

|               |                                   |               |          |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|
| Project:      | Lexington High School             | Project No:   |          |
| Subject:      | School Building Committee Meeting | Meeting Date: | 08/05/24 |
| 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                          | ✓       | Jacob Greco           | DWMP                  |
|         | Jim Malloy*          | Town Manager                            |         | Chris Schaffner       | Green Engineer        |
| ✓       | Joe Pato*            | Select Board Chair                      | ✓       | Lorraine Finnegan     | SMMA                  |
|         | Mark Barrett*        | Public Facilities Manager               | ✓       | Rosemary Park         | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Charles Favazzo Jr.* | PBC Co-Chair                            | ✓       | Matt Rice             | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Jonathan Himmel*     | PBC Chair                               | ✓       | Brian Black           | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Andrew Baker*        | Interim Lexington High School Principal | ✓       | Erin Prestileo        | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Carolyn Kosnoff*     | Finance Assistant Town Manager          |         | Anthony Jimenez       | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Hsing Min Sha*       | Community Representative                | ✓       | Martine Dion          | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Kseniya Slavsky*     | Community Representative                |         | Anoush Krafian        | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Charles Lamb         | Capital Expenditures Committee          |         | Michael Dowhan        | SMMA                  |
| ✓       | Alan Levine          | Appropriation Committee                 | ✓       | Pete Timothy          | A.M. Fogerty          |
|         | Dan Voss*            | Sustainable Lexington Committee         | ✓       | Rick DeAngelis        | Recreation Department |
|         | Maureen Kavanaugh    | Director of Planning and Assessment     | ✓       | Cindy Arens           | Recreation Department |

|   |              |                        |   |                 |                       |
|---|--------------|------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
|   | Andy Oldeman |                        | ✓ | Melissa Battite | Recreation Department |
| ✓ | Kelly Axtell | Assistant Town Manager |   |                 |                       |

| Item No. | Action Item  | Requested by | Ball in Court                |
|----------|--|--------------|------------------------------|
| 11.6     | Finalize the August 14 <sup>th</sup> Community Meeting Agenda/Format | J.Pato       | Communications Working Group |

| Item No. |   | Description | Action |
|----------|---|-------------|--------|
| 11.1     | <b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:0 pm  |             | Record |
| 11.2     | <b>Approval of July 22 - 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A motion to approve the July 22, 2024, Meeting Minutes made by J.Pato and seconded by J.Hackett</li> <li>Discussion:</li> </ul> Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Absent, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Yes, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H. Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Absent, <b>J. Malloy</b> - Absent, <b>M. Barrett</b> - Yes 9-0-0.  |             | Record |
| 11.3     | <b>Discussion with Estimator</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>L.Finnegan introduced P.Timothy, who is the president of A.M. Fogarty and one of the estimators for the Lexington High School Project</li> <li>P.Timothy noted they do lot of MSBA work and Chapter 149.a work, around 12 schools a year.</li> <li>J.Himmel noted he understands how the PDP estimates were put together as he reviewed both estimates and noted it was helpful there were two firms that contributed. Himmel noted that the SBC should have faith in the numbers and how his push may have brought this conversation to light. J.Himmel asked if there is any way for the estimators to actually tour and view the existing building for renovation purposes before extensive design work is completed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P.Timothy noted that they did provide a code upgrade version to bring the systems up to standards, but it does not involve any programing. Timothy noted he could provide another renovation estimate but he would need very detailed specifics about what would be provided in the "enhanced code upgrade".</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |             | Record |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J.Himmel noted he was referring to isolating a section of the existing building and get a detailed estimate on what would be required for the code/structure/roofing and things of that nature</li> </ul> </li> <li>● K.Slavsky noted what J.Himmel is asking is a request that needs to go through the design team and not around them directly to the estimator as it requires specific information. Slavsky thinks that the thought behind the hope of deeper exploration into this topic comes from the idea that there may be a cheaper way to do this that has not been explored yet. Slavsky wondered if this is an exercise that is worth the design team's time as it will just lead us back to the options we currently have. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ B.Black noted that SMMA would be happy to introduce another concept for a scenario that uses more existing buildings, but it would be at a very broad and higher level. Black said this could be presented at the next SBC meeting and if the SBC finds it useful, they could send it off to the estimator</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine asked where the biggest changes could come from or what areas have the least accuracy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P.Timothy noted that the site work section has the greatest variability</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine noted there has been discussion on each cost having a degree of accuracy and his concern is the relative cost difference between all new on the fields compared to the built-in place/renovation. Levine has heard renovation tends to be much higher than new construction but that is not the case with the PDP costs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P.Timothy noted that if you go into the details of the estimates, you can see the subtle changes between the two options and there were also phasing premiums added to the options that needed. Timothy shared that as a general statement new construction is more expensive but in cases like this the scale is so great that renovation tends to be the same cost or even higher.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● A.Levine asked how in the code upgrade option it is his understanding that the building envelop is so poor would it even be possible to bring it to today's energy efficacy levels</li> <li>● C.Kosnoff noted how they were just discussing if there is a lower cost options and she sees that as the code upgrade which has already been explored and passed on as it does not meet the educational program and would like to confirm if that is accurate? Kosnoff also noted there questions at the retreat about how the beginning point or the midpoint of construction should be used? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M.Burton shared the escalation bar graph/time slide and explained it. Burton shared how at the GMP the escalation is already purchased in the bid.</li> <li>○ P.Timothy noted that this is correct, and the escalation should go from bid to mid-point</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J.Himmel thinks that a level of due diligence needs to be done to make sure that the SBC is on the right path and will send out that information</li> </ul> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

|      |   |        |  |
|------|---|--------|--|
|      | <p>he is basing his recommendation on. Himmel noted that if 50% of the space is dedicated to academic the rest of the "office &amp; support space" could be fit into renovated location to save new construction square footage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Hackett noted that she agrees to have a new renovation option done exploring this as long as it is kept at a high level</li> <li>• A.Levine has been thinking about the public comments and how there is public pressure to have a deeper dive into the renovation options. Levine suggests an option that starts with the Code Upgrade and then an additional new construction can be built.</li> <li>• B.Black noted they are hearing two different approaches, and they will review and provide pros and cons. He noted this will be kept streamlined and very high level</li> <li>• A.Baker noted he understands why they are going through these options but losing a parking lot is more than just an operational cost and would be devastating</li> </ul>   |        |  |
| 11.4 | <p><b>Discuss PSR IDP/LEED Scorecard Criteria</b></p> <p>Please view the <a href="#">linked presentation</a> to see the visuals below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L.Finnegan walked through the topic schedule for the 8/05 &amp; the 8/19 meetings</li> <li>• M.Dion noted the project is registered already for LEED with a target for Gold</li> <li>• M.Dion showed the slides for the LEED scorecard and noted the outlined topic are the sections that are currently being reviewed</li> <li>• M.Dion noted to meet the LEED requirements for parking they would have to drop to 270 parking spots from 450</li> <li>• M.Dion shared how the 4% required for electric charging and the 50% for readiness is a town by-law</li> <li>• M.Dion shared the high-level embodied carbon analyses that compares the new construction and the add/reno options along with Mass Timber</li> <li>• M.Dion shared the minimum &amp; optimized energy performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Preliminary 75-year LCCA resulted in a 1–2-year payback with incentives</li> <li>○ HVAC System Selection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geothermal test well is underway, anticipated report in approximately 1 month</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• M.Dion shared the low emitting and Red List materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goal of using low emitting materials</li> <li>○ Target Red List materials priority list to be presented to the SBC</li> <li>○ Schematic Design: Decision on Red List materials to be included in the specifications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• L.Finnegan noted that the goal today is to have a discussion in what was shared including Mass Timber and the Irrigation</li> </ul> | Record |  |

|      |   |        |  |
|------|---|--------|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Himmel noted that in the Red List prior projects have had restricted items that should be discussed in the future</li> <li>• J.Pato shared that he is an advocate for reducing car use but does not see it feasible to drop that many parking spots</li> <li>• C.Kosnoff asked if there is any offset of using Mass Timber or if it is just extra cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ L.Finnegan noted there is no MSBA incentives for it</li> <li>◦ M.Dion noted that Mass Timber has a positive global impact as well as local but it does not have a direct monetary association</li> </ul> </li> <li>• C.Arens noted it is very great that the SBC is looking at Mass Timber as it is not something required to pursue. Arens noted that on the red list it is a goal to use more "less-emitting" products and less red list materials.</li> <li>• K.Lenihan noted she is worried about the state of the trees in the area as she is seeing the decline locally and how hard it is to replace trees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ M.Dion noted that with respect to lead including irrigation is only 1-point</li> </ul> </li> <li>• K.Lenihan asked what the target carbon dioxide levels would be in the occupied spaces as the state recommends it an 800ppm or less and is that factored in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ M.Dion noted that that will be reviewed at the next level of energy modeling</li> </ul> </li> <li>• D.Pinsonneault noted that they could provide connection points for irrigation without having a full system installed</li> <li>• A.Levine noted that the costs for Mass Timber seem high and he asks how much embodied carbon is really being reduced. If this money was used for solar panels or other options, would it be a better use of the money. Levine asked for this to be compared. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ M.Dion noted they will look into this</li> </ul> </li> <li>• H.M. Sha noted he would also like to see this value associated with Mass Timber be applied to other options and compared</li> </ul> |        |  |
| 11.5 | <p><b>Introduce Parking Quantity and Location, Driveways &amp; Circulation, and Current Use &amp; Anticipated Impacts of Fields</b></p> <p>Please view the <a href="#">linked presentation</a> to see the visuals below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the importance of site and structure. He noted how the building has really been broken up into two sections</li> <li>• The 'Why': Importance of site infrastructure and its influence on building form and location</li> <li>• Every option strives for 3 "givens": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ separation of bus, parent and van circulation.</li> <li>◦ a minimum of 450 total parking spaces, interspersed throughout the site.</li> <li>◦ and replicating all the programming for any impacted athletic fields</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Different building forms create nuanced influence on circulation, parking, and field location</li> </ul>  | Record |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this introductory level, we are developing options that capture the base program only- diagramming to exhibit the impacts of some of the "a la carte" program options are included for reference and scale</li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared a visual of the existing driveways and circulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ M.Dowhan noted that there is a lot of circulation, but it is handled well. He also noted there is a large population that walks to school</li> </ul> </li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared a visual showing the total quantity of vehicles that enter from each circulation route</li> <li>• M.Dowhan showed existing photos of Lexington High School at pick-up/drop-off drop off time</li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the goals for the driveways &amp; Circulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Vehicle Circulation as the "spine" of the site</li> <li>◦ Pedestrian safety</li> <li>◦ Separate bus, LABBB, car circulation   drop off &amp; pick up</li> <li>◦ Provide first responders and emergency vehicles adequate access</li> <li>◦ Maintain physical and visual connection from site to downtown through Muzzy Street access</li> <li>◦ Review warrants for intersection/driveway improvements</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared a visual of where the parking spaces are located on the existing site along with some photos of the current lots <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ E.Prestileo noted that the parking lots are 90% utilized</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared the goals of the parking location &amp; quantity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Other school statistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Function of building size</li> <li>• Function of student body</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Zoning requirements</li> <li>◦ Focus Group Recommendation- disincentivize single occupancy vehicles, disincentivize student driving</li> <li>◦ Community concerns – student parking in residential neighborhoods to the north and along Worthen Road</li> <li>◦ Cost comparison: At-Grade, structured above ground, Structured under building</li> <li>◦ Does the proposed EV bus/van depot fit somewhere on the site?</li> <li>◦ Physical layout- break up parking to make it more accessible to program options</li> <li>◦ Reduce heat island effect</li> <li>◦ More efficient stormwater management</li> <li>◦ Eye towards PV canopy cover and the size requirements necessary</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared a table comparing other schools and their parking count/building size/population to Lexington's</li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the B.1a circulation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Maintains the curved path from Waltham and Muzzey Streets</li> <li>◦ Buses will maintain access from Worthen Rd</li> </ul> </li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the D.2a circulation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Very similar to B.1a with some changes to parking location</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the C.1d circulation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ This circulation separates busses, vans (LABBB), and cars</li> <li>◦ Two separate car circulations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the C.2b circulation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Similar to the C.1d circulation option</li> </ul> </li> <li>• M.Dowhan shared the C.5b circulation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Allows for both cars and busses to have access of Worthen Rd</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo reviewed a walkthrough of the existing conditions of fields and their use</li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared the New Build field use and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Phase 1a September 2026 - November 2026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin High School Construction</li> <li>• Maintain some fields through fall season</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 1b December 2026 - November 2027 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of High School</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 1c December 2027 - November 2028 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of High School</li> <li>• Install Geothermal Wells (assumed 5 acres)</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 1d December 2028 - May 2029 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of High School</li> <li>• Complete Geothermal wells</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 1e June 2029 - August 2029 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete Building</li> <li>• Complete Site Work</li> <li>• Move into school fall 2029</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 2 June 2029 - May 2030 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abatement</li> <li>• Demolition</li> <li>• Site Work</li> <li>• Field Reconstruction</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared the build in place field use and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Phase 1 September 2026 - March 2028 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo/Construction Phase 1</li> <li>• Temporary modular classrooms and parking</li> <li>• Install partial geothermal wells</li> <li>• Move into new building April break 2027</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 2 April 2028 - May 2029 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo/Construction Phase 2</li> <li>• Maintain temporary modular classrooms &amp; parking</li> <li>• Move into new building fall 2028</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 3 June 2029 - July 2030 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo/Construction Phase 3</li> <li>• Maintain temporary modular classroom &amp; parking</li> <li>• Install partial geothermal wells</li> <li>• Move into new building fall 2029</li> </ul> </li> <li>◦ Phase 4 June 2030 - July 2031 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo/construction phase 4</li> <li>• Remove modular classrooms &amp; parking</li> <li>• Temporary modulars for gym</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|

|      |  |  |  |
|------|--|--|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete geothermal wells</li> <li>• Move into new building fall 2030</li> <li>○ Phase 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete field restoration</li> </ul> </li> <li>• E.Prestileo shared the goals of the field use and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minimize quantity of fields disrupted</li> <li>○ Minimize amount of time impacted fields will be disrupted</li> <li>○ Ensure that proposed site designs only temporarily impact parkland area or provide no net loss of parkland area while maintains existing programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• L.Finnegan shared the next steps for the topics at the 8/19 meeting</li> <li>• C.Sheth asked about the key user groups of Lexington United Soccer is accounted for if not already. Sheth noted that when we think about the impact to the fields there is a ripple effect of pressure for the other assets and that can hurt the bottom line and budget of the Recreation Department and would like this to be in the mind of the SBC and viewed very holistically</li> <li>• R.DeAngelis noted that there is a lot of information presented and the Recreation Department will review this, DeAngelis wanted to call out some buzzwords of community park, article 97, the impact of lights on the abutters. DeAngelis feels that the community park is being gutted.</li> <li>• C.Arens noted that there was no consideration for bike parking and bike access and asks for this to be included</li> <li>• M.Battite asked for the lighting on the fields to be shown in the future renderings and how the public restroom/bathroom structures will work.</li> </ul> |  |  |
| 11.6 | <p><b>Review August 14<sup>th</sup> Community Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J.Pato noted that this meeting needs to be posted as an SBC Meeting as they are there as a panel.</li> <li>• J.Pato reviewed the format of the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel Session Topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope (Ed Plan and Costs) – M.Cronin &amp; J.Hackett</li> <li>• Location/Impact – J.Himmel &amp; H.M. Sha</li> <li>• Community Values – K.Lenihan &amp; D.Voss (M.Sandeen fill-in)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Format <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> <li>• Review of each topic and Q&amp;A (25-30 minutes each)</li> <li>• Closing comments/questions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Moderation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 Minutes per question?</li> <li>• Timed responses?</li> <li>• Dore &amp; Whittier to monitor the webinar</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |  |  |



|      |   |        |  |
|------|---|--------|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J.Pato asked the committee if there should be a pitch section or just have the introduction</li> <li>○ H.M. Sha does not think the pitch section is a good idea for this meeting</li> <li>● J.Hackett liked the way the process was framed originally, and the time should be given to the community</li> <li>● C.Lamb thinks this is a fine way to set the guard rails around the meeting to keep it in line</li> <li>● H.M. Sha thought they settled on 1 minutes per question and 2 follow up questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J.Pato thinks 2 minutes is better for being concise especially for people who are not used to talk in public</li> </ul> </li> <li>● J.Pato noted the time per question will be finalized at the communications working group this week</li> </ul>  |        |  |
| 11.7 | <b>Public Comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Nora Finch 73 Webb St: Finch asked how irrigation is 1% of the MSBA reimbursement as she thought the cap was already hit. Finch asked when substituting the fields during construction there are no other high school sized baseball fields in the Town of Lexington and what the plan is for the use of field C.1 when it is offline. Finch noted that having both the buses and cars all being located on Worthen Rd will be too compact and not navigable. Finch noted that the field house group asked to see other locations where the field house can go but currently it is still in the existing footprint.</li> <li>● Bob Pressman 22 Locus Ave: Pressman found the segment with the estimator inadequate along with the August 14th meeting as the topics have been manipulated. Pressman wanted to ask the estimator if there would be more cost for the D.2 options due to the poor ground that was discovered in the test pits. Pressman thinks one large chart showing the field status and time would be better.</li> <li>● Dawn McKenna 9 Hancock St: McKenna is concerned about the summit group making a decision without any presentation on the topic prior to the summit. It is important to keep asking the designers to design a 72,000sf field house through the PSR phase. McKenna feels the community meeting agenda is steering people away from the topics that want to be discussed. McKenna feels the athletic department should have a liaison as well as recreational</li> <li>● Sarela Bilman-Cohen 17 Dane Rd: Cohen wants the community meeting to be more of a conversation than a presentation</li> <li>● Mark Sandeen: Sandeen noted that tradeoffs for parking with small multiple lots may have less effectiveness when it comes to solar while still being more expansive and would like it to be reviewed</li> </ul> | Record |  |
| 11.8 | <b>Reflections/Action Items</b>   | Record |  |

|      |   |        |  |
|------|---|--------|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H.M. Sha is thinking on the format of the community meeting and there should be more time for Q&amp;A. Sha suggests dropping the location/impact topic to create more time for the cost</li> </ul>   |        |  |
| 11.9 | <p><b>Adjourn:</b> Motion to adjourn at 2:14 was made by H.M. Sha and seconded by J.Hackett</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: <b>A. Baker</b> – Yes , <b>M. Cronin</b> – Absent, <b>C. Favazzo</b> – Absent, <b>J. Hackett</b> – Yes, <b>J. Himmel</b> – Yes, <b>C. Kosnoff</b> – Yes, <b>J. Pato</b> – Yes, <b>K. Slavsky</b> – Yes, <b>H. Sha</b> – Yes, <b>K. Lenihan</b> – Yes, <b>D. Voss</b> - Absent, <b>J. Malloy</b>- Absent, <b>Mark Barrett</b> - Absent 8-0-0.</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.