

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	09/016/24
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
18.4	Send out the PDP response comments	SBC	Dore + Whittier
18.4	Send out the PSR Estimating Package	SBC	Dore + Whittier

- 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	Action
18.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:01 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.Lenihan noted she is seeing online that there is discourse of how the extravagant design options are directing the cost of the building and how this is false <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted as a reminder there are no design choices at this stage aside from square footage. These costs come from two separate professional independent cost estimators that use a database of recent high schools' costs. Burton noted that these costs are then reconciled to make sure they are accurate 	Record	
18.2	Approval of September 03 - 2024, September 09 - 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the September 03 - 2024, September 09 - 2024 Meeting Minutes made by J.Pato and seconded by M.Cronin 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 – Absent, H. Sha – Absent, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, J. Malloy - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 12-0-0.	Record	
18.3	Introduce: Review Expansion Potential and Locations & 3 or 4 Story Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B.Black provided an update on the PSR timeline workflow (Slide 7) 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black introduced the expansion potential & locations for each of the current massing options (Slide 11) • B.Black shared SMMA's review of 3 story options in lieu of 4 stories (Slide 24) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted that 3 stories is not recommended by the project team • J.Pato asked if there is any expansion in the shared spaces such as cafeterias <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted that there is just core academic space in these expansion areas • J.Pato asked how they would expand 'Bloom' in the new configuration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted that given it is rotated they can find room on one of the ends and the approach would be the same • K.Lenihan asked the SBC if any members want 4 stories <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ No SBC member voiced an opinion for 4 stories 		
18.4	<p>Discuss: Ground Floor Program & Footprint Area, Total Gross Square Footage, choose one "New Construction on Fields" Massing Option, & "Phased-in-Place" Options</p> <p>Discussion: Total Gross Square Footage (Slide 28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine noted he read through the MSBA's comments on the PDP, he noted how they called out spaces in the Ed Plan that were not in the Space Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ P.Poinelli noted the Ed Plan has a lot of wishes from the teaching staff and worked through programming with the department heads to confirm that what was proposed will meet the needs. ◦ J.Hackett noted what they felt was important was to have everyone's voice heard. Hackett noted that some nice to haves and wishes had to be cut down to meet realistic goals. She provided an example as a program needing a small assembly space to meet the program, they have identified other spaces that can meet these needs and serve multiple programs • A.Levine noted there was a fairly long list called out in the MSBA, he asked if anything needed to be added <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Baker noted a lot of the responses were agnostic to space and were more generally about the program ◦ B.Black noted that the flexibility in these designs is different from what people are used to in current schools 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R.Park noted that is they had given every department everything they wanted they would have had a very large amount of repetitive rooms ● H.M. Sha noted much of his net worth is in his home. Sha noted that Lexington's school has dropped drastically in the rankings mostly due to the class size. They cannot afford that for the students, teachers, and the community members who invest money into the community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Hackett noted that the rankings have not dropped in the areas that matter such as output. Hackett noted from a performance standpoint they are very high in the rankings just not from an infrastructure standpoint ● R.Park noted that all the classrooms are designed to 85% utilization rate to provide wiggle room in the program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Baker noted that 100% utilization of class space is not good as there is no movement for people to change classes. Baker noted it is bets to stay under 100% utilization rate. He noted that it is impossible to predict the future as they had lots of unexpected transfer students in Lexington this year ● K.Slavsky noted that last meeting they asked for the project team to go back to the MSBA and ask for an increase in enrollment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Hackett noted there is a rough draft of a letter and they will ask even though it is unlikely ○ M.Burton noted historically the answer is no unless there is drastic change in the district ○ J.Pato noted that they have compiled information and models to provide to the MSBA <p>Discussion: Ground Floor Program and Footprint Area (Slide 33)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● K.Slavsky asked would the gym on the second floor would it still be able to be open with the rest of the school locked down <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted yes ● K.Slavsky asked if the cost reduction accounts for the need for beefing up sound protection for the floors beneath the gym <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted they have not done this cost estimate but would try to place program underneath the gym that noise does not affect such as weight rooms, locker rooms, or storage as examples ○ K.Slavsky cautions the SBC to not jump at the \$240,000 number for moving the gym to the second floor as it could be less due to sound mitigation ● J.Himmel noted he really liked how Waltham has two ground floor programs. He questioned what would happen if they moved the knoll to the other side of the site the gym could then also be at grade <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted it is a suitable idea that they can explore in early schematic design 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Himmel noted he is aware of the potential added costs that are associated with this ● A.Baker noted his preference is to have the gymnasium on level 1 as it is a community space and there is a symbolic element as well to have it open and inviting to the community ● J.Hackett noted she agrees with A.Baker to having the gym on the first floor as they disliked the second floor one, they saw in Virginia ● J.Pato noted that when cost savings are presented, they should always be considered but in this case, he does not agree ● M.Cronin noted they currently have two schools with second floor gyms, and they have discovered that they are actually much more difficult to deal with especially in the winter months ● K.Lenihan asked if there is any SBC member who wants a second-floor gym <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was no response to the question by the SBC Chair ● J.Himmel noted the other reason he was exploring having a second ground floor entrance was that when the gym and auditorium are at grade there is no program above it. ● B.Black asked if there is a desire to make all the New Construction options equal by moving the 'Braid' option gym to the first floor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SBC agreed ● J.Himmel asked if the estimators will take the areas of each raised slab and if all the areas are programmed. He asked if the estimators would use the as drawn or as programmed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted they would use the as programmed ○ J.Himmel asked them to look at the math in the space summary and they can review it offline ● B.Black noted that in the D.2 option the gym is located on the second floor. He noted they will also try to move it to the first floor, but it will be more difficult <p>Discussion: Choose a "New Construction on the Fields Option (Slide 36)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black noted there was an update to field usage for the 'Bloom' option ● B.Black noted in the revised 'Bloom' option for the fields C2, C7, & C2 could be reconstructed in place. He noted this would place the construction closer to the existing building, but it would keep the park feel and greater use of the fields. Black also noted this would keep the lighted fields away from abutters and in the same location ● C.Sheth noted it is great to see the revision to keep the fields in place, but she is worried about the football field near Waltham St ● M.Burton asked if the knoll was gone for the revised C.5b scheme if it would help provide more of a clean slate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted it is more of a question if a new field house was pursued ● M.Cronin wanted to clarify C2, C7, & C1 would be reconstructed and asked how long they would be offline 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C.Favazzo asked if they would be offline for geothermal fields or laydown space ○ B.Black noted they would be impacted starting in December 2027 through June 2029. Black noted this is mostly for geothermal but possibly some laydown ● C.Kosnoff asked with the revised C.5b scheme if there is any loss in solar orientation or PV space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted there is no big difference compared to the previous version but this scheme in general is more difficult due to the less linear aspect and there is no loss in PV space ○ C.Kosnoff asked where the new main entrance way would be in this revised version ○ B.Black noted that the main entry would be facing Worthen Rd but there is a challenge with this as they want the orientation to be usable ○ C.Kosnoff noted she is under the impression that the fields along Waltham are also lighted, she asked if this is correct ○ B.Black and M.Cronin noted that there is an interest to have this lighted but there is no final decision ● C.Sheth noted she wanted to encourage that if there is enough parking for special needs and handicap that the parking near the recreated fields be moved over to bring all the parking together it could help keep the park type feel ● J.Pato asked in the revised C.5b option if there was a new field house could I be shifted to not be up against the building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted yes and that the footprint place holders need to be updated to better reflect the revised scheme ● H.M. Sha asked if the solar canopies are baseball proof as they could be placed along the fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted they would need to review the durability better ● J.Pato noted his current preference is the revised C.5b due to the layout of the program and the ability to keep more of the fields combined <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Lenihan agrees with J.Pato ● K.Slavsky noted her current option is the revised C.5b due to the preservations of the field locations ● A.Baker noted he loves all options but finds the revised C.5b option as his favorite. Baker also thinks the C.1d option has great opportunities for educational planning ● C.Favazzo noted he also agrees with the revised C.5b option being his current favorite. Favazzo also noted it has the smallest footprint . ● K.Lenihan asked if anyone is not a fan of the C.5b option <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Cronin noted he has always been a fan of the C.1d but there is a big challenge with the fields. Cronin noted the revised C.5b is his current preference but the educational program layout in C.1d is still better 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Discussion: Choose a "Addition/Renovation Phased in Place" Option (Slide 52)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine noted he has thought about the process of choosing one option for Schematic Design and his opinion is that the train is moving very fast towards choosing a new construction on the field options. Levine thinks that the phased in place options are not optimal due to the construction length and the modulars. Levine noted he suggests revising the D.2 option so that the majority is off the existing footprint to help with phasing and the cost. He assumes that even after this is completed it'll still have a longer duration and cost more, but it could be important to help convince the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted they had a scheme in the PDP options (C.6) with the first phase being the addition, but it disrupts the circulation patterns in the neighborhoods and also does not provide a good entry among other things. Black noted that this option was moved forward but they can share it again to remind the community. Black noted they would need direction from the whole SBC to revisit this in the D.2 option • J.Hackett noted she thinks that SMMA should not pursue the proposed idea by A.Levine as the SBC has gone through many options. Hackett noted that the fields are talked about often, but it is not talked about enough about the impact to the students • J.Himmel noted there should be a review of the 1-year site restoration as he does not think it is applicable • J.Pato noted he has not decided between the phased in place and new construction options • K.Slavsky noted that with the in-place options the only way the impact on the students can be mitigated is to provide enough modulars to help the overcrowding and then add even more modulars for the phasing aspect. Slavsky noted the SBC should trust the Designers. 		
18.5	<p>KartoonEDU Videos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Pato noted this is a great opportunity for to reach out to the public to help share many topics with the community • K.Lenihan asked if any SBC members are against pursuing these videos <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The SBC agreed to go forward 		
18.6	<p>Vote: SBC to approve the RFQ</p>	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.D. Angelo noted that the Sub-Committee review the Request for Qualifications and Dore + Whittier provided an updated version with their comments • A motion to approve the Construction Manager at Risk Request for Qualifications was made by H.M. Sha and seconded by J.Pato • Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 10-0-0. 		
18.7	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.McKenna: McKenna noted that only allowing public comment after the discussion is not helpful and they should be allowed to talk on the topics. McKenna noted that the Design Team should really look into a serviceable option for a new construction phased in place. She noted that the conversation regarding the field house with the AD should be included in the upcoming summit. She urges the SBC to keep the 72,000sf-field house through Schematic • O.Guttag: She asked for her group, LHS4all, to be given 15 minutes at the community meeting to share their presentation for fifteen minutes. She noted that looking at the Revere high school comparison she thinks the numbers are not correct. Guttag noted that the fieldhouse should be connected to the locker rooms • B.McGaw: Noted he disagrees with some of the previous comments and does not think any group should be allotted more time at public meetings. He thinks a new field house would be great, but the high school should be the main concern. McGaw noted the important topic are the students and teachers. • N.Finch: noted she was a fan of the new C.5b option especially when modified to fit any new field house option. Finch noted that the fields at Harrington will all be rectangular and there will be no new diamonds. Finch noted it'll be better for the C1 and C2 fields to be offline for the fall seasons not springs 	Record	
18.8	Reflections/Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.M. Sha wanted to thank J.Himmel for presenting his analysis at the PBC meeting. • K.Lenihan noted that the presentation and recording are posted on this meeting agenda 		

18.9	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:01 was made by H.M. Sha and seconded by J.Pato</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, J. Malloy- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 10-0-0.</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.