

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	08/19/24
Location:	Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)	Time:	12:00 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	J. Greco

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
✓	Kathleen Lenihan*	SBC Chair & SC Member	✓	Mike Burton	DWMP
✓	Michael Cronin*	SBC Vice-Chair & LPS Facilities	✓	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP
✓	Julie Hackett*	Superintendent	✓	Jacob Greco	DWMP
	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
✓	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair		Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Manager	✓	Rosemary Park	SMMA
✓	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA
✓	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair	✓	Brian Black	SMMA
✓	Andrew Baker*	Interim Lexington High School Principal	✓	Erin Prestileo	SMMA
✓	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager		Anthony Jimenez	SMMA
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative		Martine Dion	SMMA
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative	✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee	✓	Michael Dowhan	SMMA
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee		Pete Timothy	A.M. Fogerty
✓	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee		Rick DeAngelis	Recreation Department
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment		Cindy Arens	Recreation Department

	Andy Oldeman			Melissa Battite	Recreation Department
	Kelly Axtell	Assistant Town Manager			

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
11.5	Set up Construction Manager at Risk Sub-Committee meeting	DWMP	DWMP
11.4	Fill out the provided criteria matrix of the PSR options	SMMA	SBC Members

- 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
11.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00 pm		Record
11.2	Approval of August 5 - 2024, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the August 5, 2024, Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by M.Cronin Discussion: Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Absent, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, J. Malloy - Absent, M. Barrett - Yes 10-0-0.		Record
11.3	Discuss: Parking Quantity and Location, Driveways and Circulation, Current Use and Anticipated Impacts of Fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett wanted to share a statement: <p>"I want to share a recent concern about something that occurred after our Community Forum on the evening of August 14th. As you know, we have a Student School Building Committee, which is the equivalent of this SBC, except it includes middle and high school students interested in learning about the project and the process. They want to understand more deeply how schools are built and how a community comes together to make tough decisions.</p>		Record

<p>The Student SBC is voluntary and includes children in grades 6 through 12. We meet monthly, and the students have helped write portions of the educational plan, joined SBC members in visiting other high schools, interviewed members of our Town boards and committees, participated in job shadowing with SMMA and Dore + Whittier, and more.</p> <p>They are always eager to learn, and on August 14th, they got an education. Just before the start of the Community Forum, I spoke with four of our student SBC members who were in attendance. I shared that as we narrow school design options from 5 to 1, feelings will intensify, and we will likely experience more tension as a community. We discussed empathy, how everyone's perspective matters, and how emotional these conversations are for people passionate about certain aspects of the project or personal concerns, such as how to pay for a potential tax increase on a fixed income.</p> <p>As always, I encouraged our students to participate in the forum, which they are always eager to do. The people who are best qualified to describe life inside LHS are the students and staff themselves. They have a unique perspective to share as they live in their current high school and understand what needs to change to improve it.</p> <p>During the Community Forum, I invited our four S-SBC students to share their perspectives on the condition of high school. They spoke very briefly, no more than a minute or two combined, about the high school facility and their experiences in it.</p> <p>At the end of the evening, we had our typical debrief. They felt good about their contribution, and one said they had so much more they wanted to say. I thanked them for attending, and they left.</p> <p>When they left, they were approached in the hallway by several adults, including a larger group of about ten people who circled around them, calling them puppets and untruthful. They said that I was telling the students what to say, and they were not taxpayers and, therefore, shouldn't be sharing their perspectives at these meetings. When they tried to say that no one was telling them what to say and that the words that they had spoken were their personal perspectives, an individual pointed a finger in their face and said they "had lost all credibility" and "people will no longer listen to what they had to say. When things started to get confrontational, one of our students took a phone call and excused themselves. The students then reached out to let me know what transpired. Their primary concern was for younger S-SBC students who may not have developed the skills yet to manage this kind of conflict with adults.</p> <p>Mr. Baker and I debriefed with the students the next day. They processed their feelings and experience and spoke about this being an opportunity to mentor younger S-SBC members. They also helped me craft the message I am sharing with you now, and to their credit, they want to continue to have an open dialogue with all members of the public, including those who don't happen to share their perspectives. This is what we teach our kids to do in school—to think critically, be reflective, have empathy, and engage in healthy dialogue. Our S-SBC students have every right to have their voices heard. They are members of our school community, and they are intelligent, thoughtful, kind, and empathetic. They have minds of their own, and I will continue to invite</p>

	<p>them to participate in these conversations and lend their voices as long as they feel comfortable doing so.</p> <p>I wanted to share this with all of you because it's a good time for us to pause and reflect. These are young people learning about the world, and it is unacceptable for adults to confront them as they did. I hope those who were involved take some time to pause and reflect. There is no requirement for community engagement; we hold multiple opportunities for the public to engage with the SBC—not because we have to but because we want to. Community engagement in the project is essential, and we know that people come from a genuine place of care and concern.</p> <p>I want to thank the many people on the SBC, in the community, and on our Project Team who have encouraged our students and made them feel valued, supported, and heard. Overall, it's been a wonderful experience for them, and I look forward to seeing them continue actively contributing to future SBC discussions in meaningful ways."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Rice noted that the SBC is in a continuum of decision making throughout the Preferred Schematic Space. He shared how the timeline has an introduction, discussion, and decision or confirmation for each topic to help break it down into manageable pieces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Rice shared a progress update on where the SBC is in the timeline (slide 7 & 8) • E.Prestileo noted that parking programs depend on a large number of variables • E.Prestileo shared a table of the existing conditions of the parking program at Lexington High School (Slide 10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ This included the quantity, type of spot, and utilization percentage • E.Prestileo shared a table showing the existing conditions of the parking and the proposed quantity and asked for input on the proposed numbers (slide 11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Levine asked if the percentages on the top are utilization and if the central office has a rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo said yes that is correct and none was provided for the central office ◦ M.Burton asked if all the designs are for 450 spots does the recommended 496 spots fit on the site? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Dowhan noted the first question should be if the SBC thinks that 496 spots are required before space is concerned as these are conservative numbers • B.Black said that each scheme shows it can bear a certain number of spaces and if more are required there would be tradeoffs with outdoor learning space, as an example. ◦ J.Pato asked if they are counting any on-street parking and if not the select board could allocate those parts to the school via permit only 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Dowhan noted they are not including the on-street parking ○ A.Baker said if having 25 student spots sacrifices any outdoor learning or educational program he thinks it is not worth it as it does not even serve the entire senior class enrollment ○ H.M. Sha noted that the goal of this is not to decide the number of spots but define an upper range and provide input on the categories. The exact number should be decided at the design phase. ○ J.Hackett noted that this is a discussion and the next time they come together they will confirm numbers for planning purposes. ○ A.Baker asked if we are only considering grade parking or if below grade parking is being thought of? ○ D.Voss asked for a row to be added for the electrical bus depot, it can have zero or a question park but it needs to be acknowledges ○ C.Favazzo responded to D.Voss asking if the town owns the buses? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● D.Voss noted it is currently private but it is becoming common practice for districts to procure their own busses ○ C.Favazzo agrees that 500 spaces is a good target number but it only informs what the plan is but there is still questions about how that is achieved ● E.Prestileo shared the massing options of each option and where the parking would go along with a +/- of the maximum number of spaces. (Slide 12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Himmel noted that most if not all the parking is needed during the school day. Himmel also noted if there is structured parking it does not mean all the cars would be in there, if it is all surface parking when expansion occurs structured parking may need to be built ● E.Prestileo shared considerations for below grade parking (Slide 13): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Geotechnical: Soils, Ground Water, Bedrock ○ Security and Access ○ Environmental: Minimize Impervious ○ Increase Student Program Areas ○ E.Prestileo noted that for this site it will be very difficult and expensive to pursue this but it would greatly free up the site to allow for more fields. She noted that this will impact the available space for the solar canopy ○ C.Favazzo noted they cannot determine what the foundation can be before the geotechnical boring are finalized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● E.Prestileo noted that these have already been conducted which led to the deep foundations in the PDP phase but more testing will be required ○ H.M. Sha noted there are many good ideas that have been heard and not pursuing it does not mean it is a good idea. Sha 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>noted what he has heard today to not do this are how it will violate the current foundation plan and the site will lose a lot of solar panel space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Himmel noted that Waltham was structured parking not below grade and does not have any of the ventilation required or elevator for access so it would be a very different animal to pursue this ○ A.Levine asked how much area is needed for the PV array and would one 500 spot lot cover it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black answered no that would not be enough space. The team is still finalizing this number and how it will be distributed across the site. Black noted the focus groups will be very helpful for this ● A.Levine is wondering about what other location nearby parking could be located along with PV arrays ○ D.Voss noted an easy assumption is that less parking is equal to less PV array space. Voss also shared that with the machinal spaces on the roofs buildings in Boston are placing PV arrays over the systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black noted they are starting to explore this as well and understand D.Voss' desire for this to be explored early as can be ● E.Prestileo shared the space required for a bus depot on each massing option (Slide 14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prestileo noted this would equal roughly 2 acres of space for all the busses and bus driver parking ○ H.M. Sha noted that he is not sure if he would like a bus depot on the site as they are large and not aesthetic ○ A.Levine asked how when he drives by there are a lot of buses lined up is this in addition to that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Dowhan noted that this is for the busses to be housed, repaired, recharged, and for parking this is independent of the queue for pick-up & drop-off ● A.Levine thinks these should be combined to not waste space ○ K.Slavsky noted if structured parking is considered it is important to look at the cost and the maintenance for these going into the future. Slavsky also noted the committee cannot afford more of a delay on deciding if space needs to be reserved for this bus depot and central office parking. She noted if these two items get added to the project late in the game it may require adding structured or below grade parking which would be an expense and challenge. ○ J.Hackett noted that the central office parking spots were revised to 57 not 100 ○ K.Lenihan noted that the bus depot is so large due to the amount of buses required for the size of Lexington. Lenihan is wondering if they can have a distributed bus depot system where they are housed at multiple schools or other locations 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>and not all on the Lexington high school site. Lenihan also thinks the School Committee and Select Board should have a say for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo thinks this is possible but it will be less efficient and more expensive ○ M.Cronin wanted to clarify this space is just for the Highschool busses and LABBB vans not any of the other schools ○ D.Voss thinks that the space reserved should just be sure of the buses not the LABBB vans as that has already been accounted for. Voss noted that Beverly houses their buses on site without a repair area. ○ C.Kosnoff thought that the buses used for the elementary are the same as the high school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Hackett noted that she thinks that there are three different tears of busses and only some get reused ○ C.Kosnoff asked how much battery storage would be required and was this already being planned for? Kosnoff noted that currently this whole operation is being outsourced and thinks this is a whole separate conversation that needs to be had ○ D.Voss noted that this topic keeps getting punted down the road along with discussion and analysis that is required to make a decision. Voss noted that this discussion needs to happen so in two-three years the site is not being torn up ○ A.Levine asked what the benefit of having this at the high school is compared to having it at a bus depot <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin noted they would be reducing their peak electric demand by having this at the site ○ H.M. Sha noted that maybe a decision does need to be made but there is not the time currently ○ J.Himmel noted they would need to know where all the solar would go to power the depot • M.Dowhan noted that when they reviewed the responses from Thought Exchange the main comment was to keep traffic out of the abutters' neighborhoods and they are aware of this and making sure to accommodate it. Dowhan also noted how they heard about making the queue space longer for pick-up & drop-off. • E.Prestileo shared the impact on the fields for the duration of each type of construction. This was shared through diagrams and photos of the site starting on Slide 17. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.Prestileo noted that Phase 1c will become more clear once the test well is complete ○ J.Hackett noted that this was brought up at the community meeting and SMMA has contacted the necessary stakeholders ○ C.Favazzo asked if they talked to the recreation department for these? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo noted yes ○ J.Hackett asked if it is the town's job to look at what is offline and figure out where the programs have to go <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo noted yes that will be ideal 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Burton noted that if Construction Manager at Risk is chosen there is a chance to start the geothermal in summer of 2026 instead of 2027 ○ H.M. Sha noted that if the geothermal incentives go away due to administration changes the fields will be more free if air-source is used. ○ J.Himmel asked about how Framingham's unique drilling would impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.Prestileo is now positive about how that technique would impact the timeline but they are looking into it. ○ J.Himmel asked if drilling has to stop in the winter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin noted no they drilled through the winter during the high school project ○ C.Kosnoff asked if all the parking will be maintained through this. Kosnoff noted that her child lived through the Hastings project and if the modulares being so close to the well field would even be possible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Burton noted that anytime you are building on the same site there will be loud noise. The loudest part of the project will be when steel is being erected. Burton noted that acoustic barriers can be used to limit this and offset it but it cannot completely block it. • M.Cronin noted on Hastings they started without acoustic barriers and then added them and there was minimal impact or help ○ A.Levine asked if the design team could modify the D.2 design to reduce the use of modulares <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted they did have this option in the PDP phase but it limited the circulation and access to the site • A.Levine asked SMMA to take another look at this 		
11.4	<p>Introduce: Ground Floor Program & Footprint Area, Total Gross Square Footage, Choose one "New Construction on Fields" Massing Option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted that the presentation prepared speaks for itself and asks the SBC to review this for the discussion next week due to time constraints (Starts on Slide 30) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black ran through the slides quickly and read them of • A.Baker noted the filled out Educational Criteria was based on his and J. Hackett's opinions from meeting with staff, students, and stakeholders. Bake noted this can be reviewed with the whole SBC as well. • A.Levine asked to clarify if the goal is to reduce from 3 new construction on the fields to 1? 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted yes this is the goal and at next meeting they will have another phased in place option so it may be useful to conduct this exercise for those as well so there are only 3 options going into the vote 		
11.5	<p>Discuss: Construction Manager at Risk vs Design-Bid-Build (vote required)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C.D. Angelo shared slides on choosing a construction manager or design-bid-build option starting on Slide 70. ● M.Burton noted that a project this size does not really have an option as general contractors normally do not have the bonding capacity for this project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Himmel added there has not been one in the last ten years for a project near this size ● J.Pato asked if the funded design process includes this cost <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted yes it is covered and the MSBA does reimburse ● J.Hackett asked if the CMR's job is to oversee the project team? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted no, the purpose is to bring them on early and help mitigate future problems by using the construction knowledge. ● J.Hackett asked this could end up saving money in the long run <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted yes this is the goal as the best time to solve problems is during design before they are being built ● C.Favazzo noted in 35 years of experience he has never done a M.G.L. c149 project (Design-Bid-Build or General Contractor) ● K.Slavsky noted she comes from a Construction Manager at Risk background but in recent years she has seen estimators question the efficiency as you never see the problems solved. Slavsky noted that with the duration of this project it is very useful to have the early release packages. She also noted that with all the back and forth with educational programs that will add more people into the equation, Slavsky believes the RFQ should be very clear about the level of involvement from the CMR. ● J.Himmel noted he has worked for and managed CMR, he wanted to note that one of the estimators will be dropped and replaced by the CMR so this would offset cost in some way. Himmel noted they will be very useful, the only drawback he can think of is if they do not perform up to standards. Himmel noted this can be solved by the RFQ noting that the construction administration is not a guarantee from having the design Purchase Order. ● J.Himmel motioned to vote for M.G.L. c149a Construction Manager at Risk Delivery Method and was seconded by C.Favazzo 	Record	

	<p>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.M. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, J. Malloy- Absent, M. Barrett - Yes 11-0-0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett motioned to approve M.Cronin, M.Barrett, J.Himmel, C.Favazzo, and K.Slavsky to the CMR Sub-Committee and was seconded by J.Pato <p>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.M. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, J. Malloy- Absent, M. Barrett - Yes 11-0-0.</p>		
11.6	<p>Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D.McKenna 9 Hancock Street: Dawn wants to make a point about liquidated damages and instead of issuing a penalty for late finishes and instead offering a bonus to finish on time. McKenna agrees with removing the 25 student parking spots and asks what the point of the visitor parking is as if it's for visitors it is not enough space. McKenna thinks the bus depot does not belong on the site as that is an industrial building. McKenna thinks it is wrong how the MSBA is driving the choice for the field house, the language used for the field house is wrong and making it seem like it is not important to the educational program. M.Battite: She noted she is excited to see how some fields may stay online and would like to review this offline with someone. Battite noted it seems like wells on the parking lot could be an option and hopes it is truly looked at as the impact on parking would be less than the fields. 	Record	
11.7	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A.Baker asked how the geothermal well system is accessed and maintained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.Prestileo noted that the manifolds would have to come up to grade somewhere but there is time to plan that C.Kosnoff thanks the project team for the visuals of the square footages described J.Himmel asked if recreation uses the current Lexington High School and if the planned meeting will be for the use of building too 	Record	
11.8	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:13 was made by A.Baker and seconded by H.M. Sha</p>	Record	

	Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Absent, 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 - Absent, Mark Barrett - Absent 8-0-0.		

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.