

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	5/20/24
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		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	✓	Jacob Greco	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
	Andy Oldeman		✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
				Michael Dowhan	SMMA

Action Item	Follow Up
Lexington to create a project central Google Drive space and share it with the team where all shared project information will be stored	Lexington
Dore & Whittier will transition important links from the website to this new storage location	D&W

Item No.		Description	Action
11.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:02pm	Record	
11.2	Approval of April 22, 2024, April 29, 2024, and May 6 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the April 22, 2024, April 29, 2024, and May 6, 2024 Meeting Minutes made by M. Barrett and seconded by M. Cronin. Discussion: J. Hackett noted that the suggestions provided by H.M Sha were included The May 13th minutes were not included in this vote Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent , 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, J. Malloy- Yes, Mark Barrett - Yes 12-0-0. 	Record	
11.3	Review Thought Exchange Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.D Angelo noted there were 1,040 participants, 857 thoughts, and 36,000 ratings. 63% were parent/guardians C.D Angelo shared that Thought Exchange creates summaries to hit on the main points C.D Angelo noted that 70% of the responses supported new construction over addition/renovation or repair. C.D Angelo noted some of the key thoughts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion room Designed as long as possible Handling the student population C.D Angelo reviewed more of the key thoughts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.D Angelo noted that the full list of thoughts can be found in the linked presentation for review. The provided presentation will be posted for the publics review M.Burton noted that there is a large variety of ways to review this information and thinks a smaller working group would be beneficial to get a deep dive into the information. J.Pato noted that this is great effort for outreach but noted that the first question forced people into choosing one instead of supporting both. Pato noted that another round of through exchange with more structured questions would be beneficial. Pato also requested to see the full AI summaries H.M Sha noted that Thought Exchange did not quite reach his expectations. Sha noted that the key take away is not a representative sample and it should not be treated as such. Sha noted that this only captured the voices of people in one channel and there are more community members that need to be reached out to for a full representation of the population. Sha noted that the committee should be careful grouping everything under the term AI K.Slavsky wants to assure members of the public that although the AI tools are helpful the committee is not being reliant on that, Slavsky has personally read all the comments. She reminded everyone that this is a survey and not a vote. It will not be used to directly make choices but to flush out concerns and some voices that have not been heard. Slavsky noted this will be useful to carry into 	Record	

	<p>the next phase of the project. The doubling of communication working groups will be helpful to share the information available to the public in a easy to digest way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel asked if Thought Exchange has any tools to capture more of the population? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C.D Angelo noted that there were many reminders sent out to the community through multiple channels as recommended by Thought Exchanged ○ J.Hackett noted this was talked about when first reviewing Thought Exchange, Hackett keeps wondering if they could engage the SSBC members to use tablets and outreach with sections of the community where they may not have access to it. ○ K.Lenihan noted it is much easier to reach out to parents/guardians and there is no "email list" for all the community members of Lexington • J.Himmel noted if it will be beneficial to go back and rank the selection criteria for the options • J.Hackett noted that she does not think the tool (Thought Exchange) is not at fault, but it is how the committee uses the tool. Hackett noted she discussed the tool with a parent who is an MIT alumnus about how they loved Thought Exchange and how useful it was for the community. Hackett noted that what is in the question is very important as it can be easy to lead someone to an answer through the questions. She also noted that she personally read every comment. Hackett noted that AI flags comments provided, and every comment was approved unless it was complete nonsense and not related to the project. • J.Hackett noted she was expecting more participation from the staff and students but that this was good as it was not overloaded from one stake holder's view • M.Burton noted this will be a good point of discussion at the next communication working group. Burton noted that at the end of the PSR phase (around October) Thought Exchange will be useful to help narrow down from the five (5) options to the one selection. • J.Pato noted that it may be useful to use Thought Exchange for other communication outreach exercises as well. • K.Slavsky asked if the Lexington population demographic is similar at all to the respondent's demographic • H.M Sha asked if Thought Exchange can join the communications working group meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Lenihan: Yes • A.Levine asked if the members online could mute their microphones if they are not speaking 		
11.4	<p>Review Draft PDP Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted she is hopeful for some feedback on the selected options and presentation that was sent over. This is what the PDP will consist of. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted she will provide an updated Page 71 for the Educational Program 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted she also had trouble accessing the link along with J.Pato. • J.Pato noted he was able to access it this morning, but the links still were not working • C.D Angelo noted that Dore & Whittier is reviewing with their IT about the issues with SharePoint links <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.D. Angelo also noted this could be an issue with Square Space (the website provider) about restrictions in place. • M.Burton noted they can review offline about using google drive or another software that works better for the Lexington team. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Pato noted that a Lexington google drive directory where everything will be downloaded would be the best as the links sometimes work on some browsers but when selected from other locations they do not work. • Dore & Whittier will review and get back to the committee • C.Favazzio noted that he had no trouble accessing the link, but it could be useful to use Procore <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMMA noted that they do not have a Procore license as the contractor normally provides it. • J.Himmel noted he has previously looked into Procore for a town, and it is much cheaper than when used for a contractor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Burton noted that almost all contractors bring Procore to the table and Designers/OPMs do not have licenses for it but it could be useful to bring it in sooner than that. Burton noted he will talk about the Construction Manager at Risk vs General Contractor decision later this presentation. • K.Slavsky noted that this is more than a SharePoint issue, it is also a Data ownership issue. Everything shared should be owned by the town and the links on the website should be shared from a town page. Slavsky agreed that Procore is the best for the Construction Phase and the contractor will bring their own version to it. She recommends that the town create a google drive and provide access to the OPM team and Designer to create and share links. • J.Hackett confirmed that the google drive will work and this can be the solution • M.Burton asked if there was any questions or comments on the PDP solution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan noted that she read through it, especially the educational plan, and found it was put together very well and someone not in tune with the project can get a great sense of it. • M.Burton noted that the majority of the submission has already been approved • A.Levine noted he has had problems accessing materials online and thinks that these tools will not be useful. The town should set up a page where all files can be dropped prior to any public meetings. Levine noted that this is much too complicated, and the documents need to be up prior to the meetings. • K.Slavsky asked if this version of the PDP draft is final as the conclusion appears incomplete? Slavsky asked if the PDP is ready to be voted on? 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that the overall conclusion is just a review of the 5/13/24 meeting where the options were selected. The submission is 99.9% complete aside from this. • J.Hackett asked if the submission can be reviewed on the screen for everyone to see • B.Black asked if people are viewing the most current document as the overall conclusions were updated on Friday • J.Hackett listed the sections of the PDP Submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Educational Program • Initial Space Summary • Evaluation of Existing Conditions • Site development Requirements • Preliminary Evaluations of Alternatives • Local Actions and Approvals • Conclusions • L.Finnegan reviewed the sections of the PDP Submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finnegan noted that with every submission the same sections are include as the MSBA wants to verify they are the same • The educational Program was originally provided in a different style, but it was modified for the submission • The initial space summary is included , the sheet that provides the total General Square Footage for just the base school • The existing condition report to demonstrate the current state of the school and the land ownership • All attachments from consultants are in included • The site development requirements for fences, wetlands, site security, access, etc. • The preliminary evaluation alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the process we just went through and eventually where we selected the five options moving forward • The local actions and approval letter along with the backup • J.Pato asked after submission where are we in the MSBA timeline. If we wanted to make changes to this, are we able to? Pato said as an example that what if the community decided they do not want to spend \$600 million can the educational program that brought us here be changed? Will the community be stuck. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted that the MSBA will respond to the submission after 21 days, they will provide feedback on the educational program and the budget. Finnegan noted that nothing is final until the end of the Schematic Design, not the budget, educational program, or the space summary. • K.Slavsky noted that schedule should be include in this as well • L.Finnegan noted that selected options were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.1: Renovation and Addition, Phased in Place • C.1d: New Construction on Fields • C.2b: New Construction on Fields • C.5b: New Construction on Fields • D.2: New Construction, Phased in Place 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett asked if the school choice vote of no for tuition agreement should be included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan responded yes <p>D.2 Concepts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.Lenihan asked what the difference is in D.2/B.2 and to review the D.2 option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan noted that in D.2 there is no renovation, it is just in the same location as the old school, one piece is built then one is torn down and that cycle repeats. B.Black noted that they are trying to orient the buildings in a east/west line and also pulled back the building to avoid all Article 97 land L.Finnegan noted the north and northeast green area on D.2 is all wetlands so the building will not be moved there. L.Finnegan noted to M. Cronin's question that with these options and the nature of the site there will be disturbance to the fields. The question now is which ones and when and how it can be mitigated. M.Burton noted that whether it is one field or all of them it is best to think about it now about how to deal with this. It is could to assume the worst case scenario and hopefully it will not be that. C.Favazzio noted that with D.2 the future expansion to go vertical is still an option J.Hackett asked for the minutes to be clarified the pros of option D.2 that Article 97, wetland impact, access via Worthen Rd., no permanent changes to the fields, maintains the connection to Muzzey street, a possibility for a larger field house but the original does not need to be removed. H.M. Sha asked that due to how D.2 is so concentrated are there some fields out on the plan west of the site that could remain undisturbed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan responded by noting this will be laid out with more detail in PSR L.Finnegan noted that the modulars would be located on some of the practice fields to left of the school as there has to be local proximity to enter the building. These modulars will be shown in the future drawing <p>Approve with Vote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett made a motion to accept and approve the PDP Submission along with submitting the document to the MSBA. J. Pato seconded this motion. Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Lamb – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss – Yes, J. Malloy – Yes, Mark Barrett – Yes 12-0-0. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.Favazzio asked to review the 5/13 SBC minutes comments to approve and include them in the package now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel noted that the first page referencing cost estimates should be an order of Magnitude instead. Himmel noted that the code upgrade only will not achieve the additional space, this should be included. On the 2nd page the notes for group 2 should include how much room for adjustments is allowed. Himmel noted at the very bottom of the page there is a comment by M.Cronin that structured parking will be (2) levels, one on grade and one raised, after this should follow all massing studies have 450 parking spots. Himmel noted that where L.Finnegan notes that the 450 spots does not include the (insert parking) spots for the central office. C. Favazzio noted that he Dislikes the phased in place new construction, not likes. Himmel noted that some of the statements made by the public, some are not true, and foot notes should be included. Himmel noted LABBB should have three (3) "B's". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted that instead of footnotes the next meeting can touch on these discrepancies. • A motion to approve the May 13, 2024, Meeting Minutes made by C. Favazzio and seconded by J. Hackett • Discussion: None • The May 13th minutes were not included in this vote • Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent , 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, J. Malloy- Yes, Mark Barrett - Yes 12-0-0. • L.Finnegan noted a code renovation option is to update the building to meet today's code. This includes energy code via insulation and envelope fixes, the mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection would all need to meet today's code. This is useful to see what the bare minimum cost would be. If the addition/renovation is used there are multiple triggers that, if it, would require the whole building to be upgraded even spaces not being touched. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel noted that these are not suggestions by SMMA this is law • SMMA agreed that this is not a choice, it is the building code. 		
11.5	<p>Upcoming Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5/20 SBC Meeting No. 11 – Review Draft PDP submission and vote to approve • 5/28 SBC Coordination Meeting – Vote to approve PDP (CANCELED) • 6/24/24 – SBC Meeting – Review MSBA PDP comments, review education adjacency diagrams 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/8/24 – SBC Meeting (if needed due to not receiving MSBA comments by 6/24/24. • 7/22/24 – SBC Meeting – Review architectural and site conceptual drawings (5 options), 3 or 4 floor votes • 8/19/24 – SBC Meeting – Discussion of CM at Risk vs Design Bid Build • 9/16/24 – SBC Meeting – Approving CMR; Review FG feedback; Review updated Site and Building concepts, parking decision and vote, expansion of building decision and vote • 10/21/24 – SBC Meeting – Present concept plans with costs and schedule, Rank the 5 options , other program (Field House, Pool, Central offices) decision and vote • 11/11/24 – SBC Meeting – Vote on preferred schematic option/roundtable discussion • 12/2/24 – SBC Meeting – Review Draft PSR Submission • 12/16/24 – SBC Meeting – Vote to submit PSR to MSBA • M.Burton noted that during the summer it can be hard to find people. Dore & Whittier has met with SMMA and identified some big picture decisions that the SBC will have to make in this phase. • L.Finnegan noted that we will be submitting the PSR early as the current date is 12/26/24. The next step would be getting back out and conducting more programming as the design criteria will be better known and have changed. • K.Slavsky asked where does Article 97 fit into this timeline? Slavsky also asked if the October vote for the extra add-ons is for the SBC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted yes as it is the SBC's charge to vote a recommendation. The Article 97 timeline is on the monthly reports which is on the website. • H.M. Sha asked about the need for the coordination meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that unless they are hijacked by the project team the SBC is free to have as many coordination meetings as possible. • J.Himmel asked that some of these items are interchanged but separated on the schedule. How can one be chosen when the option for the other has not been decided. Himmel also noted that there has been no discussion regarding the design charrette. Himmel noted that the SBC may need some presentations for in depth topics (like the one provided on track sizes) to better understand some of these topics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted that SMMA will create a flyer for how the Design Charrette will be conducted. She noted this will be similar to the 5/13 SBC meeting. • K.Lenihan will send out a message to the SBC regarding the need of coordination meetings 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett asked for a 6-week break when school ends due to the lack of attendance and vacations. 		
11.6	<p>Central Office Memo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett noted that the 18,000SF is enough for the educational program as noted in the Space Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R. Park noted there are five (5) extra teaching spaces aside from the gymnasium J.Hackett noted that the correlation between addition/reno and not a parent is not a factual statement but can be looked into J.Hackett review the central office memo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hackett noted there are five questions, soon to be six, regarding the central office relocations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Problem <ol style="list-style-type: none"> An analysis has been conducted by the capital planning and 146 Maple Street was given an "F". It will cost roughly 15-19 million to provide the renovation. Process <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The memo provided a multitude of links starting in 2021 about the correspondence regarding the process to come to these conclusions Overcrowding <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If future overcrowding becomes an issue, the 17,000 net square feet designated to the central office will be the first to be converted to approximately 15-20 classrooms. The central office is happy to be located anywhere and even move back to Bedford St. However, this provides an opportunity to have space ready to convert over to classrooms which otherwise would not be available. Athletics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Recreation and Community Programs Department's unmet need for playing time on athletic fields operates at a 2,500-hour deficit, and students are the primary users of athletic fields and facilities in Town. A high school building project without alternative solutions would mean more potential disruption for student's post-pandemic. This could be timed properly to provide new fields for use while the recreation of the ones at the high school is ongoing if that is required Cost <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The cost will be roughly the same amount based on the initial cost estimate. This will be technically a wash as the money will be required one way or another. It would be better to spend the money and have the future ability for expansion Ballot Vote <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Central Office will not require a separate ballot vote <p>Community Response Letter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Rice reviewed the community response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project team holds the community's response in high regards and wants to provide feedback to some of the consist options provided by the community. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This memo provides some clarity and critiques of the proposed community options but also notes some of the common themes that the Design Team agrees with. A lot of the community feedback has been intertwined with the provided options even though the actual proposal has not been presented as standalone options. ○ The upcoming design charrette will be a great opportunity to talk one-on-one or in small groups about some of the topics provided ○ SMMA has increased the number of options to preserve the current footprint of LHS and avoid Article 97 ○ SMMA has revisited site circulation to keep the main traffic flow off of Worthen Rd ○ SMMA has taken into account the preservation of the existing auditorium and the sight-line from Muzzey St ● The below considerations are from SMMA <p style="text-align: center;">Considerations regarding the 04/16/2024 community proposal that has been suggested by Peter Kelley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The “1” and “2” classroom wings that are proposed to be added to the west along Worthen Road and northeast parallel to Waltham Street would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Further attenuating circulation horizontally through the school increasing student travel times between classes and exacerbating the feeling of long anonymous hallways that are non-conductive to fostering a sense of community within the school. ● Remain too narrow as a building form to provide the critical types of program adjacencies that foster next generation teaching and learning that are at the heart of the educational plan that has been developed by the school district and school. The suggested width of the new wings (which matches the existing 1950’s classroom wings) will yield only a single loaded corridor circulation pattern. ● Provide less than ideal building orientations of the primary learning environments for solar control and daylight access which negatively affect overall building performance and energy efficiency. ● The renovation of the 1950’s A & B wings will perpetuate the challenges inherent with original construction of that vintage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● As noted above for the new wings that match the width of the 1950’s vintage wings, the building width yields only a single loaded corridor circulation pattern as a viable option which does not support next generation teaching and learning as outlined in the educational plan. ● The existing A & B wings have a 13’-0” floor to floor height, which is less than the preferred modern floor to floor height that is closer to 16’-0” which is needed for modern ventilation systems and desired air change rates. This could result in low ceiling heights and consequently oppressive feeling interior environments. ● To meet the educational program requirements regarding classroom size, existing rooms would need to be increased in size which would present the potential of freestanding columns being located in the midst of classroom spaces. ● A gut renovation of the existing 1950’s structure would trigger the need to make the structural frame compliant with current building code in terms of lateral support. This would involve the addition of shear walls or steel cross bracing, which when combined with the note regarding freestanding columns in classrooms above, would greatly compromise and constrain the potential layout of new classroom spaces. 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed relocation of the field house to the north presents a critical compromise in terms of the two independent sets of votes that will need to be made for the school and the field house due to MSBA requirements. Building on top of the existing field house footprint with something other than a new field house (or renovating the existing field house), creates the possibility that a new school could be approved by the town while the field house would not be approved, resulting in a new school without any type of field house. • While this proposal does largely avoid building new construction on the existing fields, the necessary phased renovation of the 1950's wing will require the use of costly and non-MSBA reimbursable temporary modular classroom buildings. Those modular classroom buildings may need to be located on the fields in a temporary condition. If the modular classroom buildings are instead located temporarily over existing parking lots, that parking program would either need to be temporarily removed, relocated off site at an additional cost to the project, or relocated on top of the existing fields. There will also be an interim need for construction project lay-down space, as well as viable open land below which to install the ground source heat pump (geo-thermal) wells, all of which may compromise use of the fields during the duration of construction. In summary – maintaining all of the existing fields in operation or the duration of construction will be challenging regardless of the option that is chosen. The project is instead planning on off-site temporary accommodations for field resources during construction. <p style="text-align: center;">Considerations regarding the 04/22/2024 community proposal that has been suggested by Tina McBride and Lin Jensen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The renovation of & addition of two stories above the 1960's vintage J & H buildings (Math & World Language) would prove to be challenging for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing J & H buildings have a 10'-4" floor to floor height, which is much less than the preferred modern floor to floor height that is closer to 16'-0" which is needed for modern ventilation systems and desired air change rates. This could result in low ceiling heights or even the need to omit acoustic ceilings entirely and consequently create oppressive feeling interior environments with compromised acoustics, as is found currently in those existing buildings. • The column grid spacing of the existing J & H buildings is too dense to efficiently provide classroom sizes that meet the educational program (and MSBA) requirements. Existing rooms would need to be increased in size which would present the potential of freestanding columns being located in the midst of classroom spaces. • Additionally, because the existing classroom sizes are insufficient, the classroom count capacity of these existing buildings would be reduced driving up the size of the new construction additions to accommodate the balance of necessary classroom spaces. • The structural logistics of adding two floors above the existing structure is enormously complicated by the geo-technical qualities of the surrounding soil which has a high organic content and is consequently considered "soft". The existing structure is not sufficient to support either the vertical gravity loads or lateral loads of floors being added above. Any new structure for floors being added above would need to be located around the perimeter of the existing structure and laced through the center of it, which would erode much of the 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>historic character/value of these buildings. This would also involve an extreme cost premium and schedule impact due to deep foundation work and shoring of the existing structure during construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of new and/or addition/renovation four story structures on the northern edge of the site while renovating the two story 1950's vintage structures on the southern side of the site will create vertical discontinuity of the educational environment. The upper floors to the north will feel disconnected from the remainder of the school and will create circulation bottlenecks as students need to move up into and down from the higher stories. • The same challenges noted above for the prior community scheme regarding the renovation of the 1950's A & B wings would exist with this option. • As an addition-renovation option that looks to re-use the majority of the existing structures, construction would be both highly disruptive to existing portions of the building which remain in operation and would require the use of costly and non-MSBA reimbursable temporary modular classroom buildings. Similar to the comments provided for the prior community scheme, the presence of temporary modular classroom facilities and/or the other construction related activities on the site will impact the existing fields and parking lots, so these could not remain unaffected. <p style="text-align: center;">Considerations regarding the 03/22/2024 community proposal that has been suggested by Jim Williams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to the 04/16/2024 Peter Kelley community proposal commented on above, the new longer classroom wing that is proposed to be added to the west along Worthen Road would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remain too narrow as a building form to provide the critical types of program adjacencies that foster next generation teaching and learning that are at the heart of the educational plan that has been developed by the school district and school. The suggested width of the new wings (which matches the existing 1950's classroom wings) will yield only a single loaded corridor circulation pattern. • Provide less than ideal building orientations of the primary learning environments for solar control and daylight access which negatively affect overall building performance and energy efficiency. • The long Worthen Road addition is also separated from the remainder of the school (in the completed condition) by the presence of the field house. Moving around the perimeter of the field house segregates the portion of the school community that will be teaching and learning in that structure, again eroding a sense of connected community across the entire school. As a proposed 4-story structure separated from the rest of the school, it will also create vertical discontinuity of the educational environment. All three of the upper levels will feel even more disconnected from the remainder of the school, and will create circulation bottlenecks as students need to move up into and down from the higher stories. <p style="text-align: center;">Considerations regarding the 03/26/2024 community proposal that has been suggested by Jim Williams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments here are similar to the 03/22/2024 proposal as much of that approach is common to this one. • The renovation and re-use of the existing gymnasium in its current footprint/volume would not provide the necessary quantity of Physical Education stations in that space to meet the educational plan. While this 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>scheme notes that 30,000 SF of existing space may be freed up due to new addition construction, converting the remaining existing space into expansion space for the gymnasium will be invasive renovation work which will result in extreme cost premiums and schedule impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel shared that this was great as a response to these community members but agrees that a cover summary page will be helpful • J.Pato said thank you as this is a great response to the community. 		
11.7	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarela Vliman-Cohen: The B1 renovation option does not save useful portions of the school that lead to cost savings, it does not provide cost saving alternatives either. An additional Add/Reno plan should be provided by SMMA that provides a lower cost option. The survey did not reach the majority of the Lexington Population and should be fixed to include more residents • Bob Pressman: Interested in hearing from the town manager whether the emergency phone system from the town can be used to garner participation in the survey. The central recreation fields are so vital to the community, they are often covered with people at all times of the day. Pressman noted the D.2 option is similar to how Winchester conducted their new school, and it could provide some savings by not having to reconstruct the fields entirely. • Jim Williams: Impressed by the way the project in general has been going and assumes there will be a lot of public interest over the coming months. Williams requested that the drawings be updated to show how many floors each model is. Williams is worried that the project team may be "shooting themselves in the foot" by not having a legitimate renovation/addition option • Peter Kelley: Only 5% of the voting population participated in the Thought Exchange survey, if a broader measurement of the community was surveyed, we could find greater support for the add/reno option. Kelley intends to provide a brief explanation each week about why add/reno should be the path forward. He noted that the challenge of Article 97 should not be taken lightly, its purpose is to protect open space. Article 97 can be contested and litigated and there is no justification to violate it. • Aviram Cohen: A mega-investment of \$600 deserves a comprehensive ROI analysis, Cohen understands the need to bring the building up to code but the remaining \$350 million needs justification. There is no need to wait until October for another Thought Exchange - Lack of knowledge and understanding. The data collection should be done continuously every 2 weeks. Distribution list is minimal and contains people in Lexington High School, older data sets could be used to get people who used to have students in the system • Dawn Mckenna: The work for creating D.2 is very much appreciated. Mckenna is most concerned about making sure the this is a public process as possible and to define exactly what process will be used to make these decisions discussed. How are the needs of a field house going to be addressed? The principal of LHS stated that an 18,000 SF gym would not meet the educational program, is that true? This room where the SBC meets needs to have microphones as it is hard to hear everything online. Mckenna, and she feels she speaks for a large majority of technology confused people, found Thought Exchange confusing. Everything needs to be laid put on the project website as easy as possible. • Suzanne Houstas: Noted she knows how to get a town to adopt a point of view as she has done it many times In her previous sales roll. She wants to create a petition to try to get the town to sign off on what they want in a high school. Noted the importance of security and keeping the fields open. 	Record	

11.8	Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:37 was made by J.Hackett and seconded by M.Cronin Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Absent, 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, J. Malloy – Yes, Mark Barrett – Absent 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.