

## 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: 2/26/24  
 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
			✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
			✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA

Action Item	Follow Up
8.4 – Send doodle poll to evaluation criteria working group to schedule first meeting.	DWMP

Item No.		
8.1	<b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> 12:03PM meeting was called to order by SBC Chair K. Lenihan with 10 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
8.2	<p><b>Approval of January 22, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 1/22/2024 meeting as submitted made by J. Hackett and seconded by J. Pato. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss - yes. 8-0-0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approval of January 29, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 1/29/2024 meeting as submitted made by J. Hackett and seconded by J. Pato. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss - yes. 8-0-0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approval of February 5, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 2/5/2024 meeting as submitted made by J. Hackett and seconded by J. Pato. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss - yes. 8-0-0.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approval of February 12, 2024, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 2/12/2024 meeting minutes amended to remove K. Lenihan from attendance and calling to order made by J. Hackett and seconded by J. Pato. Discussion: None. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss - yes. 8-0-0.</li> </ul>	Record
8.3	<p><b>Design Update:</b></p> <p>Accept Existing Conditions Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ L. Finnegan shared that SMMA had only received comments from A. Levine and made the updates that were requested. She noted that there was another walkthrough at the school last week. She mentioned at this time they are looking for the SBC to accept the report that will be included as a section within the PDP. SMMA will then continue to move on with the site development which is a separate section. If something comes up before the PDP is submitted and it needs to be included, it will be added in. The goal now is to move on with developing alternatives and site development</li> </ul>	Record

requirements. Unless someone has an objection, there is no need to vote on it and they will keep moving ahead.

Intro to Space Summary:

- R. Park explained the process that led up to the space summary and what is done with the space summary afterwards. R. Park shared the PDP workflow. In addition to the existing conditions investigations, SMMA has been analyzing the curriculum and master schedule of courses. At the same time, there are focus groups, visioning workshops, and educational programming meetings with all of the staff and educators. With all of this data and the educational plan, they can start to create a program space summary. From this, they can work on program adjacency diagrams to be able to understand the relationships between the different programmatic elements. The diagrams and research help to contribute to the initial massing concepts and forms.
- R. Park shared that the space summary is a template provided by the MSBA. This template itemizes the programs and their quantities and areas necessary to support the school's educational goals and curriculum. It is designed to achieve an 85% utilization rate, which facilitates more efficient facility use and accommodates fluctuations in student enrollment. The MSBA organizes these programs into categories, followed by line items for each type of space. The existing program is listed next to the room types, followed by the proposed program. Subsequently, the MSBA's guidelines are listed, which are numbers calculated through algorithms and ratios based on student enrollment that the MSBA will reimburse for. L. Finnegan mentioned that plugging in the MSBA reimbursement in the cell auto-populates the MSBA guidelines. The MSBA column cannot be edited, even if they agree to reimburse more square footage or change some areas. J. Hackett then shared that multiple meetings over several hours were conducted to reach this point. L. Finnegan explained the acronyms used for net floor area, grossing factor, and gross floor area. The net floor area is the space within the four walls, the grossing factor considers the thickness of the walls, toilet rooms, mechanical rooms, corridors, so multiplying the space inside the walls by the grossing factor yields the gross square footage. L. Finnegan also noted that this is subject to change until Schematic Design is approved (August 2025) by the school building committee and MSBA. Once approved by the MSBA, these numbers are finalized and do not change thereafter.
- R. Park walked the SBC members through the details of the draft proposed space summary.
- L. Finnegan shared that the staff had thoroughly reviewed the draft proposed space summary. Over 30 meetings were held with 30 departments, each comprising large group discussions. Space-by-space walkthroughs were

	<p>conducted, accompanied by conversations regarding current usage and future adaptations to ensure a comprehensive understanding. While acknowledging that some spaces may cease to exist in the future, the emphasis was on elucidating the alternatives and their potential uses. This introduction marks the initial stage, with ongoing refinement anticipated as the process evolves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ R. Park shared a slide visually depicting the programs from the spreadsheet in graphical form.</li> <li>➤ R. Park explained the adjacency diagrams, illustrating how the school could potentially be organized based on understanding the relationships between different program spaces. Three options were presented: a central innovation center, a school comprised of several centers, and distributed labs.</li> </ul> <p>Review Concept Massing Studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ M. Dowhan shared that SMMA is contemplating the next phase of their review and research concerning the site. They aim to comprehend not only the constraints but also the opportunities presented by the site and how they can leverage these opportunities to align with the program requirements.</li> <li>➤ Site Opportunities and Constraints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning – Mike notes they will need a variance for building height.</li> <li>• Recreational Facilities – There may need to be some relocation of some of the fields but will try to minimize that.</li> <li>• Wetland Resource Areas – There is a combination of water and vegetated wetlands.</li> <li>• Solar Orientation and Prevailing Winds – Need to think about maximizing solar orientation especially for classroom wings and try to make sure that any exposures that we have mitigate all the different prevailing wind elements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ A Campus for everyone – What we've heard so far: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building and campus should have character, personality.</li> <li>• It should be a place where people want to be.</li> <li>• How one approaches and enters the building are important.</li> <li>• The scale, materials, look and feel need to be appealing.</li> <li>• Site and building should feel like part of one environment.</li> <li>• Incorporate surrounding natural features and multi-modal circulation.</li> <li>• How do we maintain our identity in such a large, complex building?</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Three Siting Approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach I: Renovation and Addition, Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Builds on Top of Current Footprint</li> <li>ii. Highly Disruptive</li> <li>iii. Minimal Site Disturbance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Approach II: Renovation and Addition, Partially on Fields</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

- i. Builds First on Fields, Then Connects Buildings G and J.
- ii. Enables More Connected Rec Resources
- Approach III: New Building on Existing Fields
  - i. Construction Free of Existing School
  - ii. Separates Fields from Center Rec Facility

B. Black reviewed all construction alternatives with their pros and cons. (Code Upgrade, Renovation & Addition, New construction)

- Base Program
- Alt 1. Same as base option except includes central office
- Alt 2. Same as alt 1 except includes new field house + pool

**Discussion:**

- K. Slavsky raised a query regarding the core academic space falling short of the MSBA guidelines. L. Finnegan clarified that while individual categories may deviate from the guidelines, the total proposed space exceeds what the MSBA will reimburse. She explained that adjustments were made based on usage, aiming to reallocate space to different categories as necessary. Finnegan noted that after receiving feedback from the PDP, the committee would reassess space allocation to ensure optimal utilization. K. Slavsky remarked that prioritizing core academics is crucial, despite deviations from MSBA standards in some areas. R. Park added that the MSBA guidelines offer a range for classrooms, with their recommendation set at 900 square feet, slightly higher than the 850 square feet proposed. K. Slavsky clarified that the focus is on space per classroom rather than the total number of classrooms, suggesting that any excess space could be allocated to other programs. R. Park confirmed this understanding.
- J. Pato commented, advising caution against fixating on specific areas at this stage. He emphasized the importance of assessing the overall value that the project brings to the community.
- A. Levine raised a concern about the discrepancy between the total square footage in the space summary, noting it as 460,000 square feet instead of the expected 350,000 square feet. She observed that while the number of rooms in certain categories remained relatively unchanged, the sizes of the rooms appeared to have increased. L. Finnegan responded that this was not a consistent theme throughout the space summary. A. Levine inquired about areas where there might be a significant increase in the number of rooms. SMMA confirmed this, indicating that in the vocations and technology category, there were numerous specialty lab spaces not present in the current setup, accounting for much of the increase. A. Levine noted the focus was more on changes in room size rather than quantity. R. Park elaborated, explaining that although there wasn't a significant increase in the number of rooms, additional flexible spaces were included to accommodate students

	<p>during I blocks and study halls, thus enhancing academic flexibility. A. Baker shared insights from meetings with department leaders, highlighting the introduction of various flexible spaces such as laboratories and conference rooms that could serve multiple purposes during different times of the day. R. Park further emphasized the importance of efficiently utilizing classrooms while incorporating flexibility to accommodate potential fluctuations in student population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ K. Slavsky inquired about the existence of a metric for educational square footage per student. L. Finnegan explained that all classrooms are designed based on accommodating 23 students per classroom, with the formula assuming this occupancy in rooms larger than the current ones. While there are square footage requirements per student in certain areas like the cafeteria and media center, it doesn't apply uniformly across all spaces. The allocation of square footage per student varies depending on the specific requirements of each space.</li><li>➤ D. Voss requested that the models include the canopies so that they can be taken into account when evaluating the options. B. Black assured that SMMA would incorporate the canopies into the next round of options.</li><li>➤ J. Pato highlighted the absence of plans for expansion in the current designs, expressing concern about future growth and the preservation of the footprint. He inquired about provisions for expansion and how the footprint accommodates that need. Additionally, he expressed a preference for a more compact footprint with increased height. L. Finnegan mentioned the existence of one four-story option. J. Pato reiterated the importance of addressing expansion concerns and maximizing the preservation of the footprint.</li><li>➤ C. Favazzo inquired whether the assumption was that parking ratios remained consistent across all options, as well as the situation with the net field. Mike confirmed that indeed, the parking remained the same in every scenario, comprising 450 parking spaces, mirroring the existing site, and each scenario maintained a one-to-one match for fields. When asked about a required parking ratio for new schools, M. Dowhan clarified that there isn't one.</li><li>➤ K. Slavsky echoed J. Pato's concern about maintaining a compact footprint for the project. Additionally, he inquired about the location of the geothermal field, emphasizing its necessity for supporting the school system. L. Finnegan clarified that the geothermal field would likely need to be situated in a combination of locations, including some under the building and some under the field.</li><li>➤ K. Slavsky inquired whether the options that are more spread out allow students enough time between class changes. B. Black confirmed that they are indeed aiming to ensure sufficient time between class changes by maintaining short distances between primary educational programs. Additionally, he noted</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>that if more space becomes available on the site, it could potentially unlock new configurations leading to increased efficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Slavsky asked whether the phased replacement of old buildings with new ones fit the MSBA's definition of addition/renovation. B. Black affirmed that it does indeed fit that definition.</li> <li>➤ K. Lenihan expressed a desire to see more 4-story options in order to preserve the footprint.</li> <li>➤ K. Lenihan voiced concern over the lack of secured courtyard space for students. B. Black suggested that they could explore ways in the site design to create closure, such as using a gate or a wall.</li> <li>➤ A. Levine commented on favoring minimizing the building footprint by opting for 4-stories or beyond. In response, B. Black highlighted a tradeoff, noting that while a smaller footprint reduces the generation of electricity from the roof, it might allow for more room on the ground to accommodate canopies. He explained that typically, around 40% of the roof could be designated for PVs. Additionally, he cautioned that exceeding four stories might trigger high-rise construction regulations.</li> <li>➤ K. Slavsky inquired about the status of the pool question, noting that it's depicted as an alternative. He asked if this is part of a land planning exercise, suggesting that if a pool were to be built in the future, that's where it would be located. L. Finnegan confirmed this assumption. B. Black added that it also serves as a cost exercise.</li> </ul>	
8.4	<p><b>Approve Evaluation Criteria:</b></p> <p>When the criteria matrix is used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Used once options/alternatives are developed.</li> <li>➤ Used on April 29th when we start to review options/alternatives.</li> <li>➤ Accepting criteria ONLY evaluated at SBC meeting on May 15<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>➤ Approving PDP submission at SBC meeting on May 27th</li> <li>➤ Further review of options/alternatives based on criteria throughout the Preferred Schematic Report phase (Fall of 2024)</li> </ul> <p>Received comments from committee members Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reorganizing sections from top to bottom</li> <li>➤ Additional criteria added/changed throughout.</li> <li>➤ Sections have a numbering system.</li> </ul> <p>Scoring:</p>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Multiple ideas on how to score/weight each criterion. Requires SBC discussion.</li> <li>➤ Current scoring is 1,2,3 and color association (1=red, 2=yellow, 3=green). Recommendation to change to 0,2,5 with colors.</li> <li>➤ Weighted score/formula for each criterion for overall total score to be totaled different against each option.</li> <li>➤ Recommend working group to discuss further.</li> </ul> <p>M. Burton recommended a working group that included J. Himmel, A. Levine, J. Hackett, K. Lenihan, M. Cronin and H. Sha.</p> <p>DWMP will send a doodle poll to the working group members to schedule their first meeting.</p>	DWMP
8.5	<p><b>Communications Working Group Update (10 minutes):</b></p> <p>K. Lenihan provided the SBC with an update, informing them that all residents in Lexington should have received their postcards containing information about the project's website, featuring a QR code. She also mentioned that the next community meeting is scheduled for March 6th, offering both in-person and online attendance options. Additionally, Lenihan highlighted the recent updates made by the working group to the website, aimed at improving user-friendliness and ensuring information is readily accessible. She encouraged feedback for further improvements, promising to address any necessary changes promptly.</p> <p>C. Dell Angelo noted the next Communications Working group meeting is on Friday at 10:00am.</p>	Record
8.6	<p><b>Schedule Working Group Update (10 minutes):</b></p> <p>C. Favazzo shared that the group had provided comments to M. Cronin and M. Burton, and they have now incorporated those changes into the working schedule.</p>	Record
8.8	<p><b>Upcoming Meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>School Committee Meeting – February 27, 2024</b>, Project team present Educational Program and Space Summary</li> <li>➤ <b>Community Meeting No. 3 – March 6, 2024</b>, Designer updates, timeline review, breakout discussion</li> <li>➤ <b>School Committee Meeting – March 12, 2024</b>, Vote to approve Educational Program and accept Space Summary</li> </ul>	Record



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Permanent Building Committee – March 14, 2024</b>, Evaluation Criteria, Existing Conditions Draft Report, Space Summary, Massing Studies, Monthly Progress Update</li> <li>➤ <b>SBC No. 9 – March 18, 2024</b>, Accept proposed space summary, accept site development requirements, review concept massing alternatives</li> </ul>	
8.9	<b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None.</li> </ul>	Record
8.10	<b>Public Comment:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Dawn made several suggestions. Firstly, she proposed that meeting packets and all related materials be added to the website before the meetings for accessibility. Additionally, she recommended including the existing conditions report and draft space summary on the website. Dawn also highlighted the absence of mention of the field house in the introduction, stressing its significance as an existing program. Furthermore, she expressed concerns about the view and connection to the high school when on Mass Ave., emphasizing the importance of avoiding an industrial building aesthetic.</li> <li>➤ B. Pressman shared there are people who have been very dedicated to the towns recreation program and there should be something where we they can see total replacement if that is going to occur. K. Lenihan will reach out to the recreation committee.</li> </ul>	Record
8.11	<b>Adjourn:</b> 1:52 PM a motion was made by J. Hackett and seconded by J. Malloy to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, J. Pato – yes, J. Malloy – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, A. Baker – yes. C. Kosnoff – Yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss – yes. 10-0-0	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.