

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: 9/14/2023
 Time: 2:00 PM
 Prepared By: R. Rincon

	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			
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment			
✓	Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer			

* SBC Voting Member

Item No.	Description	Action
3.1	Call to Order & Intro: 2:07 pm meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 11 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
3.2	<p>Previous Topics & Approval of August 17, 2023, Meeting Minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to approve the 8/17/2023 meeting minutes as submitted made by H. Sha and seconded by M. Barrett. 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, C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Min Sha – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, minutes approved, 10-0-0. 	Record
3.3	<p>Designer Procurement:</p> <p>M. Burton shares on September 12th we met with the MSBA's Designer Selection Panel to review the submissions of the 6 architects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DSP Proposals Received on 8/16/23 @ 1pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Finegold Alexander Architects and William Rawn Associates ○ HMFH Architects ○ Jonathan Levi Architects LLC and DLR Group ○ KBA ○ Perkins and Will ○ SMMA <p>M. Burton explains at the end of the DSP's deliberation, it was clear that there was a top 3 out of the 6 proposals. These firms will be interviewed on October 3rd. Each firm will have 30 minutes to present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DSP Results from September 12th (Firms to be interviewed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SMMA (27 points) ○ Perkins & Will (20 points) ○ HMFH Architects (20 points) <p>M. Burton mentions the day after the DSP meeting, the MSBA wants us to set up 5 questions that we are allowed to ask the designers. After speaking with Karl Brown from the MSBA and telling him what we felt was important to be asked, he drafted some questions for us. We only had a few minor comments in return.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ DSP Interview Questions 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 1. Lexington High School is one of the largest public high schools in Massachusetts. Describe the extent of your experience working with the MSBA designing large publicly funded high school projects in Massachusetts that are educationally appropriate, flexible, sustainable, and cost-effective.○ 2. Discuss your firm's current workload in detail, including commissions for both public and private clients, and your team's approach to completing each phase of this project in accordance with the proposed schedule while completing work for other clients. Describe the role each of your key staff who will be responsible for this project and the percentage of time, per phase, that each would be devoting to this project.○ 3. Lexington prides itself on inclusive processes that engage multiple stakeholders. To that end, there are multiple boards, committees, and individuals representing important constituencies who have a vested interest in this project. Describe how and when you plan to meet with the multiple stakeholders throughout the Feasibility and Schematic design phase and explain how the information from these meetings is gathered and shared to gain consensus.○ 4. Lexington seeks excellence on its capital projects. A truly excellent high school project will be one that provides an extraordinary learning and social environment that is sustainable, healthful, and resilient. The Town of Lexington firmly believes that the very early stages of design are crucial to a project's success and attaining excellence. Explain how you and your subconsultants can work with the District and the MSBA to meet the community specific energy code requirements, Living Building Challenge, and the Integrated Design Policy goals of the District.○ 5. Provide examples of choices you have made in specifying building systems such as lighting controls, HVAC Building Management Systems, and auditorium controls that provide the appropriate level of sophistication for the District's facilities managers and users. Describe "lessons learned" from previous projects that you can implement in the proposed project. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ H. Min Sha asked do you have a conversational format or are these the questions that you use? M. Burton responded these are the questions	
--	--	--

	<p>that the designers will base their interview on. There is also a dialogue, so we do have the ability to ask questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ H. Min Sha commented I like question 5 because questions 1 through 4 tend to be focused on specifications and requirements. I am interested in the choices that they have made and how creative and insightful they are in making choices that hit the specifications but also deliver perceived value for the community. What do they understand as valuable for the community? The community ultimately has to say I am proud of this building, and this works for me. I want to make sure they are sensitive to that and make good choices. M. Burton explained while we had a quick 24 hours to turn around these questions, if I was one of the designers pursuing this job, I would do what I did when I was going for OPM. I watched every one of your meetings and so I am assuming this dialogue is going to be viewed by the 3 firms. Even though the questions are out the door, if there are certain topics we want to leave breadcrumbs for, now is the time to have that discussion. ➤ C. Dell Angelo shared that the October 3rd meeting is a public meeting, and anyone can join as an attendee and watch the interview process itself. Once we receive the meeting link, we will forward it to the full building committee. ➤ J. Hackett mentioned during our DSP meeting where we looked at each of the submissions, there was a lot of conversation in our analysis about beautiful design is one thing but how does it function? We put an emphasis on that which led us to our 3 selections. ➤ K. Slavsky asked what time does the meeting start on October 3rd? C. Dell Angelo responded, the first interview begins at 8:30 am. ➤ K. Lenihan commented how the building functions is important because sometimes when you hear about a new school that's constructed, the teachers and students go in and wonder if the designers were aware that students and teachers would be using the building. M. Burton shares that once the designer is on board, the beginning of the feasibility phase begins with the PDP and one of the most important activities is zeroing in on the educational program. I am expecting multiple visioning sessions with staff and even perhaps students. ➤ M. Burton shared there were 6 pillars we felt we needed to evaluate these proposals on. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1. MSBA High School experience. ○ 2. Capacity/Availability of team members. ○ 3. Capacity/Availability of the firm. ○ 4. Flexibility to deal with IDP process and Lexington's stakeholders. ○ 5. Successful votes. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 6. Experience with similar project size, scope, and complexities.➤ J. Hackett explained the DSP voting sheet and scores.➤ A. Levine asked if there was information on the field house in the RFP? M. Burton shared the RFP did not mention anything about the field house and a lot of firms kept the existing gym. During the walkthrough I believe we let people know that it was not a fixture of the community, and everything was on the table. Some firms grabbed it, and some did not.➤ A. Levine commented I did not notice in any of the proposals a firm going back to one of their completed projects from 4-6 years ago and asking the user whether they had comments about the building they had gotten. J. Hackett responded, we kind of did that. I reached out to my counterpart about the Billerica project which was a Perkins & Will project. I just wanted to talk about the process, how it worked, and I received a glowing recommendation with specific feedback.➤ M. Cronin mentioned that if you take away all of Lexington's DSP votes from the tally sheet, we will still come up with the same top 3. That to me says we did our homework right and we came to the right conclusion.➤ K. Slavsky shared that the MSBA now has a program where we go back a year after occupancy and do surveys and efficiency monitoring of the schools. There is data that is starting to become available from those surveys that we will be able to see for whoever the selected designer is. Another thing I have seen done is other school building committees have been given the opportunity to visit one of the selected designers' previous schools, speak with the staff about their experience and we can identify what we want or do not want to pull into our school. If we cannot get to them before the selection, it would be great to visit a school of the selected designer to be informed of their design. M. Burton commented that he has spoken to M. Cronin about picking a recent high school from each of the designers and if we could coordinate some tours. It would need to be timely as we are going back to the DSP in 3 weeks. We can talk offline and see if any of our connections can get us a time set up to visit some of the schools we pick. M. Burton then circled back on the post occupancy surveys and shared the MSBA realized that they were building these great buildings, but departments did not know how to run them and things were starting to fail. Once the school is done, they do not want that school in their pipeline for 50 years and if you do not maintain the building, you are reducing the life of the building. Now there is another module (9) for post occupancy reviews 3 years later.	
--	--	--

3.4	<p>Schedule/Timeline Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ M. Burton reviewed the updated schedule/timeline. Not much has changed but added the community meetings. We think it is important to keep these community meetings going. We are targeting the next ones in November and February (hopefully we will have some concepts at this time), then we will have another community meeting towards the end of the PDP when we have the 3 building options we need to look at. Once the designer is on board, one of the first things we need from them is a work plan which will map out all of the steps that need to take place during the feasibility phase. That will shed some light on our assumptions for schedule. Some designers included schedule information and showed the project going faster than this which I like but it also gives me pause because Lexington's process is different. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ J. Himmel suggested adding a note that explains there is another X number of years until the project is bid. M. Burton responded that people have varying opinions, but I consider SD submission usually around 50%. It is a valid point, and we can add a note about that. ➤ C. Lamb commented I expect that there are multiple funding rounds here but they are not illustrated on this diagram. M. Burton responded that is the section I removed. M. Cronin and I have started having discussions about appropriations. It is not forgotten, just the point of this was to highlight the next couple of community meetings but we can add that back to the timeline. C. Lamb notes the expectation is that the referendum is after the first chunk of design and engineering appropriation, and it should be put on this timeline. 	Record
3.5	<p>Sustainability Project Targets and Goals:</p> <p>M. Burton shared we had a PBC (Permanent Building Committee) meeting last night. The purpose of that meeting was to understand the 5 project goals because the IDP says before the designers on board, the stakeholders need to set these goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lexington Integrated Building Design & Construction Goals Checklist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Goals to Establish Early: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Resilience Level ▪ 2) Energy Use Target – EUI before renewables ▪ 3) Overall Energy Use – is Net Zero Energy the goal? ▪ 4) Battery Storage – what is the approach? 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 5) LEED Certification – LEED Silver is required by MSBA. Do we want to go beyond that? <p>C. Schaffner explained the goal that has the biggest impact on the project is the resilience level. There was a lot of discussion on this and additional work that was done with the fire chief. M. Cronin shared there was a meeting that took place with the fire chief, police chief and the director of health services. We talked about what this building should serve for the community going forward. We looked at both level 2 and level 3 resilience levels. We came up with a little bit of a compromise to be split between them. We really will be a level 2 building except for kitchen services. C. Schaffner clarified that a level 2 is a shelter where people are going to be in some sort of event which typically includes power, bathrooms, food service and internet. The difference is that the cooking is going to be electric. There would be provisions for refrigeration and food preservation on generators but for the cooking itself you would have to bring in a temporary generator if we needed to serve hot food. M. Cronin mentioned Level 3 is continued operations. You would be able to provide school that day. Level 4 is asset preservation. All the other buildings in town are level 3. The high school will have a little more resilience to it. If we had to open a shelter in town because of an event, the high school would be the place to go.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ PBC Recommendation – Resilience<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Level 2 minus Food Prep for Fieldhouse/Gym (plan for attaching portable generator for cooking)▪ Level 3 for remainder of building▪ Seven other important items identified<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1. The nursing medical cabinets and refrigerators would need to be on emergency power• 2. Restrooms would need to be near the locations where sleeping may occur• 3. Showers would need to be near the locations where sleeping may occur• 4. A Pin and Sleeve should be added to the building to support full kitchen service• 5. Automotive charging stations should be on emergency power to charge town vehicles that May provide services.• 6. Plug loads to support the needs of a comfort station would need to be on emergency power	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7. A storage closet should be included for supplies in the location where sleeping may occur <p>C. Schaffner reviewed the energy recommendation from the PBC and explained we were talking about battery storage in the context of renewables. The batteries are not there for backup power, but it is there to shift the energy from the times when it is available to the times where we are consuming it. It is all about load sharing. We are saying that this is a key element of the design of the project, the IDP requires an analysis and to maximize renewables. EV charging will also be required. M. Burton commented I have never experienced having these decisions made before the designer is on board for a project. A project I am working on right now is in Schematic Design and these discussions are happening then. The IDP is an excellent idea. We are seeing it work now and for a designer this eliminates a lot of time on their end, and it will make them more efficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBC Recommendation – Energy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy Target: EUI=25 kBtu/sf/yr or 30% better than 90.1-2019 whichever is lower NZE: Evaluate and present options. Priority is to maximize renewables. Battery Storage: Evaluate and present options. Likely required for solar. EV Charging ties into renewable and battery discussion <p>C. Schaffner explained the last part of this is whether we should be pursuing a higher level of certification other than LEED silver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBC Recommendation – LEED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building need not meet higher than LEED Silver, but from recent projects, and requirements in the updated IBDGP, it is very likely that the building would end up meeting a higher LEED level. Although the MSBA will require LEED Certification, the IDP Process requires that the School Committee and Selectboard confirm whether the project will be Certified or “Certifiable”. Is a formal vote required? <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J. Himmel questioned I wonder if we have this resilience listed properly. The way it is written could be a little misleading. C. Schaffner responded 	
--	--	--

	<p>we could say this building would be level 3, but there are additional provisions wherever the sheltering is going to be in the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ K. Slavsky commented I suggest we write into the designer contract the higher-level goal because the submission points earn you the certification. It does involve some additional effort and I would rather have it covered on their design services for those extra points submissions. ➤ J. Hackett asked what would we gain by setting the goal for Silver? M. Burton responded it will offer flexibility. We would check the minimum requirement for the MSBA but as K. Slavsky pointed out, it takes a lot of work. The higher you go, the more work it requires. C. Schaffner shared most designers will not charge you for a higher goal. ➤ C. Lamb commented we passed silver a long time ago with our policies. We are going to make gold on this project. I suggest writing in that we are striving for platinum. ➤ J. Himmel shared the IDP has an attachment A that talks about LEED and Lexington's version of LEED. We have higher thresholds in certain areas to get what we want. The intent of the IDP is that the designers mobilize their engineers to work on the project early in a more considered effort. ➤ M. Burton shared the contracts with the designer are prescribed by the MSBA and they do not like to edit them since they are tried and true. But this can be a discussion when we sit with the designer. <p><u>Vote:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A motion to accept the PBC recommendation for resilience as presented (below) made by H. Sha and seconded by M. Barrett. 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, C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Min Sha – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, vote approved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resilience Updated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level 3 for majority of building. ○ Level 2 not including food prep requirement. This will be applied to select areas of the building, such as the Fieldhouse/Gym (plan for attaching portable generator for cooking) ➤ A motion to update and accept the LEED requirement to a minimum for Gold, striving for Platinum was made by H. Sha and seconded by M. Barrett. 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, C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Min Sha – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. Abstention: None. Motion passes, vote approved.	
3.6	<p>Public Meeting Update:</p> <p>M. Burton reviewed the agenda for the public meeting tonight and shared we will be using Mentimeter to get feedback from attendees in the audience and attendees who are remote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hybrid Community Meeting - September 14th at Cary Memorial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome & Introductions ▪ Website ▪ MSBA Process ▪ Timeline ▪ Designer Procurement ▪ Upcoming Meetings ▪ Next Steps ▪ Q&A <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ C. Lamb commented if you go into the meeting tonight and say there will be a town meeting vote in 2025 and say nothing about what a referendum is, you are going to confuse everybody. M. Burton asked what would you like to be said? C. Lamb responded you need to mention there will be a referendum even if you do not know when it is. J. Pato commented that the only people who are authorized to call the referendum is the select board. It is best to say the town expects to proceed with a debt exclusion and that will go to a vote. J. Pato will send M. Burton a separate email on what to say at the community meeting. ➤ J. Himmel asked this schedule does not reflect what is ahead of us. This is everything leading up to the debt exclusion vote. M. Burton responded there is a much longer schedule that can and will be shared but it is irresponsible to go beyond this phase because we don't know what we are building yet. There are so many different factors so I am hesitant to project out because people will ask when will my child be in that school? It can come back to us in a negative way if we project wrong. H. Min Sha said he agreed there should be a visual. M. Burton responded it would be hard to get a graphic by tonight but I will speak to the MSBA process timeline. 	Record

3.7	<p>Student Involvement:</p> <p>J. Hackett shared we have an amazing group of kids from Clark, Diamond and the high school who will help with the community input portion of tonight's meeting. After we do the KLDI activity which really gets input from the community about the new project, they will take the data and formulate a report with me. Once they have analyzed the trends, they will bring it to our next SBC meeting and our next community meeting to share. We will use the mentimeter software to prioritize what we are seeing, and those prioritizations will make their way into the educational plan.</p>	Record
3.8	<p>Upcoming Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Community Meeting #1 – September 14, 2023 – 6:30pm. MSBA Process overview. ➤ SBC #4 – October 12, 2023. Kick off with Design team ➤ SBC#5 – November 30, 2023. Designer Work plan and schedule review ➤ Community Meeting #2 – November 2023. Project Team intro, review MSBA Process ➤ SBC#6 – December 21, 2023. Designer update, timeline review ➤ SBC#7 – January 18, 2024 ➤ SBC#8 – February 15, 2024 ➤ Community Meeting #3 – February 2023. Designer updates, timeline review ➤ SBC#9 – March 21, 2024 ➤ SBC#10 – April 25, 2024 ➤ Community Meeting #4 – April 2023. Review preliminary options 	Record
3.9	<p>Website:</p> <p>M. Burton shared a reminder that all project updates such as agendas, meeting minutes, recordings and presentations can be found on the project website.</p>	Record
3.10	<p>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
3.11	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ None. 	Record
3.12	<p>Adjourn: 3:39pm A motion was made by H. Min Sha and seconded by M. Cronin to adjourn the meeting, 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, C. Kosnoff – Yes, H. Min Sha – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes. Motion Passes, Meeting Adjourned.</p>	Record

Project: Lexington High School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 3 – 9/14/23
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.