

## 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: 1/22/24  
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		Elias Grijalva	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

Action Item	Follow Up
7.4 – Update students role from LHS student to LPS student under Ed planning focus group	SMMA
7.5 – Provide feedback on evaluation criteria	SBC
7.6 – Send schedule doodle for communications working group	DWMP
7.6 – Send overall project timeline to communications working group for feedback	DWMP

Item No.		
7.1	<b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> 12:01PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 12 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
7.2	<p><b>Approval of December 21, 2023, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 12/21/2023 meeting as submitted made by J. Hackett and seconded by A. Baker. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, A. Baker – yes. C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, J. Himmel – yes. 12-0-0</li> </ul> <p><b>Approval of January 8, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 1/8/2024 meeting as submitted made by M. Barrett and seconded by J. Hackett. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, A. Baker – yes. C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, J. Himmel – yes. 12-0-0</li> </ul>	Record
7.3	<p><b>SSBC Update:</b></p> <p>J. Hackett introduced LHS student, Elizabeth Yan, from the Student School Building Committee (SSBC).</p> <p>E. Yan shared that since the last time the SSBC met with the SBC, their group has expanded to about 30 students. The SSBC met on January 4th, where they reviewed the SBC process and discussed the expansion of possible SSBC activities, including community forum no. 3, more educational plan involvement, data collection surveys, making a website, and job shadowing the project team. The next SSBC meeting is on February 1st.</p> <p>J. Hackett explained that at the upcoming SSBC meeting, they will delve further into the job shadowing memo that was sent to Dore and Whittier and SMMA. The purpose of the job shadowing memo is for students to familiarize themselves with the roles and responsibilities associated with the design team and the owners' project manager. Students will learn and teach each other about these roles, and then they will be assigned to a particular person at one of the firms to share their learning experiences.</p> <p>J. Hackett mentioned that SSBC members informed the new students during their meeting that the SSBC is not just about learning about the new building; it is also about coming together and supporting each other from middle school to high school. Students as young as 6th grade were making significant contributions.</p>	Record

	<p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Lenihan mentioned that it is great because there is a lot of focus on the younger students who will benefit from this building. Additionally, there is some benefit for students even if they will graduate before the renovation or new building is complete.</li> </ul>	
7.4	<p><b>Design Update:</b></p> <p>M. Rice provided the SBC members with an existing conditions update.</p> <p>Existing Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wetlands Flagging – field work completed 12/15</li> <li>○ Traffic Observations – performed on site 12/14 &amp; 12/15</li> <li>○ Geotechnical Borings – field work completed 12/21 &amp; 12/22</li> <li>○ Geothermal test boring well – will be completed during PSR phase, around 6/1</li> <li>○ Environmental acoustics baseline measurements – scheduled to be performed around 4/1</li> <li>○ Land survey – field work is nearing completion, CAD/office work currently underway, estimated first draft on 2/14</li> <li>○ Existing Building Architecture, Structure and Systems Review –SMMA team spent two days on site on 12/19 &amp; 12/20, currently working on existing conditions report, first draft expected on 1/26</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>R. Park provided a brief overview of the process and explained how all the research is transformed into a building design. The project is currently in the information gathering stage, aiming to comprehend the site, school, curriculum, and community. Building and site investigations are underway, along with an analysis of the curriculum and master schedule of courses. Precedents from other schools are also being examined. In addition to these activities, there have been numerous discussions through visioning workshops and educational programming meetings with staff and educators. Focus group discussions are scheduled to commence this week. Lexington has already presented a comprehensive educational plan that encapsulates the desired high school educational delivery. With all the gathered data and the educational plan, an itemized space summary will be created. This summary includes the types and quantities of program spaces. The next step involves developing program adjacency diagrams to understand the relationships among programmatic elements, which will be revisited multiple times. These diagrams will contribute to the generation of initial massing concepts and forms, marking the beginning of the extensive design process.</p>	Record

Focus Group Discussion:

- Educational Planning and Equity
  - Meeting Dates
    - Meeting #1 - January 25<sup>th</sup>, 1-3PM
    - Meeting #2 - February 5<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
    - Meeting #3 - February 29<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
  - Meeting Objectives
    - Meeting #1 - Listen
    - Meeting #2 - Respond
    - Meeting #3 - Recommend
  - Meeting Focus
    - Review overall goals from educational planning perspectives, educational programming meetings and visioning sessions. As the design progresses, this group will also be involved with review of the following:
    - Plan Preview – follow up w/ refined layout.
    - Furniture coordination (inc. budget)
    - Equipment coordination (inc. budget)
    - Technology coordination (inc. budget)
- Site, Safety and Security
  - Meeting Dates
    - Meeting #1 - January 24<sup>th</sup>, 1-3PM
    - Meeting #2 - February 9<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
    - Meeting #3 - March 5<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
  - Meeting Objectives
    - Meeting #1 - Listen
    - Meeting #2 - Respond
    - Meeting #3 - Recommend
  - Meeting Focus
    - Development of the site design for traffic, circulation, safety and security. Includes conversations about parking, driveways and circulation, fields, and offsite improvements and coordination with Town Departments.

- Exterior and Interior Design
  - Meeting Dates
    - Meeting #1 - January 26<sup>th</sup>, 3:30 – 5:30PM
    - Meeting #2 - February 14<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
    - Meeting #3 - April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1-3 PM
  - Meeting Objectives
    - Meeting #1 - Listen
    - Meeting #2 - Respond
    - Meeting #3 - Recommend
  - Meeting Focus
    - Review exterior design concepts including composition of form and material selections such as brick, precast, metal panels etc. Review the design concepts of the large spaces such as the Gymnasium, Dining Commons and Media Center as well as a typical classroom, Administration, and typical corridors. Review of the products and materials selected for finishes such as flooring, tile, ceilings, wood paneling, paint colors etc.
- MEP Systems and Sustainable Design
  - Meeting Dates
    - Meeting #1 - January 25<sup>th</sup>, 3:30 – 5:30PM
    - Meeting #2 - February 12<sup>th</sup>, 1-3 PM
    - Meeting #3 - April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3:30 – 5:30 PM
  - Meeting Objectives
    - Meeting #1 - Listen
    - Meeting #2 - Respond
    - Meeting #3 - Recommend
  - Meeting Focus
    - Selection of preferred MEP systems. The LEEDv4 Certification and energy/water performance compliance as mandated by MSBA, as well as the MA Energy (Stretch) Code compliance, including Solar PV installations. This will include security and access control systems. Review sustainable design features and components, which increase the energy efficiency and water reduction within the building, product selection for low and no VOC and renewable materials; and site design and landscape features which contribute to environmentally friendly design.

Educational Visioning Update:

- Visioning
  - Workshop #1 held on 12/5
  - Workshop #2 held on 12/20
  - Workshop #3 held on 1/10
  - Included a focus on sustainability.
  - Workshop #4 scheduled for 1/24
- Programming
  - Day #1 of meetings held on 12/11
  - Day #2 of meetings held on 12/21
  - Day #3 of meetings held on 1/5
  - Day #4 of meetings held on 1/9
  - Day #5 of meetings held on 1/10
  - Day “#6” of meetings
  - Make-up mtgs on 1/18 & 1/19
  - Central Office mtg will be scheduled.

M. Burton walked through how the MSBA views certain program spaces and their guidelines. The project team is looking for additional clarification from the MSBA.

Other Program Spaces:

- The Following Spaces shall be categorically ineligible for Authority funding.
  - Swimming Pools – MSBA will only allow a separate project, separate funding, and ballot vote.
  - Skating Rinks
  - Field Houses (Field houses have a track vs Gymnasium)
  - District Administrative Office Space – MSBA may allow but will not participate.
  - Indoor Tennis Courts
  - Other spaces as determined ineligible by MSBA.
- The Following Spaces are subject to size limits.
  - Auditorium shall be no more than 13,300 nsf (based upon upper limit of 1,000 seats)
  - Gymnasiums – The district may choose to build a gymnasium and associated spaces, but in no event shall the gymnasium exceed 18,000 nsf. The MSBA will participate in a gymnasium of up to 12,000 nsf unless adjusted by the MSBA to increase teaching stations for enrollment and/or the educational plan.
  - Areas in excess of the MSBA guidelines will be at the sole expense of the district.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Community support must be demonstrated</u> prior to MSBA approval of a district's proposed project scope and budget.</li> <li>○ The MSBA will exclude from its grant the cost of the total gross square foot ("gsf") above guidelines for these areas. Total NSF over MSBA limits x 1.5* grossing factor. This amount will not change over the term of the grant even if the bids come in at a lower amount.  <i>*Net square foot (NSF)</i>  <i>* Grossing factor to be determined at end of schematic design</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ J. Hackett asked how far down you go for the well? M. Rice explained they are still deciding on that with the consultant. The traditional wells that are being looked at will be 500 feet deep. They are also exploring the potential to go 800 feet deep, which would involve fewer wells in that scenario.</li> <li>➤ H. Sha asked if SMMA is coming to any conclusions that have started shaping what the school is going to look like? R. Park responded no, indicating that they are not at that stage yet.</li> <li>➤ J. Himmel inquired about blocks J, H, K, and L, from the existing conditions diagram and whether SMMA is looking at maintaining the buildings. For example, building J is near wetlands, and building a new structure there might be precluded, but maintaining the building for some use while everything else goes away could be a consideration. The same consideration is raised for building L and K, built in 2015 and 2014, respectively. J. Himmel is interested in whether there are ways to salvage them. M. Cronin commented that the last two buildings (L and K) are modulares and not portable. He shared that these are built differently than typical modulares, with a life expectancy of about 20 years. There have already been issues with the K modular. M. Rice responded that they do not know yet whether they will need modular classrooms to support the construction phasing, but it is within the realm of possibility.</li> <li>➤ J. Hackett asked about precedents and how they influence the work. M. Rice explained that they are looking at various types of precedents. During the visioning meetings, they had initial looks at project precedents illustrating paths other schools have taken in terms of design goals and guidelines. Visits to nearby relevant and new schools are also scheduled as part of the process. They will examine exterior and interior design precedents as well. L. Finnegan mentioned that school visits are ideal once they have gone through the first draft of the space summary after the February meeting. A list of proposed schools will be sent out in advance of the meeting, and times will be coordinated.</li> <li>➤ H. Sha inquired whether the SBC will be part of those school visit meetings and how feedback will be accessed. SMMA responded yes, and M. Rice explained that during previous school tours, a small camera crew documented the tours.</li> </ul>	SMMA
--	--	------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ J. Hackett mentioned the need for a correction, stating that Sanjama Thesayi is a middle school student, and it should be corrected to say LPS student.</li> <li>➤ K. Slavsky suggested that the recommendations from the educational planning focus group should be presented to the school committee, not just the SBC. L. Finnegan clarified that these recommendations go back to the SBC, and the school committee approves the educational plan. The goal is for everyone to go back to the SBC with a recommendation, and conversations about the final space summary are expected between the SBC and the school committee.</li> <li>➤ J. Hackett mentioned the importance of ensuring LABBB is represented. M. Rice mentioned they spoke with LABBB during the educational programming but are happy to include and involve them. J. Hackett expressed the desire to have a representative from LABBB.</li> <li>➤ A. Levine noted his interest in being a part of the focus groups. C. Dell Angelo mentioned that all meetings are public and will be posted with the agenda and Zoom link for those who cannot attend in person.</li> <li>➤ K. Slavsky commented on Arlington High School having a daycare built at the same time adjacent to the school. L. Finnegan explained that it depends on whether the project was a renovation or part of the existing building.</li> <li>➤ K. Lenihan asked when there will be a definitive answer on the categorically ineligible spaces. M. Burton explained that they met with the MSBA last Thursday, and they will be checking with senior leadership. They are hoping to have a response from the MSBA in about a month.</li> <li>➤ K. Lenihan asked how much does a pool for a high school typically cost? L. Finnegan responded that for a competition pool, it costs around \$15-\$20 million.</li> </ul>	
7.5	<p><b>Evaluation Criteria:</b></p> <p>M. Burton explained that in the spring, the SBC will begin to see options. These options include a code repair-only option, addition/renovation options, and new construction options. The SBC's challenging task will be justifying why they prefer certain options to help eliminate others. A sheet has been created to narrow down to the option that makes the most sense. This sheet is not predetermined, and the SBC can modify it to identify what is important to the group.</p> <p>M. Burton mentioned that the rating system makes it graphically easy to conclude without doing the actual math, providing a simplistic approach.</p> <p>Categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion</li> </ul>	Record



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Cost and Schedule</li> <li>➤ Educational</li> <li>➤ Building</li> <li>➤ Site</li> <li>➤ Sustainability</li> <li>➤ Construction Impacts / Cost</li> <li>➤ Operational Cost</li> <li>➤ Community</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ J. Hackett asked when will the criteria matrix be used? M. Burton responded around April.</li> <li>➤ J. Himmel commented that he is happy to see the draft and has some initial comments. M. Burton explained that he wants the SBC to focus on column B and note what is important to the committee, then email feedback to C. Dell Angelo. Another version will be released based on the comments received between now and the next SBC meeting. Feedback should be sent by the end of the day on February 16th.</li> <li>➤ K. Slavsky mentioned that some of those categories should not be differentiators between options, though they are important elements. L. Finnegan asked the committee to view this as not only a tool for evaluating multiple options but also to communicate the reasons for choosing a particular option to the town. It serves as a communication piece to convey the rationale behind the preferred option</li> </ul>	SBC
7.6	<p><b>Communications Working Group Update:</b></p> <p>J. Himmel provided the SBC with a communication working group update, mentioning two topics: the postcard and the project website. The website, while having organized information, might be challenging for non-SBC members to navigate. Efforts will be made to improve accessibility for citizens. The postcard, although featuring nice artwork, faced feedback that the artwork overshadowed the message. The consultant team is working on rebalancing the message and artwork.</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo mentioned that there are still changes requested, and DWMP is meeting with marketing to finalize the draft. The goal is to have the revised version sent out by the end of the day.</p> <p>K. Lenihan noted that once it is finished, it will be sent out to the other members.</p>	Record

	<p>M. Burton shared a simple timeline shown during the working group meeting that, once approved, could be shared on the website.</p> <p>K. Lenihan discussed the consideration of changing the date of the community forum due to concerns about its proximity to February vacation. The goal is to be more responsive to when people might be able to attend.</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo mentioned that there is a placeholder for a March 6th community meeting that can be used for the third meeting.</p> <p>H. Sha suggested amending the previous motion, stating that the SBC needed to approve the postcard and that the communications working group is to approve it.</p> <p>DWMP will send a schedule doodle for a follow-up communication working group meeting to review the postcard and website.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Slavsky asked for the updated timeline to be shared. DWMP will send the timeline to the communications working group for comments.</li> <li>➤ J. Himmel wants the postcard to direct people to the website, encouraging them to provide feedback. The goal is to make everyone aware of where to access information.</li> </ul>	<p>DWMP</p> <p>DWMP</p>
7.7	<p><b>Article 97 Update:</b></p> <p>J. Malloy shared that there had been a recent meeting, and there will be another meeting tomorrow. Additionally, there will be another meeting in the first half of 2024. Starting in June or July, they plan to have monthly meetings.</p> <p>L. Finnegan reviewed the Article 97 process and provided an update on its status. The project team will keep the SBC informed with monthly updates on this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team Met with Tori Kim, MEPA Director, on 1/2/2024. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the project and general schedule of feasibility and schematic design.</li> <li>- Shared diagram of approximate existing uses within Article 97 portion of campus</li> <li>- Reviewed high level of PLPA and associated legislative process.</li> <li>- Tori recommended the team meet with PLPA to clarify the process and respond to questions and associated project implications.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Previously established Article 97 Working Group reconvening 2/23/20024 to develop goals and confirm cadence/schedule for future meetings.</li> </ul>	Record

	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Slavsky asked whether the land swap alternatives would include land off-site or distant from the vicinity, or if it's more likely to involve the existing school site when it goes away. L. Finnegan responded that the goal is to contain it within the red boundary on the map shown. The intent is to remain within the site as much as possible, ensuring equitable, same-quality land. The working group will determine potential trade options, consider the current use of the land, and ensure that proposed swaps provide fields with the needed orientation and the same level of quality.</li> </ul>	
7.8	<p><b>Upcoming Meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SBC#8 – February 26, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept existing conditions report, review concept massing studies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Community Meeting No. 4 – March 6, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designer updates, timeline review, breakout discussion</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ SBC#9 – March 18, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept proposed space summary, accept site development requirements, review concept massing alternatives.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ TBD Community Meeting No. 5 – April 4, 2024</li> <li>➤ SBC#10 – April 22, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review focus group MEP/sustainability design recommendations, refine MEP and sustainable design requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ SBC#11 – May 20, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review draft PDP submission.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ SBC #12 – May 30, 2024 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of PDP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record
7.9	<p><b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record
7.10	<p><b>Public Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record
7.11	<p><b>Adjourn:</b>  1:27 PM a motion was made by J. Hackett and seconded by A. Baker to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, A. Baker – yes. C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, J. Himmel – yes, D. Voss – yes. 13-0-0</p>	Record

Project: Lexington High School  
Meeting: School Building Committee  
Meeting No. 7 –1/22/2024  
Page: 12

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.