

---

---

## **PART 4: LOCAL ACTIONS & APPROVALS**





**TOWN OF LEXINGTON**

**MASSACHUSETTS 02420**

**1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE**

June 29, 2017

Ms. Diane Sullivan  
Senior Capital Program Manager  
40 Broad Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

The Town of Lexington's School Building Committee ("SBC") has completed its review of the Schematic Design for the Maria Hastings Elementary School Project (the "Project"), and on June 14, 2017 the SBC voted to approve and authorize the Owner's Project Manager to submit the Schematic Design related materials to the MSBA for its consideration. A certified copy of the Schematic Design Approval Vote, which includes the specific language of the vote and the number of votes in favor, opposed, and abstained, are attached.

Since the MSBA's Board of Directors invited the District to conduct a Feasibility Study on May 25, 2016, the SBC has held **13** meetings regarding the proposed project, in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law. These meetings include:

- August 11, 2016
- September 15, 2016
- October 5, 2016
- November 10, 2016
- December 8, 2016
- December 22, 2016
- January 12, 2017
- January 26, 2017
- March 9, 2017
- April 6, 2016
- May 11, 2017
- June 5, 2017
- June 14, 2017

In addition to the SBC meetings listed above, the District held **10** public meetings, which were posted in compliance with the state Open Meeting Law, at which the Project was discussed. These meetings include:

- October 20, 2016
- November 1, 2016
- December 15, 2016 – Posted Community Meeting
- December 20, 2016 – School Committee
- February 28, 2017 – Abutter Meeting
- March 30, 2017 – Posted Community Meeting
- May 23, 2017 – School Committee
- June 6, 2017 – School Committee
- June 8, 2017 – Abutter Meeting
- June 15, 2017 – Posted Community Meeting



TOWN OF LEXINGTON

MASSACHUSETTS 02420

1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE

The presentation materials for each meeting, meeting minutes, and summary materials related to the Project are available locally for public review on the project website at: <http://www.lexingtonmultipleprojects.com>

To the best of my knowledge and belief, each of the meetings listed above complied with the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25 and 940 CMR 29 *et seq.*

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact Trip Elmore, OPM, at 978-499-2999.

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.

**By: Carl Valente**

**Title: Chief Executive Officer**

**Date:** 6/22/17

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.

**By: Mary Czajkowski**

**Title: Superintendent of Schools**

**Date:** 6/21/17

By signing this Local Action and Approval Certification, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information supplied by the District in this Certification is true, complete, and accurate.

**By: Alessandro Alessandrini**

**Title: Chair of the School Committee**

**Date:** 06/21/2017



Town of  
**Lexington**  
Massachusetts

Permanent Building Committee  
PBC Vote to Proceed with Submitting Schematic Design to the MSBA  
Lexington Hastings School Project  
Voted Upon in the 6/14/2017 PBC Meeting



Motion to authorize the OPM and Designer to proceed with the submission of Schematic Design to the MSBA, for a total project cost of \$65,280,000 as approved by the Lexington School Committee on June 6, 2017, by Howard Hobbs and 2nd by Phil Coleman

Discussion:

VOTE:

FOR: 6 AGAINST: 0 ABSTAIN: 0

Motion Passes For:

Certification of Vote: Jonathan Himmel, 14 Jun 17  
Jonathan Himmel, Chair Date

PBC Members Present for the vote, check the box for YES:

Jonathan Himmel, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Carl Oldenburg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Andrew Clarke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Curt Barrentine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Richard Perry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Charles Favazzo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Philip Coleman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Howard Hobbs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Peter Johnson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



## LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVALS

### SUMMARY OF LEXINGTON SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Meeting Date	Time	Group	Location	Topic
August 11, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	SBC Meeting to introduce OPM and review Designer RFS process
September 15, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	SBC Meeting to discuss Designer Selection
October 5, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Designer fee approval, schedule & goals discussion
November 10, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Review program, site selection process and design issues Approve PDP Submission
December 8, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Sustainability and Hastings LEED v. NE CHPS Review, Discussion and Recommendations
December 22, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Overview of Community Feedback, Presentation of Preferred Schematic, Approve PSR Submission
January 12, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Review of Construction Delivery Methods
January 26, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Design Progress and CM Selection Update
March 9, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Review of solar studies, neighbor impacts and sustainability
April 6, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Geo-Thermal Review
May 11, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Review of early packages, security updates and massing and elevation updates
June 5, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Review of SD Estimate Reconciliation
June 14, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Building Committee	Public Facilities Building	Vote to approve Schematic Design

## LOCAL ACTIONS AND APPROVALS

---

### SUMMARY OF OTHER PUBLIC MEETINGS

October 20, 2016	7:00 PM	PTA Visioning Meeting with Designers and OPM	Hastings Elem School	Community Visioning Meeting
November 1, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Committee	Public Facilities Building	Education Program Review and Approval
December 15, 2016	7:00 PM	PTA and Community Meeting	Estabrook Elementary School	School Tour and School Building Option Review and Feedback
December 20, 2016	7:00 PM	Lexington School Committee	Public Facilities Building	Overview of Community Feedback, Presentation of Preferred Schematic
February 28, 2017	7:00 PM	Abutter Meeting	Hastings Elem School	Building Project Update
March 30, 2017	7:00 PM	PTA and Community Meeting	Hastings Elem School	Building Project Update
May 23, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Committee	Town Offices	Building Project Update
June 6, 2017	7:00 PM	Lexington School Committee	Town Offices	Vote to approve Total Project Budget
June 8, 2017	7:00 PM	Abutter Meeting	Hastings Elem School	Building Project Update
June 15, 2017	7:00 PM	PTA and Community Meeting	Hastings Elem School	Building Project Update



Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
**SBC MEETING MINUTES**



**DATE OF MEETING:** June 14, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#12)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Phil Coleman	Lexington PBC
Howard Hobbs	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Kate Colburn	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP

---

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

- a. **Approval of May 11, 2017 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – Motion to approve the May 11, 2017 meeting minutes by R. Perry, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C Oldenburg.**

**Discussion:** None.

**VOTE:** Unanimous to approve

- b. **Approval of June 5, 2017 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – Motion to approve the June 5, 2017 meeting minutes by C Oldenburg, 2<sup>nd</sup> by R. Perry.**

**Discussion:**

- #2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, add a statement “ the original \$600,000 Geothermal Design was based on a deep well (1,500+ foot) Open Loop System similar to those in other Lexington schools, after engineering review it was determined that system was not appropriate for the Hastings Project but that a shallower (500 foot) Closed Loop System was the best fit for the Hastings Project, which led to a 100+/- well design configuration and a \$2.3 million dollar system cost. A test well was authorized and dug to confirm the engineers findings and it was determined that the closed system would work for the project.”**
- #2, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, add “the total value of the Value Engineering taken was \$1,445,370.”**
- Add a final paragraph “ The Design team has taken design benefits and lessons learned from the Estabrook Project and incorporated them into the Hastings design.**
- In the list of V/E taken, G.3 is listed 2 times, remove one.**

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

***Motion changed to accept amended minutes as are outlined in 1 - 4 above.***

***VOTE: Unanimous to approve***

**2. Budget Update and Submission of the Schematic Design:**

T. Elmore reviewed the copy of the budget summary that was reviewed with the Lexington School Committee, pointing out that the Project cost of \$65.28 Million was voted and unanimously approved by the Lexington School Committee on the 6<sup>th</sup> of June 2017. He also had provided a copy of the Table of Contents of the Schematic Design submission that would be delivered to the MSBA on June 29<sup>th</sup>, if the PBC voted tonight to have the OPM and Designer submit the schematic design, at a budget of \$65.28 Million.

The committee asked a few questions about the make-up of the Total Project Budget numbers and the Value Engineering process going forward. T Elmore explained that once this number has been agreed to with the MSBA, we can continue to look for ways through the value engineering process to reduce the cost. As we go through the next steps and phases we will continue to find Value Engineering items to be added to the list for review. It was noted that the number for the project with the MSBA is capped once the MSBA Board approves the Schematic Design Submission and issues/executes the project funding agreement. The budget can go down, but not above the agreed upon project budget amount.

***Motion to authorize the OPM and Designer to proceed with the submission of the Schematic Design to the MSBA, for a total project cost of \$65,280,000 as approved by the Lexington School Committee on June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017, by Howard Hobbs, and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Phil Coleman.***

***Discussion: None***

***VOTE: 6 for the motion; 0 against; 0 abstentions***

***Motion Passes.***

(Certification of the vote was signed by the chair)

**3. Upcoming PBC Meetings:**

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. June 28, 2017 – PBC Meeting

**4. Hastings Discussion adjourned at 8:32 PM – Minutes provided by T. Elmore, Dore & Whittier management Partners**



**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 12, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#6)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

1. **Approval of December 22, 2016 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – PBC**

**Motion to approve and certify the December 22, 2016 meeting minutes as the official certified record for the MSBA, by C. Oldenburg, 2<sup>nd</sup> by D. Perry.**

***Discussion:***

*Minor typo correction was cited: 1<sup>st</sup> page, item 1 motion “Oldenbug should be Oldenburg”*

*A question was raised on the value of the Add/Reno option in the minutes; does it include the cost of swing space? The OPM clarified that at the time of the meeting it was an unknown cost and was NOT in the Add/Reno value. However, after the meeting, the OPM contacted Triumph Modulars and estimated the cost of an 80,000 SF complex to cost over \$5 million for a 20 month duration. It was acknowledged that there isn't a site for this modular complex to go and that the swing space number when added to the Add/Reno option it would push the cost higher than the new building option.*

**VOTE: Unanimous to approve the December 22, 2016 minutes**

2. **PSR Submission update**

OPM and Designer reported that the Preliminary Schematic Report (PSR) had been submitted to the MSBA on January 4<sup>th</sup> as planned. The MSBA responded that in their cursory review, all of the required material was included in the submission. The project team reported that they had a Pre-Facility Assessment Subcommittee (FAS) Conference Call with the MSBA and Lexington's

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

representatives describing the FAS meeting which is scheduled for January 18<sup>th</sup> at 9:10 AM at the MSBA offices.

T. Elmore explained that at the FAS meeting, the District describes their Educational Program and the Designer reviews the preferred solution to the MSBA team and their selected Board Members. In the call, the MSBA acknowledged that this is a fairly straightforward project and they don't anticipate any unusual issues.

### **3. Presentation of Construction Delivery Method options & Inspector General CM at Risk Application process (See attached Construction Delivery Slides)**

The OPM reviewed the slide presentation that had been included with the meeting information packet to the SBC members. The committee held a lengthy discussion on the benefits and concerns with both construction delivery methods, of which most of the topics discussed were captured in the attached presentation slides.

After the committee asked specifically about other project experiences using both methods to the OPM and Designer, both the OPM and the Designer recommended the CM at Risk Construction delivery method for many of the control and safety reasons that exist in this process.

The Dept. of Public Facilities and Estabrook School Principal both agreed that the CM at Risk benefits were evident from the Estabrook Building experience, especially in terms of a quality building and the safety aspects of the construction process.

There was discussion around the "premium costs" associated with the CM at Risk delivery method, which could range from 3 to 10%. It was noted that sources to verify a specific "premium" number are highly speculative and tend to be more opinion than fact. However, the MSBA is eliminating the additional 2 reimbursement points, and is commenting that there is a premium cost. The team believes that we are still entitled to the additional 2 Reimbursement points if the decision is to use the CM at Risk (149a) method as we should be "grandfathered" in.

J. Himmel commented that there are a number of summary benefits related to chapter 149A, CM at Risk construction delivery which should be included into this evening's notes:

- Improved site safety and management of construction vehicles coming to and from the site.
- Better control of the schedule ie better on time completion of the project
- Occupancy of building 4 to 6 months earlier than 149 process – (Design, Bid, Build)
- Earlier use of the site after building construction is done
- Preconstruction services
- Subcontractor quality providing better project quality
- Better fit with redistricting since there is a sense that re-districting is best done at the start of the school year [there is a greater chance that a September completion is more at risk with the 149 process.

D. DiNisco indicated that her read was that the schools that are currently in the pipeline, such as Hastings, are eligible for a CM reimbursement of 2% of eligible costs [\$312 per sf].

The current construction is thought to be \$450 per sf; Lexington would be on the hook for the \$138 per square foot delta for the first 2%, or \$303,600 if there are 110,000 sf in the project. Furthermore, Lexington would be on the hook for the 149A process premium at a rate of

$\$450 \times 1\% \times 110000 = \$495,000$  per each additional 1% over the 2% reimbursed by the MSBA. Therefore, if the 149A premium is, say, 5%, Lexington would be on the hook for the \$303,600 for Lexington's portion of the first 2%, plus  $\$450/\text{sf} \times 3\% \times 110000 = \$1,788,600$ .

The OPM discussed the CM at Risk Selection process, which starts with the selection of a Construction delivery method. If CM at Risk is selected, the OPM would then need to begin the IG Application for submission.

The remainder of the steps will take place in a sequence that gets the CM on board in approximately 3 months, or in Lexington's case, by the beginning of April 2017. Following the selection of the Construction Delivery Method, the PBC would then have to select the CM Selection Committee at the next meeting if they voted to select CM at Risk.

***Motion to use the CM at Risk Construction Delivery method on the Hastings elementary School Project and have the OPM submit the IG Application, by C. Favazzo, 2<sup>nd</sup> by P Coleman.***

***VOTE: Unanimous to approve the motion to use the CM at Risk Construction Delivery Method and submit the IG application.***

**4. The Design Meeting update**

D. DiNisco commented that the 1<sup>st</sup> design meeting that took place on the 11<sup>th</sup> was primarily focused on the site aspects around the building. She reported that the tentative agendas for the next four meetings were handed out in case any of the P/SBC members have interest in participating.

*These meeting take place every other Wednesday at 7:30 AM at 201 Bedford Street and PBC Members are invited to contribute at these meetings.*

**5. Sustainable Building Process Update**

C. Barrentine attended the Sustainability Stakeholders follow up meeting on January 9, 2017, and summarized the additional detail generated in a spreadsheet, which was distributed and discussed. (See the attached handout.)

Currently, the Stakeholders meetings are being scheduled to have a recommendation to the Lexington Selectmen by March 1<sup>st</sup>. This committee will be asked to vote their recommendations on items in the next meeting. It was requested that the committee members be given a scoring sheet in advance of the next PBC meeting which DPF agreed would be done.

**6. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. TBD 2017 – PBC Meeting

**7. Motion to adjourn by D. Perry, 2<sup>nd</sup> P Coleman. VOTE: Unanimous to approve. Hastings Project meeting ended at 9:35 PM**

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Trip Elmore

Dore & Whittier Management Partners

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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.

Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES



**DATE OF MEETING:** January 26, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#7)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Peter Johnson	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

1. **Approval of January 12, 2017 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – PBC**

***Motion to approve the January 12, 2017 meeting minutes by C. Oldenburg, 2<sup>nd</sup> by D. Perry. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.***

***Discussion:***

T. Elmore explained that the scheduled included as backup to the minutes was provided to show the discussed scheduled differentiation between the CM as Risk and Design, Bid, Build delivery methods for record.

2. **CM at Risk Qualifications Sub-Committee Selection**

T. Elmore explained the CM at Risk Application is currently being built and is expected to be submitted to the IG next week. He then explained that the next steps in the CM at Risk process is to form a CM Selection Committee who will be responsible for reviewing the qualifications submitted by interested CM Firms to pre-qualify them to bid on the project. In addition, a Selection Committee must also be formed for the review and evaluation of CM Proposals and Interviews (if interviews are held).

He added that often both selection committees are made up of the same members – pointing out that the member requirement for these committees is the OPM, Designer and 3 representatives from Lexington.

C. Favazzo, D. Perry and J. Himmel all volunteered to participate in the CM Selection Committee.

***Motion by J. Himmel to approve C. Favazzo, D. Perry and J. Himmel to serve as the 3 required Lexington Representatives on the CM Selection Committee, 2<sup>nd</sup> by P. Johnson. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.***

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

T. Elmore added that he has heard from both Consigli and Skanska that these firms are interested in submitting a proposal for the Hastings Project. The Committee agreed that if these firms do submit proposals, some members of the PBC may have to recuse themselves from any votes on their behalf, as these Firms employ them.

### 3. Design Process Update

T. Elmore reported that 2 Design Process Meetings have been held since the design meeting schedule had been issued, and DiNisco has begun formulating more design detail with the input provided at these meetings.

Furthermore, he added that DWMP, DiNisco and P. Goddard participated in a conference call with the MSBA this week where they discussed the MSBA's PSR comments, and the next steps going forward throughout the year. T. Elmore informed that the call went well, which is usually a good indicator that the following Board Meeting (on February 15, 2017) where the MSBA vote to move the project into Schematic Design (SD) will also go well.

The Committee discussed the next few deadlines, pointing out that the SD submission will be due at the end of June to stay on schedule, where the decision to move into the Design Development (DD0) Phase will then be made.

L. Lipsitz added that she has scheduled 3 full days in February with DiNisco and certain members of the Hastings Staff to discuss design details of a few spaces.

P. Goddard also added that a vote for additional appropriation must take place at the next Town Meeting to allow for the \$720,000 which will continue the project, \*at risk\*, through DD; explaining that the risk is to immediately begin DD after SD has been submitted to the MSBA, but before the MSBA's Board vote to move the project forward into DD – since the \$720,000 is reimbursable by the MSBA if this vote passes, but will not be reimbursed if the vote does not pass.

T. Elmore pointed out that the next town vote to appropriate the funds for the *remainder* of the project will take place in the Fall of 2017.

### 4. Update on Policy Recommendations Since 1/12/17 PBC Meeting

P. Goddard reported that a third Stakeholders meeting was held on Monday where they made the final revisions to their Integrated Design spreadsheet. The Committee then went through the spreadsheet line by line documenting which decisions they support.

P. Goddard will update the spreadsheet with the PBC's input and re-distribute.

### 5. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. TBD 2017 – PBC Meeting

### 6. Motion to adjourn at 8:45 PM by D. Perry, 2<sup>nd</sup> C. Oldenburg. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.

#### **DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Rachel Milaschewski

Dore & Whittier Management Partners

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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.



Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES



**DATE OF MEETING:** March 9, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#8)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Peter Johnson	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

1. **Approval of January 26, 2017 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – PBC**

***Motion to approve the January 26, 2017 meeting minutes by D. Perry, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Favazzo. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.***

***Discussion: None.***

2. **Budget Updates:**

T. Elmore reviewed the copy of the budget that was distributed, pointing out what has been expended to date and what currently remains. He added that the Environmental & Site, Geotechnical, and Survey work that was recently amended to DiNisco's contract was an expected expense, and there will likely be more testing going throughout the Schematic Design Phase.

3. **CM Selection Update:**

T. Elmore stated that the CM Selection Committee met prior to this meeting to review and discuss their evaluations of the qualifications received from interested CM Firms. He pointed out that they received 8 statements of qualifications from a great pool of Construction Managers, of which only one firm did not meet the minimum grading criteria. He added that the 7 qualified firms will receive a copy of the RFP on Monday to invite them to submit a proposal for the MHES Project.

Furthermore, he stated that the SBC needs to establish and vote on the CM Selection Committee for the proposal review stage, though it is common the members stay the same as the qualifications review stage.

After discussion, the SBC agreed that the members of the Selection Committee should stay the same, with the addition of Louise Lipsitz, the MHES Principal.

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

**Motion to keep the members of the CM Selection Committee the same for the proposal evaluation phase, with the addition of Louise Lipsitz by C. Favazzo, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Oldenburg.**  
**VOTE: Unanimous to approve.**

**4. Designer Updates:**

D. DiNisco spoke to their presentation, updating the committee on the most recent design evolvments, sustainability decisions and schedule (presentation attached). She pointed out that many stakeholders felt strongly about an all-electric geothermal system, which the School Committee agreed; DiNisco is currently working these design decisions into the design of the building.

Additionally, she said that the project team had met with the MSBA in February prior to Lexington's invite to the Schematic Design (SD) Phase for the MHES Project; the meeting went well, and the invite occurred when anticipated, keeping the project on schedule for the SD submission at the end of June, 2017, and a winter 2020 occupancy.

**5. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. TBD 2017 – PBC Meeting

**6. Hastings Discussion adjourned at 8:25 PM – Minutes provided by R. Milaschewski, Dore & Whittier management Partners**

**7. BOS Sustainability Policy Discussion**

Pat Goddard distributed four documents for review and discussion

- The Stakeholders Integrated spreadsheet with final stakeholder input that was discussed at the joint BOS SC meeting on 2-27-17.
- A draft of the 2005 BOS Sustainable design Policy updated by Pat Goddard to include the 3 out takes for the 2-27-17 mtg.
- A draft of the 2005 BOS Sustainable design policy updated by the Sustainable Lexington Committee.
- An updated draft of the 2005 BOS Sustainable design policy updated by the Sustainable Lexington Committee.

Pat briefly updated the PBC on the discussion points at the 2-27-17 BOS/SC meeting with regard to the stakeholders Input Table and the three issues from that table that were acted upon.

Hastings project would have level 4 building resiliency not level 3.

Hastings project would employ an all-electric HVAC model utilizing geothermal wells.

Hastings project would not require 30% increase in ventilation to reduce CO2 ppm, but distribution modifications to enhance dilution of CO2 perhaps 10% better than Estabrook.

The purpose behind the draft policy update was to formally update the 2005 Policy based upon the past two integrated design processes that have been followed for the Clarke & Diamond Project and the Hastings Project, with very similar outcomes.

There was discussion on the specifics of some of the draft update language.

It was noted that there was not a quorum of the core PBC committee and that this particular issue needs to be discussed by the core committee so in-depth discussion at tonight's meeting should be deferred until the core PBC had a quorum.

It was agreed to continue this discussion at another meeting.

## 8. **PBC Membership**

At the request of Jon Himmel PBC Chairman, Pat verified with the members present that the nomination of Howard Hobbs be made to the Town Manager for the open slot on the full PBC core committee. The members present agreed.

**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**



**DATE OF MEETING:** April 6, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#9)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Phil Coleman	Lexington PBC(left at 7:45)
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Ken DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Vivian Low	DiNisco Design
Tim Roos	Wellspring Geothermal
Semmoon Oh	VAV International

---

**1. Call to order at 7:07**

- a. J. Himmel commented that there was a Sustainability Committee and Selectmen meeting on April 5th, 2017, but no vote or new policy direction was issued because of that meeting.

**2. Geo-Thermal Discussion**

D. DiNisco opened the discussion with a review of the events that had taken place over the past several months, including:

- a. The integrated project design process reviewed several Sustainable Building options that were evaluated for pro/con's, including the concept of going "All Electric".
- b. In the "All Electric" HVAC system designs, 2 types of systems are available, VRF and Geo-thermal. VRF had been eliminated as an option for several reasons, including building size and short life span on equipment (less than 15 years).
- c. The Geo-thermal concept was initially thought to match the Fiske and Harrington "Open Column Loop" design and would have an initial cost premium of approximately \$600,000 for 12 to 15 1,500-foot-deep wells.
- d. The Selectmen approved going with the "All Electric" HVAC concept in March.
- e. After learning more about the Geothermal systems, the initial cost estimate was found to be inaccurate for a "Closed Loop" geothermal system which could be a cost premium of \$1.2 to \$1.8 Million.

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

Tim Roos, Wellspring Geothermal, and Semoon Oh, VAV International, Inc., provided the PBC with a handout that detailed the evaluation between an “Open Loop” or a “Closed Loop” geothermal system that has taken place to determine which system is the best geothermal system for the Hasting project. Tim then provided a summary of the handout and led a discussion on the 2 types of geothermal systems available. (See the attached VAV International letter, dated 4/5/2017, handout for specific details)

The result of this analysis is that a “Closed Loop” System is the “right choice” preferred system for several reasons, including:

- a. The system is not effected by ground water particulates that reduce the performance of the system, which has found to be an issue at the Fiske and Harrington Schools
- b. The system is completely buried and does not impact the ground surface, so it can go under the play field
- c. There is no environmental permitting, or registration with the DEP
- d. The performance between both systems is comparable (if there are no sediment issues with an “Open Loop” system which we know to exist in Lexington, therefore a closed loop is a more controlled and reliable choice)

The design team recommends that a 500-foot-deep test well be installed and tested over a 48-hour period in order to more accurately design and price the system. The cost for the test well is approximately \$30,000, plus some other design and consultant costs. The test well would become a part of the permanent system, if the system is installed.

D. DiNisco informed the PBC that the system should have a back-up alternative if there are unforeseen issues with the geothermal system. Therefore, DiNisco Design is recommending that a small Boiler Plant be included in the design. After discussions with the Facilities Department, the option to install 2 small boilers instead of one larger boiler would be preferred.

PBC members asked questions during the discussion, including:

- a. What is the Btu design capacity between the 2 types of systems?

Answer- Open Loop ranges 12,000 to 18,000 Btu per well depending on several factors;  
Closed is 2,500 Btu per well

- b. What would be the expected number of wells in a Closed Loop system for the Hastings project?

Answer- approximately 110 +/- 500-foot-deep wells

- c. Do we have a sense of the levels of ledge in the area proposed

Answer- we have not done a ledge profile for the area, but based on information gathered around the building foot-print we anticipate that the ledge is 10 or more feet below the current field surface.

***A motion to use the “Closed Loop” geothermal system on the Hastings Project as basis of the HVAC Design and to approve moving forward with the test well and 48 hour testing was made by P. Coleman, and second by C. Barrentine. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.***

Additional comments:

DiNisco Design has notified the Conservation Commission that we would be seeking approval by PBC to put in a test well, DiNisco Design will update the Conservation Commission on the outcome from tonight's meeting.

The committee agreed that when the discussion about the upfront cost premium of Geothermal is more defined, it should always include the offsetting operational cost benefit. This would more accurately show that the upfront cost is less significant. The Design team was asked to provide a life cycle cost analysis of the system to illustrate the operational cost benefit. The Design team agreed to try and have this available by the May 11, 2017 PBC meeting, but due to number of design variables and attaining the test well result report that date may not be achievable.

*\*The Hastings portion of the PBC meeting ended at 8:03 PM\**

**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**



**DATE OF MEETING:** May 11, 2017 at 7:30P.M. at Community Center, Rm 425, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#10)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Howard Hobbs	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Kate Colburn	School Committee Liason
Peter Kelley	Selectmen Liason
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Vivian Low	DiNisco Design

---

**1. Call to order at 7:30**

T. Elmore of DWMP made the announcement that the CM Selection Committee for the Maria Hastings ES Project finalized their evaluations and selected Walsh Brothers as Construction Manager.

**2. Plan Update and Site Development Considerations**

V. Low reviewed the slides provided in the meeting packet; she explained that there have not been any major design changes made to the building or the site since the Committee had last met. She and D. DiNisco pointed out that they have explored multiple options for Police access around the building, as requested by the Lexington Police Department, but they have not settled on a particular option yet at this time. V. Low explained that the cost difference between the options could range significantly, as it affects the size of the retaining wall which abuts it and could become pricey; it will become clearer which direction to go in once they receive the reconciled SD cost estimate.

Furthermore, DiNisco discussed the option of building an access road to Mass. Ave on the upper portion of the site for utility vehicles during construction. The Committee discussed this option and suggested exploring ways to use this road permanently, even after construction.

The Design team explained that due to the volume of traffic on Mass. Ave and its location to the bypass over the highway, it may be unsafe to use the access road as a permanent drive, though they reiterated that they will be exploring these options further with the Construction Manager.

**PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS**

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

### 3. **Site Security Update**

V. Low then went on to explain that the Design team has met with their Security Consultant, who offered some suggestions in regards to site safety and security measures (i.e. fencing along drives, card access to building, camera locations, etc.), which they will continue to include into the design.

### 4. **Massing Elevation Updates**

DiNisco then reviewed the elevation images included in the meeting packet, describing their thoughts behind potential material selections and locations of glass, etc. V. Low mentioned that the building has the potential to look very heavy with the classroom wing being 3 stories, and the design team is exploring exterior material options and applications to avoid such a heavy look.

The Committee agreed with DiNisco's findings and offered suggestions, which the Design team will review and discuss at their next Design Team Meeting.

### 5. **Project Schedule**

DWMP and DiNisco discussed the meeting schedule leading up to the Schematic Design Submission. T. Elmore explained that in this time there will be a number of PBC meetings, a cost estimate reconciliation, a Budget Summit, and a number of School Committee meetings.

Due to the short period of time between the reconciliation and the budget summit, P. Goddard explained that the reconciled estimate may be presented to the School Committee prior to the PBC having an opportunity to hold a meeting. Though the PBC will see the reconciled estimate before the Budget Summit meeting, the Committee still felt it was important to schedule a special meeting to discuss the estimate beforehand.

The Committee then further discussed the list of upcoming meetings and agreed to add a PBC Meeting for Monday, June 5<sup>th</sup> in order to review the estimates.

*\*The Hastings portion of the PBC meeting ended at 8:50 PM\**



**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**



**DATE OF MEETING:** June 5, 2017 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford Street, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#11)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Howard Hobbs	Lexington PBC
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Ken DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Vivian Low	DiNisco Design

---

**1. Call to order at 7:05**

M. Barrett handed out the Meeting Minutes from the 5/5 and 5/11 PBC Meetings, which the Committee agreed to table until the next scheduled PBC Meeting on 6/14 for further review.

**2. Review of Project Estimate**

D. DiNisco began by explaining that a good portion of last week was spent reviewing the estimates from both A. M. Fogarty (third party estimator), and Walsh Brothers, adding that they will be carrying A. M. Fogarty's number in the Schematic Design submission to the MSBA. She explained that the building itself has not shifted from a cost perspective, but there are many characteristics to the site which create a challenge, and in turn increases cost; some of these characteristics being the topography, storm water management parameters, need for large retaining walls, etc.

D. DiNisco went on to say that the estimates were close to a 7% difference at the end of the day Friday, adding that the project team has spent a lot of time reconciling. Furthermore, she stated that Walsh wanted a couple more days to fine-tune some of their numbers, and added that she is confident they will get to a number that is agreed upon.

Additionally, D. DiNisco explained that the project team had begun to put together a VE Log to bring the number down; they had gone through a series of adjustments to simplify some areas of design to be more cost effective. One major adjustment that is currently being explored is a ~15% rotation of the building away from the abutter property lines, which could allow them to avoid any easements, perform a smaller amount of blasting, and less of a retaining wall on the north side of the property. The Committee then began to review the VE items, and D. DiNisco reassured that none of these items would affect the educational program, maintenance, operations, or function of the building; she added that most of them are more of a "nicety" and not necessary to the design.

**PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS**

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

After being asked why the cost of geothermal went up so much since the PSR, the project team explained that after further exploration of the site and geothermal well systems, it became apparent that the “shallow closed loop” system was most appropriate and efficient for the site, which is more expensive than the deep wells upfront. D. DiNisco pointed out that they would have a life cycle cost analysis soon. *The original \$600,000 Geothermal Design was based on a deep well (1,500+ foot) Open Loop System similar to those in other Lexington schools, after engineering review it was determined that system was not appropriate for the Hastings Project but that a shallower (500 foot) Closed Loop System was the best fit for the Hastings Project, which led to a 100+/- well design configuration and a \$2.3 million dollar system cost. A test well was authorized and dug to confirm the engineers findings and it was determined that the closed system would work for the project.*

The Committee then discussed the option of the Haul Road, giving access to construction vehicles during construction. D. DiNisco pointed out that Walsh believes the Haul Road could come as a savings to the project, as it would allow for larger construction vehicles to access the site for deliveries, resulting in less deliveries, which cost money. There was a discussion regarding the requirement of a police detail if the Haul Road were to be put in place, and D. DiNisco reported that the project team is currently exploring this option in further detail. The Committee and project team all agreed that the Haul Road would be worth if from a cost standpoint, and the project team will report back with their findings.

The Committee then reviewed the remaining items in the VE log, agreeing to take several of the items now and leaving the rest of the items for discussion down the road, *the total value of the Value Engineering taken was \$1,445,370.*

G.1, G.3, G.4, G.6, G.7, G.14, B.1, B.2, B.6, C.1, C.2, C.4, C.6, C.7

D. DiNisco and T. Elmore then explained that this list will continue to grow and will be much larger by the time they go out to the voters, though this was a successful first pass in finding savings. D. DiNisco added that the VE Log will also be included with the cost estimates in the submission to the MSBA.

*The Design team has taken design benefits and lessons learned from the Estabrook Project and incorporated them into the Hastings design.*

Motion to Adjourn by D. Perry



**Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES & LOCAL VOTE RESULTS**

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 11, 2016 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#1)

**ATTENDING:**

Pat Goddard	Director of Public Facilities
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Dr. Mary Cazjkowski	Superintendent of Schools
Louise Lipsitz	Principal, MHES
Eric Brown	Lexington PBC
Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo Jr.	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Sandra Trach	Lexington
Eileen Jay	School Committee
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP

---

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 7:00 PM with 8 voting Members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

A short SBC review of the June 30, 2016 Meeting Minutes was provided by the E. Brown.

***Motion to approve the June 30, 2016 SBC Meeting Minutes by E. Brown, 2nd by R. Perry.  
VOTE: 8 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain***

**Discussion:** No discussion.

3. **General Business Update** – Introduction of OPM below:

4. **OPM Selection Process Update** – Introduction of Dore & Whittier Management Partners

M. Barrett introduced Trip Elmore, Project Director, and Rachel Milaschewski, Assistant Project Manager, from Dore and Whittier as the OPM for the MHES Project.

P. Goddard briefed the committee that the MSBA had endorsed the Town's OPM selection at the OPM Review Panel Meeting on August 1, 2016 and are ready to move forward with the project.

T. Elmore added that the Dore and Whittier team was organized to fit Lexington's needs, stating that they are prepared for what's to come and commented on their strong relationship with the MSBA

5. **Kick-Off Meeting with OPM – Binders Handed Out and Materials Reviewed:**

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

T. Elmore then went on to explain the SBC Binders which were provided to each committee member at the beginning of the meeting and touched on the purpose of each item included in the binders listed below:

**a. State Ethics Course Description**

The state of MA has an online ethics course that reviews the ethics guidelines that would be applied to all that represent a municipality. This course is not a requirement, though it is recommended.

**b. AGC Open Meeting Law Guidelines Handout:**

A basic reference for Open Meeting Laws and Guidelines, i.e. participation requirements, posting requirements, meeting records requirements, etc.

**c. Project Team Contact Information:**

The project team contact sheet includes an email and phone number for each member of the committee, as well as the OPM team, and the Designer and CM once they are on board.

**d. Project Goals Sample:**

The project goals sample is a list of “project goals” that has been generated by committees on past projects for an idea of what other Districts have strived to accomplish throughout their school building projects. Also included with the sample goals is a worksheet that committee members can record their personal goals on for the project in terms of sustainability, finance, educational program, etc.; These goals are typically put together in a collective statement which can be referenced throughout the project to assure that the design and other aspects, such as sustainability, finance, educational program, etc. stay on track.

E. Brown suggested that they request feedback from the faculty as well, while also suggesting the committee forms a working group to lead this exercise.

**e. Project Working Group Sample:**

Working Groups can be created to assist the SBC in exploring the many details of the project offline and in depth, then bring their recommendations for strategic decisions to the committee to capitalize on time. The committee can invite members of the community to participate in the working groups, especially those who may have particular interests or skillsets that could be of help in areas like the interior design or mechanical systems selection. Some working group examples may be Facilities Working Group, Community Outreach/Public Relations Working Group, Finance Working Group, etc.

**f. Potential Project Schedule Sample**

Depending on the outcome of the Designer Selection, two difference schedules were provided – an accelerated schedule which may be an option if DiNisco is selected as the designer for the remainder of the project, or a non-accelerated schedule if they are not. The MSBA’s typical schedule was also included to use as a reference.

P. Goddard made a comment that they won't know what schedule path they are on until they select a designer, and T. Elmore mentioned that the Committee could set up a Schedule Review Working Group if it becomes necessary.

Also included in the Schedule section is a "Typical Project:" meeting outline, defining what meetings happen when, and the milestones/votes they lead up to.

T. Elmore stated that DWMP would provide a meeting outline specific to the MHES project once the designer is on board.

**g. Architect RFS Draft**

The draft Architect RFS was included for the committee to review. T. Elmore pointed out that the MSBA has provided their feedback on the document, and they plan to have it completed for distribution on August 17, 2016, when the advertisement will be published in the Central Register.

**h. Community Communications Sample**

Examples of Community Outreach materials were provided that can be used to reach the general public prior to the vote; these materials, made in the form of a flyer, mailer, summary report, etc., are intended to educate the community on the building project outside of the public forums.

A member of the committee pointed out that taxpayer money cannot be used for promotional material for a debt exclusion vote, though the committee did agree to explore what options are available and allowed for PR opportunities down the road.

DWMP indicated that any updates made to the binder material will be distributed to the committee, and added that the binder is a good way to stay organized and on the same page.

**6. Architect Hiring Process Update**

**a. RFS and Distribution Progress Update**

T. Elmore pointed out that the advertisement for the Architect RFS will be published on August 17, 2016, and proposals will be due on September 7, 2016. He added that he spoke with the MSBA about the accelerated schedule to see if it was something they would support, which they agreed to do if DiNisco were chosen as the Project Architect. Though, the MSBA fully expects the Town of Lexington to follow through the designer selection properly and without bias.

T. Elmore added that the RFS states that DiNisco has already completed the front end work, but the work that has been done to date will be available for the interested firms if needed.

A question was raised asking if this information stated in the RFS would scare away potential Architects, as they may assume that another company already has a shoe-in.

T. Elmore explained that that is a possibility, but it is best to be transparent about the process thus far.

Some committee members asked if there was a way to be proactive by sending letters out to design firms requesting a proposal, though others agreed that doing that may be a conflict of interest.

A few more questions were raised asking about the selection process, and how it would pan out if only one proposal was received, or if the MSBA's Designer Selection Panel (DSP) chose not to interview.

T. Elmore described the Architect Hiring Process with the DSP, stating that if the DSP has to make a motion to interview and it is ultimately their call. He pointed out that if interviews are held, the Town is allowed 3 of the 15 total votes, but it is permissible to explain to the DSP who the Town is most comfortable with and why.

P. Goddard and DWMP agreed to create a write-up and timeline of the DSP process and distribute it to the Committee for more clarity.

7. **Other Business Not Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting:** *None.*
8. **Public Comment:** *None.*
9. **Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:** TBD
10. **Adjourn**

***SBC Motion to adjourn by R. Perry, 2nd by P. Coleman. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM***

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Rachel Milaschewski

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, 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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.



**Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES & LOCAL VOTE RESULTS**

**DATE OF MEETING:** September 15, 2016 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#2)

**ATTENDING:**

John Himmel	Lexington PBC, Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Dr. Mary Czajowski	Superintendent of Schools
Louise Lipsitz	Principal, MHES
Eric Brown	Lexington PBC
Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo Jr.	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Sandra Trach	Lexington
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP

---

1. **Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 7:02 PM with 5 voting Members in attendance.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

A short SBC review of the August 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes was provided by the M. Barret.

**Discussion:** A suggestion was made to spell out the acronyms in section 4 of the meeting minutes.

***Motion to approve the August 11, 2016 SBC Meeting Minutes as amended with discussed changes by C. Barrentine, 2nd by C. Oldenburg. VOTE: 5 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain***

*\*C. Favazzo, J. Himmel, and P. Coleman arrive – 8 voting members in attendance\**

3. **Architect Selection Update; DSP Meeting on 9/27/2016 at 8:30AM, 40 Broad Street, Boston, MA**

T. Elmore of DWMP began by pointing out that only one Designer submission was received in response to the RFS, which came from DiNisco. He explained that in this case, the MSBA requires that the eligible applicant submits a statement that explains the following (statement attached):

- Why they may have received less than 3 proposals
- A description of the public advertisements
- A description of the on-site briefing/walk-through provided for the interested architects

Furthermore, the MSBA asks that the submission includes the following attachments:

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

- Statements from the architects who attended the walk-through describing why they did not submit a proposal
- Letters from the Town Counsel and the Owner's MCPPO certified representative endorsing the adequacy and completeness of the procurement activity

T. Elmore mentioned that the responses collected from the architects who attended the walk-through were fairly consistent, as they all stated that the reason(s) they did not submit was out of "professional courtesy", lack of a competitive advantage, and/or inconvenient timing related to the holiday, a recent submission to a different project, or both.

He then went on to explain that the architect selection committee should still follow the same procedures they would as if they received 3 or more proposals, meaning they fairly evaluate DiNisco's submission and attend the DSP meeting on September 27, 2016 with an idea in mind of how they would like to proceed or not proceed with the submitting architect. Furthermore, he pointed out that the MSBA has advised that the District is prepared to describe each step of the procurement process that was followed when the designer services were secured for the previous study, and that they will likely have a lot of other questions.

The committee then went on to discuss the situation at hand:

E. Brown stated that the procurement process is to find the architect who will provide the best services for the project, and based off of DiNisco's performance on the Estabrook project, he believes they could provide the same level of achievement for the Maria Hastings School.

The committee then reiterated what their hopes were for the Maria Hastings School, and whether or not they thought DiNisco was a good fit. They also discussed the ramifications if they did not select DiNisco. T. Elmore pointed out that, though being somewhat conservative, a 2 to 3-month delay in the schedule now, *could* result in a September, 2020 occupancy date, rather than the September, 2019 date that they are hopeful for. The committee agreed that the major delay in schedule would have a serious impact on the students and educational program due to the heavy increase in enrollment, which is only projected to grow more.

L. Lipsitz, principal of the Maria Hastings Elementary School, pointed out that 63 new students enrolled over the summer of 2016, plus an additional 9 since the beginning of the academic school year, as opposed to the average 30 students over the summer enrollment period.

Though they were interested in receiving proposals from other architects, the committee at this point agrees that DiNisco is a qualified and able architect. They went on to weigh the pros and cons of moving forward with DiNisco or beginning the architect selection process over again, and all agreed that due to the timing and great past performance from DiNisco, there is little downside to moving forward with them as the project architect, and it is important to the community that the over-population issue is addressed for the sake of the educational program and comfort of the students as soon as possible.

#### 4. **Project Goals**

T. Elmore pointed out that an extra copy of the project goals worksheet is attached to the meeting packet. He mentioned that if anybody would like to provide their input, that the worksheets can be filled out and submitted to him and R. Milaschewski via email.



5. **Schedule Staff Meetings to Enable PBC Member Input**

T. Elmore clarified that rather than creating “working groups”, P. Goddard suggested scheduling “Staff Meetings” instead, for better conformance with open meeting laws, to discuss specific topics in depth, in relation to the project should somebody want to participate. The participant(s) of these staff meetings can then report their suggestions/findings, etc. back to the committee during the following School Building Committee (SBC) meeting.

6. **Other Business Not Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting:** *None.*

7. **Public Comment:** *None.*

8. **Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. September 28, 2016 – Designer Selection – TBD. *Contingent upon outcome of DSP meeting held on September 27, 2016*
- b. October 13, 2016 – TBD. *Contingent upon outcome of DSP meeting held on September 27, 2016*
- c. October 20, 2016 – TBD. *Contingent upon outcome of DSP meeting held on September 27, 2016*

9. **Adjourn**

***SBC Motion to adjourn by R. Perry, 2nd by P. Coleman. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM***

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Rachel Milaschewski

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, 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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.



**Lexington Permanent Building Committee -  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC Meeting Minutes**

**DATE OF MEETING:** October 5, 2016 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#3)

<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Pat Goddard	Lexington, Director of Public Facilities
	John Himmel	Lexington PBC, Chair
	Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
	Dr. Mary Czajowski	Superintendent of Schools
	Louise Lipsitz	Principal, MHES
	Eric Brown	Lexington PBC
	Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
	Charles Favazzo Jr.	Lexington PBC
	Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
	Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
	Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
	Sandra Trach	Lexington
	Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
	Elaine Ashton	
	Trip Elmore	DWMP
	Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
	Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

**1. Call to Order of SBC Meeting at 7:03 PM with 5 voting Members in attendance.**

The Committee discussed the use of remote participation for future meetings if a member is unable to attend. P. Goddard issued a copy of the Selectmen's Policy on Remote Meeting Procedures in regards to remote participation and all agreed to put this topic on the next meeting agenda for further discussion.

**2. Approval of Minutes:**

A short SBC review of the September 15, 2016 Meeting Minutes was provided by the M. Barrett.

**Discussion:** None.

**Motion to approve the September 15, 2016 SBC Meeting Minutes by P. Coleman, 2nd by C. Favazzo. VOTE: 5 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain**

*\*2 More Committee Members arrive – 7 voting members in attendance\**

**3. Architect Selection Update; DSP Meeting on 9/27/2016 at 8:30AM, 40 Broad Street, Boston, MA**

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

T. Elmore reported the results of the DSP Meeting held on September 27, 2016. He explained that the MSBA pointed out that they will not be “selecting” an Architect since only one proposal was received, but rather, they would determine whether the single submitting Architect is qualified. He added that there was a lot of discussion held between the MSBA and the Owner explaining the Architect Selection process. T. Elmore also pointed out that the Lexington Representatives who attended the meeting did an amazing job clarifying any misunderstandings and emphasizing their need to move forward with the project.

He then added that after a lot of discussion, the MSBA voted DiNisco as a qualified Architect for the project and praised them for their past work and positive effects on communities.

DWMP and the Lexington Representatives stated that they were happy with the outcome

D. DiNisco of DiNisco Design told the Committee that she was happy to be there and that she and DWMP immediately began working on the schedule and discussing their fee after meeting with the MSBA.

T. Elmore then pointed out DiNisco’s proposed fee of \$530,000 (reference letter attached) and how it relates to typical fees for this phase of work. He went on to explain what is included within this fee, stating that DiNisco will have to revisit their previously produced Preliminary Design Program (PDP) and Feasibility Study deliverables prior to submitting to the MSBA, which is then followed by the Schematic Design Phase; He believed that their proposed fee was reasonable and recommends them for the job.

D. DiNisco added that the current schedule has them submitting the Schematic Design materials on June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017 in order to make it into the August 23, 2017 Board Meeting with the MSBA, which is followed by a 120 day stretch to get the Town’s approval for local funding, followed by another MSBA Board Meeting in February, 2018.

The Committee then discussed the Model School option and how it would affect the schedule and Architect’s fee going forward. T. Elmore explained that the MSBA would determine whether or not the Hastings ES is a candidate for a Model School based on their Educational Program, as it must meet the MSBA’s criteria very closely in order to get their approval to build a Model School.

In the meeting packet were documents that the OPM recently received from the MSBA. They have not been fully reviewed by the OPM and will need to be gone through to evaluate if this program is an option for the Hastings School Project. There was caution given by the MSBA that this Model School Program is very rigid and does not allow for any significant changes. There was a MSBA recommendation to consider a building like the Estabrook School that is in the Core Program but utilizes efficiencies in terms of decisions, layout, finishes, and the like that streamline the process. The MSBA offered that they might be able to waive a submission at DD to assist in this time savings.

The Committee then discussed the pros and cons of the Model School Program, agreeing that they should further analyze the situation and look into the school/community needs as well as the differences in fees and reimbursements.

T. Elmore added that he would try to put this Model School Program in perspective for the next meeting on November 10<sup>th</sup> to evaluate if there is schedule and/or financial benefit. He concluded, saying that they have until the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) submission to decide whether or not they would like to go with a model school; he clarified that DiNisco will be prepared to submit the

revised PDP on November 11, 2016 and will then immediately begin working on the Preferred Schematic Report (PSR).

T. Elmore indicated that the Architect's fee is typically 10% of the estimated construction contract and this Feasibility/Schematic Design Fee amount will be a part of that amount, so you can give it to them now or later. It was noted that the Designer Fees are much lower in a Model School reimbursement, as the MSBA will only participate in 4.75% for Designer Services, adding that anything beyond this 4.75% would not be considered for reimbursement and would be 100% local costs. The reimbursement amount is very low on this Model School Program and typically the Designer is requiring significantly more fee to perform their services.

The committee asked if the Dore & Whittier recommends the Designers Proposal. T Elmore responded yes, and noted that it falls within the typical range for designer costs as is represented in the MSBA Fee Analysis attachment to the meeting packet. The Town Facilities Department was also asked if they have reviewed the Designers proposal and would recommend that the committee recommend it be accepted by the town manager. P Goddard had reviewed the document and recommends it be accepted by the committee.

Following this discussion, a motion was made to accept DiNisco's Fee Proposal.

***Motion to accept DiNisco's Fee Proposal in the amount of \$530,000 by E. Brown, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Oldenburg. VOTE: 7 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain. Unanimous to approve.***

#### **4. Project Schedule**

T. Elmore and D. DiNisco pointed out that the submission dates are scheduled to make the most sense for the MSBA Board Meetings, though the schedule will be adjusted pending the decision to go with a Model School or not.

As the schedule currently has the project running into 2020, the Committee asked if DWMP and DiNisco could explore ways to accelerate the project to make a September, 2019 completion date.

Both DWMP and DiNisco agreed to explore any possible opportunities which will be discussed at the following PBC-SBC Meeting.

#### **5. Project Goals**

A committee member asked that the completion target date of September 2019 be listed as one of the GOALS of this project.

T. Elmore indicated that a couple of Committee members had submitted their Project Goals Worksheets were compiled and attached to the meeting packet. He said any additional goals received would be added to the compiled list.

#### **6. Other Business Not Anticipated 48 Hours Prior to Meeting: None.**

#### **7. Public Comment: None.**

#### **8. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Proposed, to be verified and edited prior to meetings –
  - i. November 1, 2016 – School Committee Meeting

- ii. November 10, 2016 – Agenda Expected: Further discuss Remote Participation, Model School, Schedule and Design Option Development, Vote Expected to submit the PDP to the MSBA

9. **Adjourn**

***SBC Motion to adjourn by R. Perry, 2nd by P. Coleman. VOTE: unanimous to approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM***

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Rachel Milaschewski

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, 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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.



**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES & LOCAL VOTE RESULTS**

**DATE OF MEETING:** November 10, 2016 at 7:15P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#4)

**ATTENDING:**

Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Dr. Mary Czajowski	Superintendent of Schools
Louise Lipsitz	Principal, MHES
Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
Peter Johnson	Lexington PBC (arrived 7:45)
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Pat Goddard	Lexington, Director of Public Facilities
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Sandra Trach	Lexington
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

1. **Start of Hastings SBC Meeting at 7:17 PM with 5 voting Members in attendance, as of 7:45.**

2. **Approval of Minutes:**  
SBC reviewed the October 5, 2016 Meeting Minutes.  
***Motion to approve the October 5, 2016 SBC Meeting Minutes by C Oldenburg,  
2nd by P Coleman.***  
**Discussion:** none

***VOTE: 5 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain***

3. **SBC Committee Member update (PBC)**

Eric Brown notified the Town Manager that he has resigned from the Permanent Building Committee. There was discussion about other members 3 year terms and if a replacement was being considered.

4. **Ed Program presentation update (DiNisco)**

There was an introduction of the process followed to date to define and verify elements of the Design Program written by the school district. Several meetings and discussions have taken place to understand the space needs and adjacencies required to make the Lexington Education Program work.

This program and outline of space required was summarized by DiNisco Design in a power point presentation given in the meeting and distributed as a paper copy in the meeting packets. See Power Point attached to these minutes for details discussed. The overview included:

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

- Education Program is the basis for decisions on many aspects of the building
- The Educational Program is one of the drivers for the size and layout of the building
- The process is a step by step process that starts with enrollment (645 students), the Educational Program for types and sizes of spaces required that begins to point to adjacencies and potential building layout
- This information was compared to the current building to show the difference between the needed space and lack of space available currently.
- The information was also compared to the Estabrook School program and highlighted a larger enrollment and different SPED/ILP student population at Hastings
- It was noted that the differences between the Estabrook and Hastings school population and SPED/ILP program were significant enough to “Substantially Modify” the layout of an “Estabrook Model” if it remains as a consideration for the Hastings project.

This information was presented to the School Committee at their meeting on November 1, 2016. The School Committee voted to approve this educational program in their meeting.

**5. PDP submission overview (DiNisco)**

DiNisco Design outlined the requirement of Preliminary Design Program (PDP) document that needs to be submitted to the MSBA as our first submission in their module process. The PDP materials in the submission include:

- Enrollment, as agreed to by the MSBA (645 Students)
- The Education Program
- Space required to deliver the education program (roughly 110,000 square feet)
- Existing conditions of the existing building
- Preliminary site evaluation
- Preliminary options that could solve the current issues with the building and educational program delivery, which must include:
  - Repair of the existing building, as a basis for comparison even though it doesn't solve the issues
  - An addition/renovation option to solve the issues, however there is no place to relocate the existing students while a project is constructed
  - New option(s) for consideration on the existing site, which had previously been determined to be the optimal solution

**SBC recommendation vote to submit the PDP to the MSBA:**

**Motion by the PBC/SBC to recommend that the Town of Lexington authorize the OPM and Designer to submit the Preliminary Design Program to MSBA for their review and comments, by P Coleman, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C Oldenburg.**

**Discussion: none**

**VOTE: 5 approve, 0 against, 0 abstain; Motion Passes**

**6. Schedule review / Model School Option (D&W, DiNisco)**

**Schedule:**

In the October 5<sup>th</sup> PBC meeting, the PBC asked if DWMP and DiNisco could explore ways to accelerate the project to make a September, 2019 completion date.

T. Elmore had sent out an email on October 31<sup>st</sup> to the PBC Members that included attachments of the OPM review of schedule options that had been developed and vetted by the team to determine if there was a path to complete the building by the September 2019 school start date.

This review was included an Executive Summary document and 5 Concept Schedules that were distributed again in the meeting packet. A summary Power Point was reviewed in the meeting.

As no designs or tangible scope decisions have been made at this point this exercise was more on the Concept Level than an actual scope based schedule evaluation.

T. Elmore reviewed the assumptions, 5 schedule move in dates and the recommendation to anticipate a winter 2019/2020 turn-over and move in for planning purposes. (See power point attached)

The possibility of improving upon that time-frame could happen in the future as more is known about the project detail and the process unfolds.

It was discussed in the meeting that there were certain elements that would dictate the ability to compress the schedule. P Coleman commented that various tasks should be examined further to see if there might be ways to compress schedule drivers. This included tasks like beginning the Conservation Committee approval process as early as possible and utilizing any possible time saving approach to not give up on a September 2019 turn over date. This was discussed at length. There were additional points raised that the initial hope for the September 2019 completion date was based on MSBA acceptance in to their program approximately 6 month prior to the actual acceptance in to their building program. The delay in the beginning has direct impact on the team's ability to forecast a September 2019 date.

The Model School program was raised as a potential time saving solution, which was then discussed.

**Model School:**

T. Elmore had sent out an email on November 7th to the PBC Members that included attachments of the OPM review of the Model School program offered by the MSBA.

This review included an Executive Summary document that was distributed again in the meeting packet. A summary Power Point was reviewed in the meeting.

T. Elmore reviewed the fundamental parameters of the program, the benefits and challenges of the program and the recommendation to follow a traditional core program process for the Hastings project. (See power point attached)

The discussion included the PBC Members, Public Building Staff, OPM, DiNisco Design, School Representatives and others attending the meeting. The OPM pointed out that the analysis done and included in the meeting packet, indicates that there are multiple factors that would not be supported by a Model School. DiNisco Design has looked at the Hasting site and preliminary conclusions are that the Estabrook Model School is possibly the only Model School that would fit on the site. DiNisco Design has also looked at the Hasting Educational Program and determined that it would not fit in the Estabrook Model School without Substantial Modifications. This was a significant factor in dismissing the Model School as an option.

The Public Building Department also informed the committee that Estabrook was designed and built prior to several new Lexington initiatives that would "substantially Modify" the design in terms of systems, thus eliminate the Estabrook as a Model for Consideration. Two worth noting are:



- The Lexington Board of Selectmen have a goal to adopt a “Better Building” policy with clearly defined policy objectives, including Healthy Buildings, energy efficiency, and other stretch goals.
- The Lexington Sustainability Committee has been tasked with initiating the policy discussion with a presentation to the Board of Selectmen.

Based on the limitations discussed, **the PBC Members all agreed that the Model School Program was not a good fit for this project** for 2 primary reasons. The Lexington “Better Building” initiatives and potential policy for new construction that will upgrade the sustainable aspects of all future Lexington Public building projects likely eliminates the Model School as a viable option. The inability to fit Hastings SPED/ILP requirements into a Model School without substantial modifications was also a factor to determine that the Model School Program is not a viable option.

#### **7. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Proposed, to be verified and edited prior to meetings –
  - i. Other Elementary School site visits are scheduled for November 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - ii. Other community forums are going to be scheduled in December
  - iii. Tentatively - December 8th PBC Meeting to review preliminary options

**Hastings Project portion of the meeting ended at 9PM**

#### **DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Trip Elmore

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, Project Director

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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.



**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 8, 2016 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#5)

<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
	Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
	Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
	Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
	Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
	Peter Johnson	Lexington PBC
	Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
	Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
	Joe Pato	Selectmen
	Peter Kelley	Selectmen
	Mark Sandeen	Lexington Sustainable Committee
	Roger Borghesani	Lexington Energy Conservation Cmte
	Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
	Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
	Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
	Trip Elmore	DWMP
	Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
	Ken DiNisco	DiNisco Design

- 
1. **Sustainability/Hastings SBC Meeting at 7:00 PM with 8 voting PBC Members in attendance.**
    - a. Multiple Lexington Committee's and Town Departments were present for the presentation of sustainable building proposed initiatives and subsequent discussions. (Representatives from: Selectman, DPF, Sustainable Buildings Cmte, Energy Conservation Cmte, School Cmte)
  
  2. **Presentation and discussion led by Mark Sandeen, BOS 2017 Sustainable Building Policy Goal – See presentation attached for details.**
    - a. Presentation overview:
      - i. Task of the Sustainable buildings committee is to update Lexington's position on constructing "Sustainable Buildings"
      - ii. Lexington's primary energy expenditure is in public buildings
      - iii. Need to examine the long-term energy usage cost along with the upfront cost of buildings to identify savings
      - iv. Review of the LEED measuring system for sustainable buildings
      - v. Review of building CO2 levels and impact on cognitive performance of building occupants (Harvard Study), Lexington Sustainable buildings committee proposes a standard CO2 limit of 600 PPM
      - vi. Proposed Minimum standards that Lexington could adopt for future buildings in 3 categories; Health, Energy & Renewables, and Resilience.
      - vii. Proposed process to evaluate and incorporate sustainable building standards, that may be different by building type, into the Design and the local stakeholders that could be involved

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

www.doreandwhittier.com

- viii. Review the policies every 3 years as building innovations and opportunities to improve energy efficiency measures continue to evolve.
- b. The Board of Selectmen will take up this discussion on revising the 2005 Board of Selectmen Sustainable Design Policy in the February 2017 time frame, and is a 2017 goal for the Board of Selectmen. General discussion followed and highlights are noted below:
- i. It was noted that this decision on potentially increased “Sustainable Building” standards for Lexington’s buildings could be a challenge for the Hastings Elementary School Project schedule. Discussion noted:
    1. Lexington must identify an internal process to make increased sustainable building determinations in time to support the Hastings design schedule.
    2. The Hastings project Design Team is currently designing to achieve the “LEED Silver” or “NE CHPS” equivalent rating to receive the MSBA 2 additional incentive reimbursement points.
    3. A series of Staff meetings will be scheduled to review the direction for Hasting project, M Sandeen, R Borghesani, C Barrentine, and P Goddard agreed to meet on Monday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, at 8AM to begin the review of this topic.
  - ii. The Group had discussions on the multiple decision levels of determining the mandated “policy” versus a “goal or guideline to try to reach” in the process of designing a Lexington public building. Some of the factors noted in the discussion were:
    1. The committee agreed that Lexington is a community that wants to see their future investments in public buildings to be at the higher levels of “Sustainable Buildings” best practices
    2. There should be a method to determine the “cost benefit” of the increased “Sustainable Building” standards and it may change for different building types/projects
    3. There could be conflicts between various increased “Sustainable Building” standards as they may not be compatible with each other for a specific building type
    4. The process to determine the best “Sustainable Building” directions and implement those recommendations is to have an Integrated Design Process as was successfully used on other recent Lexington Projects

**3. Review Hastings Project Team recommendation to utilize NE-CHPS v3.1 or LEED Schools v.4**

- a. The Committee discussed many aspects of the best building evaluation measuring tools, either NE-CHPS v3.1 or LEED Schools v.4, for the next MSBA submission for the Hastings ES Project. Some of the discussion points were:
- i. MSBA reimburses two additional percentage of eligible project costs for school construction utilizing either NE-CHPS v3.1 or LEED Schools v.4
  - ii. The NE-CHPS v3.1 may align better with the Lexington “Sustainable Building” proposed initiatives and be easier to gain accreditation points
  - iii. The NE-CHPS v3.1 may not be as widely used as the LEED Schools v.4
  - iv. The NE-CHPS v3.1 is more paper work intensive and would require additional management time by the Designer’s consultant, which is estimated to cost approximately \$20,000.
  - v. The MSBA has a requirement that in the next Preferred Schematic Report submission the team state if the project will be seeking the 2 increased reimbursement points and which tracking method will be used to measure them.
  - vi. If the team, after the next MSBA submission, choose to change direction on the measuring system to used, the MSBA would allow this change to occur.
  - vii. The LEED programs have been more widely used over the past 5+ years, so more contractors and vendors are accustomed to their requirements, however, the new version of LEED Schools v.4 has standards that are new and the building industry has not fully caught up to those reporting requirements.

- b. After discussions, the group collectively agreed that the LEED School v.4 method of tracking the project was the preferred approach.

**4. Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. December 15<sup>th</sup>, PTA/Public Meeting to review option and present preferred option
  - ii. December 20<sup>th</sup>, School Committee Meeting to review option and present preferred option
  - iii. December 22<sup>nd</sup>, PBC Meeting to review preliminary options and approve Preferred Option

**Hastings Project portion of the meeting ended at 9:05 PM**

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Trip Elmore

Dore & Whittier Management Partners, Project Director

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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.

**Lexington Permanent Building Committee Meeting  
Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
SBC MEETING MINUTES**



**DATE OF MEETING:** December 22, 2016 at 7:00P.M. at 201 Bedford St, Lexington MA

**PROJECT:** Maria Hastings Elementary School Building Project  
Dore & Whittier Project #MP16-0112

**SUBJECT:** School Building Committee Meeting (D&W#5)

**ATTENDING:**

Jon Himmel	Lexington PBC Chair
Andrew Clarke	Lexington PBC
Curt Barrentine	Lexington PBC
Richard Perry	Lexington PBC
Charles Favazzo	Lexington PBC
Philip Coleman	Lexington PBC
Peter Johnson	Lexington PBC
Carl Oldenburg	Lexington PBC
Louise Lipsitz	School Principal
Pat Goddard	Lexington DPF
Mark Barrett	Lexington DPF
Judy Crocker	School Committee Liaison
Trip Elmore	DWMP
Rachel Milaschewski	DWMP
Donna DiNisco	DiNisco Design
Ken DiNisco	DiNisco Design

---

1. Approval of November 10, 2016 and December 8, 2016 PBC/SBC Meeting Minutes – PBC

**Motion to approve and certify the November 10, 2016 meeting minutes as the official record for the MSBA and December 8, 2016 P/SBC Meeting Minutes by C. Oldenbug, ,2<sup>nd</sup> by D. Perry.**

*Minor typo corrections were cited on 11/10/16 – Page 2, #5 2<sup>nd</sup> line “out should be our”  
And 12/8/16 – 2.b.3 “Barrantine should be Barrentine”*

**VOTE: Unanimous to approve**

2. Presentation of Options and Preliminary Cost Estimates

D. DiNisco ran through their presentation (see attached) reviewing each option and concept of each option from a base repair, an add/reno option, and a new building. She reported the current cost estimates which were recently received by PM&C and AM Fogarty, stating that the estimated cost of the add/reno came in at \$59,300,000 (does not include cost of needed swing space), and the estimated cost of the new building came in at \$61,700,000.

PROJECT MANAGERS  
ARCHITECTS

Newburyport, MA 01950  
260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7  
978.499.2999 ph  
978.499.2944 fax

[www.doreandwhittier.com](http://www.doreandwhittier.com)

T. Elmore pointed out that the cost of swing space could be upwards of \$2-3M, meaning the new building would be the most cost effective option.

D. DiNisco went on to explain the site differences and parking layouts found within each option as well as opportunities for future expansion. She then explained that though the elementary school already has a large population, Option 3 does offer the possibility to expand down the road if needed.

The committee discussed the estimated costs, agreeing that Option 3 would be the most cost effective and best supports the educational program.

D. DiNisco pointed out that the School Committee and Community members who had attended some of the Community Meetings also agreed that Option 3 is the best fit for this project.

### 3. **Vote to Proceed with the Preferred Option**

***VOTE: Motion to select Option 3, Concept C as the preferred option and have the Designer and OPM submit the Preferred Schematic Report to the MSBA by D. Perry, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Oldenburg. VOTE: Unanimous to approve.***

### 4. **The Path forward in January – Design and Other Meetings**

T. Elmore of DWMP commented on the 1-month look-ahead schedule (see attached) which was handed out at the meeting; he pointed out that the project team uses this schedule to track upcoming meetings which has recently been updated with DiNisco's schedule of bi-weekly design staff meetings. He then added that the tentative agendas for the next four meetings are also attached in case any of the P/SBC members have interest in participating.

### 5. **Sustainable Building Process Update**

P. Goddard reported that the last Sustainability Stakeholders meeting was a success, and there is a follow up meeting scheduled for January 9, 2017 which C. Barrentine, PBC Member will be attending.

Concerns were raised about the ability of the Stakeholders to come to recommendations in time meet the Hastings timeline and that this effort may be a guiding influence if policy discussions take longer than expected. It was discussed that the Hastings project may proceed as following the spirit of the initiative.

### 6. **Upcoming Meetings & Public Forums:**

- a. Scheduled meetings –
  - i. January 12, 2017 – PBC Meeting

**Hastings Project portion of the meeting ended at 9:55 PM**

**DORE AND WHITTIER MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC**

Trip Elmore

Dore & Whittier Management Partners

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. After the minutes have been voted to approve, we will accept these minutes as an accurate summary of our discussion and enter them into the permanent record of the project.