is elevated and heavily forested. A town vote is required for changing it

<b>Total Site Acreage</b>	<b>57.8</b>	<b>ac</b>	
Northern Recreation	12.2	ac	tennis courts, playground, pool, track/field
Wetlands	4.1	ac	not including basin area
SUBTOTAL	16.3	ac	
Remaining Area	41.5	ac	
Parkland Area	16.9	ac	maintain or swap (existing A97 area less northern recreation area & wetlands, this includes 11.3 acres of playfields)
Existing Field House	0.8	ac	
Field not within parkland	1.2	ac	
4-story HS footprint	6.0	ac	average - includes 10'(+/-) buffer around exterior
Outdoor plazas	1.8	ac	
450 parking spaces & access drives	8.0	ac	Range 6-8 acres depending on clustered or distributed
SUBTOTAL LEFT	6.8	ac	

- E.Prestileo shared the field usage diagram showing which organizations play on the fields , which fields, and when
- E.Prestileo noted that they are planning on geothermal currently
- E.Prestileo geothermal require large work area per loop and underground vaults/manifolds may be required
  - M.Burton noted that when it comes to geothermal it is not just straight down and starts roughly 10 feet below grade. It also has to go horizontal to connect to the other wells and to the school.
  - L.Finnegan noted that the wells could also be phased to keep some fields online. The fields will also need to two growing seasons
- E.Prestileo shared DRAFT conceptual construction phasing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For phased in place items like temporary parking, construction laydown, modular classrooms, and geothermal well field will be required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● C.Favazzo asked if the modular classrooms are showing 100% relocation</li> <li>● L.Finnegan noted it is only around 40 classrooms</li> </ul> </li> <li>● K.Lenihan asked if the environmental goals can be achieved without geothermal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L.Finnegan said yes with air-source or ground-source heat pump. There is a test well being conducted tomorrow that will provide more information</li> <li>○ K.Slavsky noted that there is a large majority more rebates being provided to geo-thermal</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine asked how long the geothermal well scope would take <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton shared that there are many variables, but it would take at least a year, but the fields would not be offline for the full duration of the construction</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
11.7	<p><b>Public Comment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jim Williams: Noted that he is not on bored with this project along with the 100s if not 1000s of people behind him. Williams asked for three (3) documents to be added online. The SMMA master plan, which showed building on the playground/field/track complex.</li> <li>● Steve McKenna: As the track and field coach for Lexington Highschool the numbers for the field house at Williams College were \$30 million to build a 55,000-sf field house (\$545/psf) McKenna noted that if we are this far off with the field house estimate how far off is the high school?</li> <li>● Dawn McKenna: McKenna noted that there is not enough discussion about how to resolve the issues being revised. The field house is an existing structure that dates back decades and is used by many different groups not just track and field. McKenna noted that the athletic director needs to be spoken to as they do not coordinate well enough with the recreational director</li> </ul> <p>Melissa Battite: The recreation department would like slides on field usage. M. Battite wants to point out that information for slides was gathered from the recreation director, athletic director, PE, health and wellness director sports council</p>		
11.8	<p><b>Reflection/Action Items</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J.Himmel asked if there is a way to find out if the PSR can be added to the April MSBA Board Meeting. Himmel also asked if earlier estimates can be conducted as we already have more information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton said yes, they can always ask but the concern is that by doing so the end date would be pushed out to November which is when Town Meeting is. Burton also said</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	<p>yes that the estimators can look at something at any time, but the decisions laid out on the timeline need to be made. The estimators that conducted these cost estimates are the best people in the Commonwealth to conduct this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Malloy noted that comparing a public Lexington project to a private one at Williams College is not the same as the public procurement drastically increases the costs</li> <li>• A.Baker noted that the timeline cannot be pushed out as these MSBA is the large impact in pushing this project forward. It is the SBCs job to find time to figure out responses and answers to what the project team requires to meet the MSBA timeline.</li> <li>• K.Slavsky noted that she agrees with not delaying the process as it will reduce the sense of urgency that this project needs. Slavsky noted that she works in the industry and is an OPM as well, the estimators used are the best available for public procurement in the state.</li> <li>• J.Pato noted that as a report from the Communication Working Group the July meeting will be skipped and the August meeting will be an interactive meeting with the community</li> <li>• J.Hackett asked if the estimates for the sustainability aspect of the school can be taken out of the full price to compare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ M.Burton noted that this can be done, and they are currently working on it for the PDP price options and will include it in the new update price comparison video</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>D.Voss noted that the memo sent out is important to incorporate in the costs. The memo discusses life cycle cost analysis estimation, and it is not apples to apples to look at other schools and compare them. They were built under the prior building code and now face extra cost to meet the current code. Voss noted that some items in that list are not optional as the label may seem.</p>		
11.9	<p><b>Adjourn:</b> Motion to adjourn at 2:30 was made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Yes, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Absent, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Absent, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H. Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Yes, <b>J. Malloy</b>- Yes, <b>Mark Barrett</b> - Yes 11-0-0.</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.

