

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	11/04/24
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
✓	Steve Bartha	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
			✓	Claire Sheth	Recreation Department

Item No.		Description
1	<p>Call to Order & Overview: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:0 pm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBC Proposed Norms <p>1—Suspend disbelief and think, “Yes, we can.” 2 —Trust the process and prepare for it to be messy! 3 —Keep an open mind. Encourage respectful, free debate and suggestions regarding our work. 4 —Check your air time. External processors are encouraged to be internal processors and internal processors are encouraged to speak up. 5 —Celebrate individual and collective accomplishments.</p> <p>Activity: Working in small groups, SBC and Recreation Committee members will rotate through three stations and have a chance to interact directly with Project Team members. SMMA and Dore + Whittier representatives will facilitate at various stations, along with school staff. Before the discussion begins, each group should appoint a (1) notetaker, (2) timekeeper, and (3) reporter. Each team will have one large poster paper to record important insights from their station visits. Additionally, Station #2 includes a shared Google Doc for each group to copy and create a “mini position statement” that we will consolidate into one SBC Position Statement that will be shared publicly on 11-12-2024.</p> <p>Group Assignments: (Abbreviations will be used in the minutes for all names)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group #1: 1—Rick DeAngelis, 2—Melissa Battite, 3—Jon Himmel (JH2), 4—Carolyn Kosnoff, 5—Hsing Min Shah, 6—Alan Levine Group #2: 1—Andrew Baker, 2—Mark Barrett, 3—Absent, 4—Claire Sheth, 5—Kseniya Slavsky, 6—Dan Voss Group #3: 1—Steve Bartha, 2—Mike Cronin, 3—Chuck Favazzo, 4—Kathleen Lenihan, 5—Joe Pato 	Record
2	<p>STATION #1—FIELD HOUSE & ATHLETIC SCHEDULE Facilitators: Mike Burton and Lorraine Finnegan</p>	Record

	<p>In Station #1, participants will engage with SMMA (including Mike Dowhan and Anoush Krafian) to better understand the implications of the SBC's vote on the Field House and the extensive ongoing field use planning. SMMA will share their extra-large, colorful gnat charts, showing how they have analyzed field use and how Recreation and LPS Athletics are working together to determine future field use.</p> <p>Anticipated Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants will clearly understand the implications of a vote to include or exclude a new, larger Field House. ○ Participants will gain insight into the planning process for using the fields. ○ Participants will have an opportunity to ask questions and offer suggestions. <p>Essential Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the implications of a vote to include or not to include a new, larger Field House in the plans? ○ What impacts (positive and negative) might this decision have on the future design of the high school (e.g., solar benefits, design implications, etc.)? ○ Are there activities that once were held in the Field House that can now be included in the gymnasium to alleviate space concerns? ○ How is the Design Team helping Recreation and LPS Athletics balance the impacts associated with limited field use? <p>News You Can Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recreation Committee's Endorsement of Bloom ○ The SBC defines the base project as HS + FH + CO. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High School - 440,000 SF ● Field House - 34,000 SF renovated FH for \$27M. ● CO/Extra Classrooms - 20,000 SF for \$20M ○ 5 Field House Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A \$27M renovated Field House (34,000 SF) ● A \$41M add/reno Field House (48,000 SF) ● A \$38M new small Field House (36,000 SF) ● A \$60M new medium Field House (60,000 SF) ● A \$71M large Field House (72,000 SF) ● Group #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Possible to reserve a spot for a larger field ○ Wants a recommendation from the summit tonight ○ Explored locations where it could go – would not have a positive impact on the school, at best negative ○ Added complexity to Art 97 strategy ○ Possibly needing parking below it - costs of parking to be part of FH ○ Does seem the Rec Dept and Athletics are in conversation about its use ○ The new 18K gym could accommodate athletics that occur today in the exist FH ○ New FH would be built after new school is built ○ Reserved space should be a field not parking ○ Should be on the 5-10yr plan ○ Southeast corner or NE corner reviewed but not final choice 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make the existing FH bigger – Add/Reno is better ○ If you are going to do the new FH do the biggest ○ Jurisdiction discussed – if building that size it needs to a community space not necessarily school space – who owns it? Who manages it? Permitting for use? ○ Concerns about reserving the space for the larger one - constricts the area for everything else – tighter for parking and Fields ○ Being mindful that this is the "emerald jewel" and putting more uses on the site ○ Baseline option Add/reno leave space for larger one ○ Add cost for parking underneath it • Group #3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School project and reno is the appropriate path ○ Felt comfortable for reserving space for a small FH on campus ○ In reviewing the NE corner as the preferred location ○ Loose walking paths for new building and need an access road ○ Not really a "need" for the large FH ○ The Town is working proactively to coordinate field usage 	
3	<p>STATION #2—DRAFT POSITION STATEMENT FOR BLOOM OR WEAWE</p> <p>Facilitators: Christina Dell Angelo and Brian Black</p> <p>In Station #2, participants will engage with Dore + Whittier and SMMA (including Tom Faust & Erin Prestileo) on the pros and cons of Bloom and Weave. Each team will develop a “mini position statement” that will be collated with the other teams’ position statements and refined to make one official SBC Position Statement that will be read on November 12, 2024.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SBC Position Statement Template <p>Anticipated Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Each small group will reach a consensus on one design option (Bloom or Weave) and contribute ideas that will be shared with the whole group at the end of the day. <p>Essential Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Keeping in mind your unique perspectives as individuals representing various constituencies, what option do you choose and why? Identify key issues that should be included in our official SBC Position Statement. ○ What are the reasons for <u>not</u> choosing the other design option or options? 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering opposing views (see Citizen Petition materials below), what additional information might be helpful to include in our SBC Position Statement? <p>News You Can Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Alternatives Summary Reno and Add/Reno Challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architects' presentation (see slides 45-87) SBC video recording (see recording from 00:14:00 to 01:00:00 mark) on September 3, 2024 Article 1: Reports of Town Boards, Officers, and Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation Slides: Report of the School Building Committee Presentation Video: Report of the School Building Committee (YouTube) Article 8: Delay Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) Filing Resolution (Citizen Petition) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description Motion Presentation Slides Presentation Video (YouTube) <p>All 3 groups reviewed the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Things that both schemes C.5b and D.2 offer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> both are New construction have a life expectancy of 75 years meet the LPS educational program have MSBA reimbursement Address overcrowding meet Security and safety guidelines and standards have Some space for future expansion meet Lexington sustainability performance goals Affect abutters in different ways meet Accessibility requirements guidelines and standards <p>Pros and Cons of Bloom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pros: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less disruption Less cost More space around the building Less time Safety and security No modulars Only one move Meets educational adjacencies Cons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One wing of the building right next to existing building Article 97 Impact on fields <p>Weave:</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pros: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Article 97 • No field disruption • Reduced site scope • Cons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phased complicated building operation tie into MEP system • Disruption to school • Noise, transportation, efficiency of space • 4 phases of moves and tie in modulars • Less outdoor space • Circulation hasn't improved • Side by side impact • Higher cost • 2 more years • Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed parking vs distributed fields, what does splitting the fields mean? • Separating fields can add negative affect of not being able to observe all fields at once • Not convinced that it wasn't a big problem • Cost, duration, duration of disruption, degree of disruption and adjacencies • Bloom shines in all of these categories • Adjacencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bloom has a central core with vertical circulation, a more concise layout from core to neighborhoods and the ability to better engage the public • Bloom allows architect to start from blank slate • Weave requires architects to work around spaces • Bloom allows better site design • How to better allocate construction uses to parking to have less intrusion on fields • Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not just about families not being able to watch games together • Contiguous nature of fields allows for flexibility of programmed space • Economies of scale • More contiguous = more multipurpose • Lighting on Lincoln fields has been very well contained but noise remains • Pros and cons of either options vs potential citizen proposals • Starting from a baseline assumptions that buildings will serve all students and educational program • Anything else would mean relying on existing building to chug along • Weave: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing is more than just a noise disruption • Reroute systems that used to be connected and create new exit pathways • Modulars are a major investment that doesn't contribute to ultimate solution 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to justify paying more, taking several years longer, disruption students • Systems are past expected life and money is being spent to band aid the building • Consensus was that Bloom is less disruptive that invests money directly in something that is a benefit to town <p>Group 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimously in favor of Bloom • Risk aversion for schedule, cost, logistics, safety, disruption • Don't have to worry about risks when building on fields <p>Discussion</p> <p>J. Himmel says if we we're to do a phased project would enough be done in phase 1 that would qualify the project for MSBA reimbursement and would it be compliant with ed plan and SOI if town spends more than 30% of value of building, need to bring building up to code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phased approach, adjacencies in new building will be good for new building and questionable for things that remain in old building • Handicapped with adjacencies of multiphase • If you want something that excels in adjacencies, Bloom is the way to go 	
4	<p>STATION #3—ENROLLMENT AND MBTA ZONING BYLAW CHANGES</p> <p>Facilitators: Maureen Kavanaugh & Julie Hackett (Rosemary Park & Jacob Greco)</p> <p>In Station #3, participants will engage with Lexington Public Schools representatives & SMMA (including Phil Poinelli & Jesse) to learn more about the impacts of housing on enrollment and what LPS is doing to address concerns.</p> <p>Anticipated Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A shared understanding of the impact of known housing developments on enrollment. ○ An opportunity to review and discuss what is being done to address the impacts of the zoning bylaw changes, including outreach to the MSBA and master planning exercises to help determine 1) “How big is too big” for a high school, and 2) what enrollment numbers would trigger which brick and mortar, construction, or other options and when. <p>Essential Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are MBTA bylaw zoning changes, how is Lexington’s approach to them different than other cities and towns, and why is this a challenge? ○ What are the known housing developments, and how is LPS adjusting its enrollment projections? ○ What planning exercises is LPS engaged in to address zoning bylaw challenges? <p>News You Can Use:</p>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Planning Committee Update: Reviewing Enrollment & Space Use Strategies • Adjusting Enrollment Projections Based on Known Housing Development: A Preliminary Analysis • MSBA Enrollment Reconsideration Request • MBTA Zoning Bylaw Impacts & 3 Strategies in All Design Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group #1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CS asked if it is typical for cohorts to change from around 100 kids from K to 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted no that the 1st grade cohort shown is just 100 kids larger it is not a change from year to year ○ CS asked if they know the difference of student density based on owner/renter percentage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted that no there is no way to determine this yet as many owners rent out their condos ○ KS asked if the developments included in the projection are only the approved ones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted yes that they need more information from the pending ones to be able to include it ○ CS asked if there is a trend analysis that is happening that shows if taxes are going up that people are leaving and maybe more housing is going to be available for families with students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted around 10 years ago they reviewed this and there was not strong evidence to show that people 'graduate and evacuate' as aggressively as it is though ○ KS noted that as taxes go up the trend of mortgage rates going down may cause a net-zero change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK agreed as there are many outside factors that could negate the peaks and valleys in the trend ○ KS noted that it has been discussed that Lexington does not want more than 3000 students and she is wondering where that number comes from and what some other solutions will be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH re-iterated what she discussed in Group #3 • JH noted that the high school could accommodate anywhere from 850 to 1300 extra students depending on how aggressive of a path is taken • JH also noted that the common spaces have square footage caps on them that would only be able to accommodate so many students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group #2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HMS asked where the students that left went 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted that they went to a variety of different options such as homeschool, private, or moving due to the ability of families to work remotely or overseas/across the country. ○ HMS asked how they are gaining the data for the student density of these housing developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted they are using local Lexington data and not federal or national data. They are basing this on existing housing development data and syncing this with enrollment data ○ HMS asked about the average age of students that are moving into these units as how old they are when moving to Lexington will impact how they are being involved in the public school system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted that they do not have that data for first year movers but they will keep updating their projections ○ AL noted he is wondering if the numbers of home school and private school students will lower and if more students will be coming back to public schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MK noted that the number has stayed the same since the movement from 2020 but they will get new numbers this January. Historically the number has been at 90% attend public schools currently it is around 87%. ○ CK asked if there is any data of students leaving schools during construction years or any influxes of students when a new high school is finished. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMMA noted that 'If you build it they will come' but they do not have any new data on actual numbers ○ MK noted they are working on expanding the existing development housing data to get a better sense on the student impact ○ JH2 asked if the developments being proposed would be attracting the same income bracket families that the existing data is based on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CK noted that the majority of them are market rate ○ Patrick Mehr noted that in Lexington some developments generate 0 students but others bring in a large student density. The current projections are only 1/10th of the potential and it is impossible to note the projection of what these developments will bring. ○ AL noted that a problem is that Lexington has one of the top school systems in the state and the effect might be significantly different than other schools. He noted the developments coming in are going to be all vastly different. AL noted it will be very important for the school department to look into how it will impact their operating budgets. ○ CK noted that enrollment for the high school is important to her but based on what they have learned the impact the MBTA zoning will have on the high school is not on the top of her list of worries about how this will impact the town. She is more worried about operating budgets and other things as they have demonstrate the high school will have wiggle room for student population. ○ JH noted that there is a possibility of LABBB contributing money to the project as they have \$3 million in their budget. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AL noted that even if all of this is spent that would only be 25% of the roughly \$13 million the LABBB program will cost Group #3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH noted that LPS has reached out to the MSBA requesting multiple things and asked for their partnership. JH noted that they will be meeting with the MSBA on 11/12/24 to review their requests. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please view the 'MSBA Enrollment Reconsideration Request' for details of the requests JH noted that Lexington does not want to build a school for a max of 3,600 students and the master planning committee is working to find alternate solutions to hosting all of the students in one building. MC noted that based on the projections if the school opens in 2029 the enrollment number will be lower than the number the school is being built for. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MK noted that these numbers will change as only the smaller developments are included in this projection. However, the future cohorts are much smaller than the ones currently in the high school so the numbers will not be as bad as people are claiming. CF noted that when the projections for those are included it may likely still be within the built-in buffer zone the high school will have KL noted that the central office will allow an additional 244 students at the same class size CF noted that with the built in buffer zone the high school may not even be an issue it would be the elementary and middle schools. PP noted that he is concerned about the messaging that the school can handle such a large number of students as people may question why it is being built so large. He noted that with this size comes an increase in the utilization and this would be detrimental to the education program for Lexington. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JP noted that the higher utilization rate would bring them back to where they are today but in a facility where it is better accommodated to handle it. 	
5	<p>WHOLE GROUP SHARE OUT & REFLECTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Station 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that a spot for a larger field house could be reserved and there will be a recommendation from the summit tonight how much this is wanted. It would not have a positive impact on the planning for the site and would most likely be negative. There was discussion about adding parking under the field house which would raise the cost of it. The 	Record

	<p>new larger 18k gym could accommodate program from the current field house. It was noted that this would have to be included on a 10 year plan. The group was in favor of continuing with the renovation in favor of a new field house.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A key take away was that the default should be expanding the current field house but if a new one was to be built it does not make sense to do smaller or medium new and the larger one should be used. It was noted that if a new field house was built it should be first and foremost a community space rather than a school space as it would be taking up so much for the site. The group discussed who should own and manage the field house. There were concerns about reserving space for a new large field house due to the constraints and how tight the fields and parking would be. The group noted that as a baseline should be the add/reno and to save space for a large field house and if that goes to a vote the cost should be included to have parking beneath it. ○ Group 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The group noted that renovating the current field house is the ideal path and savings space for a new small field house would work but the medium and big would require too much loss of site. The group discussed the northeast corner being the ideal space but currently it is a nice walking area for the site. They discussed that the large field house is not necessary and the new school could account for some of the existing field house program. ● Section 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The group discussed distributed parking versus distributive fields and what it really meant as there has been little opposition to this aside from a group in town that dislikes it. It was noted that it could be a negative for families with multiple kids playing at the same time so they cannot all be seen at once. The group was not fully convinced this was a large problem. They focused the discussion on cost, duration, degree and duration of disruption, and adjacencies. It was noted that on all of these topics Bloom exceeded while Weave did not. The group was fond of Bloom's central core and vertical circulation. The group did discuss that with bloom the design team has a blanks late and can better create adjacencies than in weave. Bloom was also noted to have a better site design with a smaller footprint. The group discussed what would happen to the parking and how to better allocate construction uses to the parking instead of the fields. ○ Group 2: 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that all options will have a 1:1 recreation of the fields and all current uses on the bloom option including the fields created by the overlays of two fields. The group discussed the pros and cons of both options and some of the citizen community options. The two current options meet the full education plan and not part of it. If any other option is pursued it would require the continued use of the existing building which is already past its expected use. The group agreed the shorter the time till the new high school is open the better from both a fiscal and disruption perspective. The group noted both options would support the goals of the project at the end of the day but the actual construction project looks very different. The weave option would pose a lot of logistical challenges and would involve disruption construction inside the building. The group noted the negative of modulars in both a fiscal and disruptive sense. ○ Group 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group noted that the current building is much past its expected life and already has systems failing. In the weave option the very last phase is the one that would replace the HVAC and other vital systems and it was noted that the building should not be expected to last till then. The group noted they were all in favor of the Bloom selection and agreed with all the points presented by the previous two groups. • Section 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group noted that the numbers presented were much different and lower than what is being said about every unit producing a student. It would be good to look at the profile of students generated from the housing developments that the current companies have previously completed. The group noted a concern for operating costs in the town and other issues that may arise and they felt that the high school was not the largest issue that may arise from the MBTA zoning. The current letter to the MSBA about appropriate compensation for the change in zoning was reviewed also. It was noted that Lexington Highschool should not be larger than 3000 students as that is the ideal size. ○ Group 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main conversation was that all these things can be done but there is so many variables and factors that cannot be predicted that impacts who moves in and who moves out. They discussed how mortgage rates and taxes could impact student population and the group agreed that the MSBA should review the current situation. They noted how the current project could include the expansion potential area and if the central office is needed right away that another 	
--	---	--

	<p>group in town may have to start reviewing where they can move.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The group noted how valuable the presentation was on enrollment and are looking forward to the discussion with the MSBA on 11/12. The assumption in the group was that with the built in ability to grow enrollment for students in the current project is in a good place to meet the future demands and reach the upper limits of 3000 students. The group pointed out how the future enrollment is decreasing and with the MBTA zoning they will most likely be in a similar spot as they are currently are. The group also noted that the future building will be able to function better at higher utilization rate than the current building does. <p>Closing Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SBC had consensus on C.5b as the preferred option. There was further discussion regarding the field house. 2 out of 3 groups agreed with a renovated field house with future expansion/addition capabilities for planning purposes during Schematic Design. 1 group agreed that an addition renovation field house was their preferred option to explore. The SBC agreed that the Field House decision will be made on November 12th, the same meeting that the preferred option will be officially voted on. - 	
6	Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 3:35 was made by K.Lenihan and seconded by K.Slavsky	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.