

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	10/15/24
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
✓	Kelly Axtell*	Interim 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

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
20.4	Update the PSR option table to have the cost of field house included	J.Himmel	Dore + Whittier
20.4	Provide the link to the October 1 st enrollment analysis	A.Levine	J.Hackett

- Please click [here](#) for the presentation
 - o This will be referenced in the meeting minutes with slide numbers called out to refer to.

Item No.		Description
20.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:02 pm	Record
20.2	Approval of September 30 - 2024, October 7 - 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve September 30 - 2024, October 7 - 2024 Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by D.Voss Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Abstain, D. Voss - Yes, K.Axtell - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 11-0-1.	Record
20.3	CM at Risk Subcommittee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton provided an update on the CM at Risk Selection Subcommittee. He noted that four (4) CMs submitted proposals, and the group agreed to move forward by qualifying all of them. Burton noted the four CMs were Consigli, Skanska, Suffolk, and Turner. M.Burton noted that the interviews are set up for December 3rd and 4th K.Slavsky noted that all four firms are very reputable and great firms Vote: Qualified CM(s) for RFP Shortlist and qualification approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to shortlist the four (4) CMs was made by J.Pato and Seconded by J.Hackett 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion: None ● Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Abstain, K.Axtell- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 11-0-1. 	
20.4	<p>Present PSR Cost Estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Burton shared the new PSR Cost Estimate slide for each option. This table also provided information such as duration, number of phases, building location and max modular count. (Slide 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These costs include the central office but do not include any cost for the field house ○ J.Hackett noted at the last meeting the straw poll vote was only to wait for the costs ○ H.M. Sha asked what the annual price inflation factor was used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Burton noted it was 3% ○ A.Levine asked why the C options are now 4.5 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Burton noted that apart of the PSR phase is to get into more detail and something that came up was that one year to get the full demo and sitework done was most likely not enough and they would like to be more realistic. He noted the building construction would still be just 3 years. ○ K.Slavsky noted that as part of the CM at Risk qualifications they asked for their thoughts on the phasing, she asked if there were any thoughts from the CM applicants that would change these estimates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Burton noted that they all approached it differently but some of the schedules said they could do it faster ● L.Finnegan noted that in all her time she has never seen a qualification schedule that is noted to be faster work once they get on the project ○ K.Lenihan noted it is a good idea to remember that these costs are based on the square footage driven by the education plan and not by design choices ○ J.Pato noted that these costs are meant to compare among the options and are not a direct budget or final cost. ○ J.Hackett noted that it is important to talk about enrollment as the current options are for 2,395 students. She noted that they have reached out to the MSBA and provided an update on the community and the new MBTA zoning which will greatly increase the housing developments in Lexington. J.Hackett also noted that the new central office will be available for classrooms if needed for expansion. ○ A.Levine asked for a link to the analysis for the October 1st enrollment numbers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● J.Hackett noted it is in the MSBA letter she shared with the MSBA ● A.Levine asked if the enrollment is still expected to peak this year and go down in the future 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted she will get the information • M.Burton also shared a table that combines each option with the possible combination of central office + each field house variation. (Slide 6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky noted that the way these slides are showing it appears that the field houses are options, but she wants to remind everyone that one must be chosen ○ M.Burton added from the raised MSBA caps that they expect to get slightly more than the previously projected \$100 million by roughly \$5million although none of these numbers are final ○ J.Himmel noted that it is important to share numbers for what the base project would be as that is the one that includes the renovated field house, so people get used to seeing the correct base number • L.Finnegan shared a table that broke down each field option and provided their costs as well (Slide 7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky asked what the square footage difference is between the add/reno and new small field house <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that the add/reno is slightly larger and there is more detail provided to the estimators this time around for the field house options ○ K.Slavsky asked if there is any advantage to the medium 60,000 sf field house over the add/reno. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted there is much more space in the new construction medium field house and the add/reno is very tight ○ D.Voss asked if the add/reno will have a new roof <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted it will still be arched as it is just an extension ○ K.Lenihan noted that it seems the numbers have changed but nothing has drastically changed ○ C.Favazzo asked if the costs for these field houses all are in with no reimbursement for the town <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that there is no reimbursement for the field houses although they do not know exactly how the renovation will shake down as the MSBA has not provided clear answers ○ A.Levine asked for more expansion for the add/reno to be connected to the new building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that the renovation options will not have new facilities or bathrooms, and they would coordinated to allow use of the schools facilities ○ K.Lenihan asked about the cost that was presented at the PBC meeting for keeping the field house alive for 5-10 years <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin noted that this would just keep the field house alive and is not an actual renovation ○ J.Hackett noted that to define the base high school project which will be the educational program, central office, and renovated field house ○ K.Lenihan asked for a straw poll vote and then there will be a formal one at the next SBC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed with J.Hackett definition of the base school 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Baker asked about the \$1.6-\$2-million-dollar field house option to keep it alive and asked if the heating systems would be completely new <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan noted it will be a whole new heating system housed next to the field house but will not be the high efficiency they would use in a renovation/new option ● J.Pato asked if the building inspector would approve this ● L.Finnegan noted that they have not discussed this with the building inspector yet and there is no guarantee that it would work ○ J.Himmel noted the phases line on the table on Slide 5 could be more clear 	
20.5	<p>Present Solar Photo Voltaic (PV) Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan noted that with the group today there is two members from Solar Design Associates (SDA) ● M.Dion shared that the estimated annual building energy use will be between 3.3 and 3.5 Megawatts based on an EUI of 25 KBtu/SF/Yr. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Dion noted some caveats to this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sizing and quantities are PRELIMINARY and subject to change ● Include a 10% margin of error ● Preliminary HVAC layouts: subject to change with impact to available roof areas and final PV layout: location, clearances, roof screens, etc. ● Chris (SDA) shared a table for options C.1d, C.5b, and D.2 showing the simulated total annual production for each option (slide 10) ● Chris (SDA) and B.Black proceeded to walk through the analysis for each of the three options provided above and also shared renderings for each of these starting on slide 11 ● D.Voss noted that with the target they are looking at he noted the team will look into a scenario of high EV charging to see how that will affect the total energy usage. Voss noted the same approach could be taken for the account of an increase in HVAC square footage on the roof <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted that if air source route is taken, they will need an additional 10,000 square feet of PV space ● A.Levine asked if the rectangles on the roof HVAC air handlers were <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted it is more space reserved for HVAC and not one single unit ○ L.Finnegan noted acoustic screening may be needed also if the units are loud as they cannot increase the sound decibels by too much ● H.M. Sha asked if the team looked into PV being placed along the playing fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SDA noted that it comes with a lot of variables and is difficult and by no means their first choice ● J.Himmel noted that the PV panels at the police station have a very different look than what is shown here in this design. Himmel note that maybe they 	

	<p>could be dropped to a lower height given they are not over aisle. He noted how they buy it, who designs it, and how it is executed is very important as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted the SMMA team still has work to do, and they want to plan a visit to a location that has the full aisle PV that covers the whole parking lot. • K.Lenihan noted that a lot of the problems with the police station solar canopy is due to the historic district and it is confirmed the high school has not designation 	
20.6	<p>Confirm: "New Construction on Fields" Option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan asked if anyone wants to make a case for any other option • Confirm option "C.5b - Bloom" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed that option "C.5b - Bloom" will move forward with a formal vote next week 	Record
20.7	<p>Confirm: "Phased-in-Place" Option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan asked if anyone wants to make a case for another phased in place option aside from D.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Levine asked in the B options if the difference in floor height is included in the costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted yes • Confirm option "D.2 - Weave" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed that option "D.2 – Weave" will move forward with a formal vote next week 	
20.8	<p>Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lana : Noted she looked at some documents and talked to people in town and shared how they are so overwhelmed with the amount of options and numbers. Lana noted that another requirement that should be included on the table shared on slide 5 should be conservation. She noted that she wants to know what they will be saving from what they have already paid for and made. She thinks the wetlands and conservation should be on a larger school. • Olga Guttag 3 Emerson road: Olga asked does the cost that is being advertised includes everything in the soft costs. She asked what contingency is being carried to keep the current high school functional until the new school is ready. She also asked what can be done with in the Bloom scheme if the expansion potential is not enough for the future. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sara Carter 5 Spencer Street: Sara noted she wants to advocate to keep in mind especially for the special education students how disruptive a renovation or phased in place project would be for them. She noted that the space issues must be addressed as quickly as possible. • Dawn McKenna 9 Hancock Street: She noted that the renovation options do not fully understand how the field house is currently utilized, and 6 lanes is the need. McKenna noted she recently toured the new fire station, and it struck how well they met every need they need without discussing about limiting anything. She does not feel this was about the high school and noted all the other projects do not have limitations on it like there is on the high school. She noted anything short of the 72,000 sf field house does not meet the needs of the community and those that use it • Nora Finch 73 Webb Street: She noted that multiple groups have noted how they would like more space in the field house, but none are ready to advocate for it now. Finch noted that if they remove the ability to allow the community to vote on the larger field house it would not be right. She noted it is a community resource as well as for the school as it is a school facility. Finch asked when they will get the cost adjustments for the field houses and additions such as bathrooms on the field houses as well as costs for bussing. 	
20.9	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted that on November 4th there will be two retreats, one with recreation and another town summit • A.Levine asked if the group is meeting for the next two weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ C.Dell Angelo noted yes • K.Slavsky noted that she is concerned about what life in the building will look like during construction for both options and how it will affect the education for the students. She also noted that this building is going to have so many facilities that the town will benefit from as community spaces, and she would love to learn more about what these could be. • D.Voss asked how long it will be for the new solar updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted the goal will be for the next actual SBC meeting • J.Himmel asked if the batteries were shown on the diagrams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted they are shown but they will update the location and make it clearer. • K.Slavsky asked for results on the test well <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that the company doing the simulations and tests are in Ashville NC and are struggling to get reliable power and Wi-Fi. She noted the test drill was complete, but it did include extra casing to get through so geological issues that are common in this area. Finnegan did not they were able to reach 850 feet and are assuming 250-300 wells • J.Pato asked if there are any additional foundation requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted they know the site and will need to make ground improvements for both types of options. She noted during Schematic Design they will run more geotechnical tests. She noted that these costs have been captured since PDP 	Record

20.10	Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 1:44 was made by K.Slavsky and seconded by J.Hackett Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, K.Axtell - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 12-0-0.	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.