

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: 12/21/23
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	✓	Elias Grijalva	DWMP
✓	Andrew Baker*	Interim LHS 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

Item No.	Responsible Party	Description
6.3	SMMA	Note when there are “no issues” on the workplan
6.4	All	Community working group will discuss website updates at their next meeting
6.4	Community WG	Community working group will edit the mass mailer
6.6	DWMP	Send schedule to Working group members
6.6	DWMP	Send doodle poll to coordinate the schedule working group meeting for the week of January 15 th
6.7	DWMP/SMMA	Provide report out from EEA meeting on January 2 nd

Item No.		
6.1	Call to Order & Intro: 12:01 PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 11 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
6.2	Previous Topics & Approval of November 30, 2023, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to approve the 11/30/2023 meeting minutes as submitted made by J. Hackett and seconded by K. Slavsky. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: C. Favazzo – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Himmel – yes, J. Pato – yes, C. Kosnoff – yes, J. Malloy – yes, K. Slavsky – yes. H. Sha – yes, D. Voss – yes, K. Lenihan – yes, A. Baker - yes. 11-0-0 	Record
6.3	Designer Update: M. Rice provided an update on all designer activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Existing Conditions Investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wetlands Flagging – field work completed 12/15 ○ Traffic Observations – performed on site 12/14 & 12/15 ○ Geotechnical Borings – have been marked and will be performed 12/21 & 12/22 ○ Geothermal test well – still needs to be located and performed. ○ Environmental acoustics baseline measurements – scheduled to be performed around 4/1 ○ Land survey – field work is underway and will be complete in approximately 3 weeks, pending weather. ○ Existing Building Architecture, Structure and Systems Review – Two days scheduled for SMMA team to visit LHS 12/19 & 12/20 ➤ Educational Visioning Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workshops #1 & #2 were held 12/5 & 12/20 ○ Workshops #3 & #4 are scheduled for 1/10 & 1/24 ➤ Focus Group Kickoff Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Held on 12/15 to introduce the process, general introductions, establish the schedule and decide on the format for subsequent meetings (goal of hybrid) ○ Detailed meetings for each group will be conducted between January & April of 2024, with a final meeting of all focus groups to outline recommendations that will be forwarded to the SBC. ➤ Educational Programming Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial day of meetings completed on 12/11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Departments/groups met with on the first day include LHS Principal, LPS Technology, Facilities/Custodial, METCO, Health, 	Record

	<p>Athletics, Academic Support Teachers & Lexington Community Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Days 2, 3, 4 & 5 are scheduled for 12/21, 1/5, 1/9 and 1/10 respectively. <p>➤ Workplan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ (refer to slides 9 - 11) <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ D. Voss asked if the traffic observations were for setting the baseline for parking and traffic movement around the campus or the surrounding area. M. Rice responded that it is a baseline in getting an understanding of what the current condition is. D. Voss wondered if, for the PDP, they have to have a view of the future traffic need. M. Rice explained that there will need to be some understanding, but nothing is really locked in. In terms of the PDP, that is going to be something that comes out of the discussions primarily with the safety, security, and site focus group. SMMA will start to include some concepts of what might be part of the project as part of the PDP report.➤ D. Voss inquired whether a broad geotechnical boring was being conducted across the entire site at the moment due to a lack of clarity on the exact placement of the building. M. Rice clarified that there might be localized benefits based on the conductivity of the ground, which they aim to capture through the boring to inform the overall efficiency of the system. If there's a likely location for the building and a preference to avoid placing geothermal wells directly below it for accessibility and longevity reasons, SMMA is trying to identify potential locations. They seek specificity about the system's performance before conducting the borings. If uncertainties arise about the building's location or if there are multiple options, they will initiate the boring activity to obtain better engineering criteria information. SMMA believes they are not losing anything by delaying the drilling, as many criteria will influence the building's location. D. Voss questioned whether the decision to postpone was to conduct a more concentrated analysis. M. Rice explained they are allowing the rest of the process to unfold to gain a better understanding of factors that will determine the building's location, aiming for a more realistic assessment of available geothermal field locations.➤ K. Slavsky inquired about SMMA's expectations regarding the relative depths of the geotechnical borings in comparison to the geothermal wells. Additionally, they questioned whether there is a possibility of having a geothermal well field underneath the existing school if it is not being retained and how this might impact the study of that area. M. Rice replied that the geotechnical borings will be shallower than the geothermal borings, with depths of around 500ft being considered for a typical well field. There's also recent consideration that 800ft might be a slightly more cost-effective depth to	
--	--	--

	<p>explore. They are evaluating whether testing should extend all the way down to 800ft to have comprehensive data. Regarding the possibility of a well field beneath the building, it is a potential scenario for the location of the well field. The decision will depend on the project's specifics, and while it's a higher candidate, it remains uncertain as to whether a new building will be constructed or if there will be addition/renovation work. All these considerations are subject to change as the project details are yet to be finalized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ D. Voss inquired about the noise study and whether it is being postponed to establish a higher baseline. They asked whether the requirement is for a total increase in noise over the maximum baseline throughout the year, the minimum, or the average. M. Rice clarified that the acoustician mentioned that the difference between measuring at a noisier versus a quieter time is not appreciable. The primary consideration for conducting the study in warmer weather is the equipment's performance, which tends to be more accurate in such conditions. The focus is on the decibel level at the property line during both day and night, ensuring it does not increase beyond 10 decibels above the current minimum. ➤ J. Hackett extended a compliment to SMMA for the visioning meeting held the previous night. M. Rice acknowledged the significant student attendance, highlighting their excellent engagement in dispersing themselves among the group and actively sharing their thoughts. ➤ H. Min asked if there were any issues on the workplan that the SBC should be aware of. M. Rice responded no. H. Min asked that SMMA write explicitly on their work plan that there are “no issues” at the top of the workplan to help them with the report in the future. ➤ K. Slavsky inquired about the most effective method to obtain summary information and takeaways from the focus group and visioning meetings. J. Hackett explained that it would involve a combination of verbal updates, along with notes, presentations, and recordings available on the website. 	SMMA
6.4	<p>Communications Working Group Update:</p> <p>J. Himmel shared an update on the past two communications working group meetings.</p> <p>J. Himmel expressed the opinion that communication is the second most important function of the building committee, encompassing both tangible and electronic communications. At the highest level, the goal is to ensure a clear and impactful message about the high school reaches every household and business in town. To achieve this, there is a recommendation for a mass mailing in advance of the next community meeting.</p>	<p>Record</p> <p>CWG</p>

<p>Regarding the mass mailing, the architect demonstrated a masterful mock-up of the draft mailer, subject to dissection and critique by the working group. Ultimately, a consensus was reached that the mailing should target all 13,900 residential and business addresses in town, utilizing the post office's Every Door Direct Mail process (EDDM). This process involves packaging the mailing for delivery to a designated zone, reaching every mailbox without individual addressing. The suggested size for the mailing is up to eight and a half by eleven double-sided cardstock, with discussions ongoing about other size options.</p> <p>The content of the mailing should be concise, featuring approximately six quick-read topics that are further explored on the web. These topics include updates on the high school project, ways to get involved, sources for more information, the potential impact on children and taxes, and the overall benefits. The intent is for the QR code on the mailing to direct recipients to a webpage resembling the postcard, offering pathways to more detailed information. The rationale behind the mailing is that it's a one-time endeavor, with the real and more precise messaging intended for the web platform.</p> <p>The communication working group emphasized the importance of ensuring that no one can credibly claim they were not aware of the events at the high school in the future, especially after the distribution of the mailer. The mailer served as a launching vehicle for communication, with the website being the arbiter where all essential information is accessible. The website provides details on definitions, roles at the town, MSBA, boards, committees, commissions, organizational charts, commonly asked questions, minutes, Zoom videos, agendas, calendars, and drawings. Recognizing that these elements evolve over time and require constant updates, the group plans to dedicate future meetings to thoroughly explore and enhance the website.</p> <p>Currently, the website features a portal with a project management look and feel. However, during the final minutes of the meeting, there was a consensus that a friendlier portal view is needed for citizens, students, and the general public. In conclusion, the communication strategy involves using a mailer to inform everyone, coupled with ongoing web enhancements to facilitate robust communication. The goal is to create a user-friendly and comprehensive platform that provides accessible and up-to-date information for all stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ J. Hackett noted that anything sent out should be run by the ethics committee.➤ D. Kanter asked when does financing in terms of cost estimates enter this timeline I am seeing today? M. Burton responded that the cost estimates that come at the end of the preliminary design program will probably be around April/May. D. Kanter asked that the finance committees have a chance to see	All
---	-----

	<p>the progression to the extent that it is practical along with other functional discussions.</p> <p><u>Vote:</u> A motion was made by H. Sha and seconded by K. Slavsky to approve the expenditure of up to \$14,000.00 to send a mailer to all addresses in Lexington, non-advocative in content, approved by the ethics advisor in time to notify the community of the February community meeting, subject to SBC approvals of the specific content prior to mailing. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: C. Favazzo – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Himmel – yes, J. Pato – yes, C. Kosnoff – yes, J. Malloy – yes, K. Slavsky – yes. H. Sha – yes, D. Voss – yes, K. Lenihan – yes, A. Baker - yes. 11-0-0</p>	
6.5	<p>Agenda Setting Working Group/Propose new SBC Meeting Schedule: J. Hackett provided an update on the agenda-setting working group meeting that transpired. J. Hackett introduced the concept of weekly meetings scheduled every Monday from 12:00 pm to 1:00 pm. These meetings, designated as coordination meetings, are planned for the 1st, 2nd, and 4th weeks of each month. On the 3rd week, the traditional SBC meeting will take place, organized by the Owner's project manager, with all meetings overseen by K. Lenihan.</p> <p>The structure of the coordination meetings will follow a framework commencing with introductory remarks, the review and approval of meeting minutes, a brief orientation highlighting the current stage or module in the process, a retrospective look, a forward-looking perspective, and the proposal of topics for the subsequent meeting. This structured approach aims to allow participants to express their priorities, providing community members with the assurance of a consistent public discussion every week. These meetings are set to commence on January 8th.</p>	Record
6.6	<p>Schedule Working Group Update: M. Burton delivered an update from the schedule working group, sharing that the designer work plan was recently provided to the working group, received less than two weeks ago. Since then, efforts have been made to integrate this schedule into Dore + Whittier's comprehensive schedule, which extends beyond SMMA's focus. This overarching schedule encompasses MSBA modules 2 through 9, Article 97 considerations, and Construction Manager at Risk procurement.</p> <p>In response to feedback from the recent meeting, it became evident that members are seeking a process akin to the Lexington model and increased stakeholder engagement. These aspects are actively being addressed. To finalize the schedule, several key steps are in progress. The designer workplan, received on December 12th, is a foundational document. Subsequently, a detailed scheduling session with L. Finnegan and SMMA is planned for the week of January 8th, involving a line-by-line review to ensure alignment. A scheduling discussion with DPF is scheduled for the week of January 15th.</p>	Record

	<p>Crucial meetings, including an MSBA Kick-off meeting on January 18th, will shed light on the required MSBA deliverables for 2024 and 2025. Additionally, a funding process meeting will be scheduled to thoroughly vet the local actions and approvals. A kickoff meeting with EEA for Article 97 is planned for January 2nd.</p> <p>Following these meetings, the schedule will be shared with the working group during the week of January 22nd, followed by presentation to the full SBC in the week of January 29th.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Favazzo inquired whether the schedule working group could attend the DPF meeting to provide input at an earlier stage. C. Favazzo also expressed the view that incorporating the Permanent Building Committee (PBC) and its expertise into the schedule, in some capacity, would be beneficial. ➤ D. Voss concurred with C. Favazzo's suggestion. D. Voss added that during the recent call, there was a consensus on the importance of being realistic and transparent in the schedule regarding the approvals and deliberations that need to occur outside of the school building committee. ➤ J. Hackett highlighted the idea of distributing meeting materials to the School Building Committee (SBC) members 72 hours in advance, ensuring ample time for the members to review the minutes before the upcoming meeting. ➤ J. Himmel conveyed that the Integrated Design Policy received approval from both the select board and the school board, and it has specific requirements regarding the schedule and its delivery time. J. Himmel proposed inviting members of the schedule working group to participate in the schedule meetings with the Owner's Project Manager (OPM) and designer, advocating for a more collaborative approach due to the urgency of the timeline. Additionally, J. Himmel suggested assigning resources to the schedule and recommended a joint meeting involving DPF, SMMA, D+W, and the schedule working group. M. Burton emphasized that once the schedule goes live, critical elements such as the town vote process and Article 97 need validation. Similar to the design of the building requiring stakeholder involvement, the schedule also necessitates input from various groups. The plan is to meet in mid-January for a comprehensive review of the schedule. D+W will coordinate a joint meeting, allocating 2-3 hours to thoroughly examine the schedule. The overarching goal is to ensure that when the schedule is presented to the SBC, it has undergone sufficient vetting and is ready for public consumption. While progress is being made expeditiously, additional input is sought for further refinement. ➤ D. Voss expressed a preference for having a meeting next week to review the schedule rather than waiting for three weeks. J. Hackett acknowledged the urgency felt by the community and the pressure on the schedule side. The 	<p>DWMP</p>
--	---	-------------

	<p>issue of the one-month schedule came up in a working group meeting, and feedback from L. Finnegan suggested that the timeline might be too ambitious. J. Hackett raised the question of including D. Voss, C. Favazzo, and J. Himmel in the DPF meeting. M. Burton offered to share the schedule he has developed so far and welcomed comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Malloy expressed support for J. Hackett's perspective, emphasizing a preference to wait a couple of weeks for a document that is accurate and well-prepared. 	
6.7	<p>Article 97:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Purpose: The Public Lands Preservation Act (PLPA) establishes a process for submission to the Legislature of petitions for disposition of land subject to Article 97. ➤ PLPA Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notify the public and Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) of the proposed action. ○ Prepare an alternatives analysis ○ Land Description including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacement Land ▪ Acreage ▪ Appraisals ▪ Natural Resource Value ○ Draft legislation and obtain authorization including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lexington Town Meeting (2/3 vote) ➤ Article 97 Approval Process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lexington Conservation Commission and Recreation/Open Space entities ○ Act of the Massachusetts State Legislature (2/3 vote) <p>J. Malloy provided an update on the Article 97 working group, highlighting the substantial number of members actively participating. Meetings for this working group are scheduled to take place between January 15th and January 31st, after which regular meetings will continue. State legislators have been informed about the filing associated with this initiative.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Pato inquired about the January 2nd meeting. M. Burton clarified that it is a kickoff meeting with EEA (Executive Office of Energy and Environmental 	<p>Record</p> <p>DWMP SMMA</p>

	<p>Affairs). The meeting is expected to be high-level, following SMMA's recommendation that "less is more" for this initial meeting. Updates and relevant information from this meeting will be reported to the committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Himmel mentioned that he had seen plans but wondered whether Article 97 requires additional information not present on those plans. M. Burton responded that SMMA had their surveyor break up the parcel by acreage, size, delineating pedestrian pathways, fields, wooded areas, etc. E. Prestileo further explained that the work done so far is based on limited information, and they are still in the process of gathering more information. ➤ K. Lenihan inquired about public access to future Article 97 meetings beyond the January 2nd meeting. J. Malloy explained that once a date is set, the meetings will be posted, and an agenda will be made available. The meetings will be conducted in a hybrid format, allowing anyone to attend. The intention is to ensure the transparency of the process and make it as public as possible. 	
6.8	<p>Website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Lenihan shared that the communications working group will be meeting next time to specifically discuss the website. 	Record
6.9	<p>Upcoming Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Coordination Meeting #1 – January 8, 2024 ➤ SBC#7 - January 18, 2024 ➤ Community Meeting #3 – February 13, 2023. Designer updates, timeline review ➤ SBC#8 – February 15, 2024 ➤ SBC#9 – March 7, 2024 ➤ SBC#10 – March 21, 2024 ➤ SBC#11 – April 18, 2024 ➤ Community Meeting #4 – May 1, 2024. Review preliminary options. 	Record
6.10	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record

6.11	Public Comment: ➤ None.	Record
6.12	Adjourn: 1:29 PM a motion was made by J. Hackett and seconded by A. Baker to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: C. Favazzo – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Himmel – yes, J. Pato – yes, C. Kosnoff – yes, J. Malloy – yes, K. Slavsky – yes. H. Sha – yes, D. Voss – yes, K. Lenihan – yes, A. Baker - yes. 11-0-0	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.