

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	02/24/2025
Location:	Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)	Time:	12:00 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	J.Greco

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

				Melissa Battite	Recreation Department

Item No.	Action Item	Ball in Court
25.11	Add the community submission information to the FAQs	DWMP
25.8	Conduct a solar analysis of field house Option D	SMMA

- Please click [here](#) for the presentation
 - o This will be referenced in the meeting minutes with slide numbers called out to refer to.
- Below is a summation of key points, please view the recording for full transcript.

Item No.		Description
25.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00 pm	Record
25.2	Approval of January 13th, 2025 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve January 13th, 2025 Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H.M Sha – Absent, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes , S.Bartha - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 11-0-2	Record
25.3	MSBA Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted they have received the MSBA PSR comments and they are due back to the MSBA tomorrow M.Burton noted they did have a quick call with the MSBA regarding the field house options and they did not note any restrictions 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He noted that by the March 26th FAS meeting the preferred field house option needs to be selected ● L.Finnegan noted that a large portion of the PSR comments were for the space summary and they will work the administration to finalize those comments ● J.Himmel noted that it is important to remember that the preferred scheme is anchored on the education plan and just using the square footage of the classrooms would not satisfy that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan agreed and added that the education plan is for the aspect of the full student life in the school and not just the classrooms. The design team has to prove how the scheme meets all aspects of the educational plan ● J.Himmel asked that if they decided to just choose a new scheme what would they have to do? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted at the very least they would have to restart the Preferred Schematic Report ○ K.Lenihan added that if anything other than the Bloom option is chosen construction will not start in 2026 ● C.Favazzo asked about what constitutes an add/reno for the field house in the MSBA eyes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted that they showed them the four options and they did not say any could not be done but ultimately it will be up to the FAS Committee and only one option can be shown to them 	
25.4	<p>Design Meeting Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan reviewed the three design meetings that have occurred so far (Slide 7) ● K.Lenihan asked when the confirmation on the CO2 PPM will be made and if it is a hard upper limit or a target <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Oldeman noted that when the system is implemented the 800ppm would be set as the target and the limit for triggering the Building Management System (BMS) alarm can be adjusted to whatever the town desires. ○ M.Burton noted that the lower the target limit the higher the cost will be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● J.Himmel also noted it is not just an up-front cost but also an operational cost 	Record
25.5	<p>Introduce: Proposed space layouts, circulation and square foot per student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black reviewed the current floor plan for the first floor (Slide 12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky noted she has a concern around the common double height space and the cost associated with it compared to utilizing the space for additional square footage ● B.Black reviewed the current floor plan for the second floor (Slide 13) 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Baker asked that if the field house becomes attached to the building will those classrooms lose daylight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black noted not necessarily as they will have good daylight coming in and the program adjacent to the field house will be locker rooms and other athletic spaces ● B.Black reviewed the current floor plan for the third floor (Slide 14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Levine asked what classrooms the olive green color is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black noted that those are the science classrooms and noted how they are clustered together in the B-Wing ● B.Black reviewed the current floor plan for the fourth floor (Slide 15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted that now the central office/expansion space is solely in the A-wing ○ K.Lenihan asked for a rough estimate on what it would cost to convert the central office space to classrooms ○ L.Finnegan noted they could include that cost in the June 4th estimate but with a big asterisk for the escalation that would be needed for whenever the actual switch would occur ○ J.Himmel noted it may be good to show a layout for what classrooms would look like in the central office space ● T.Faust shared the current travel time and the projected new travel time (Slide 16) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He noted that the current school has an average walk time of 5.5 minutes from the furthest points and the new school would have an average time of only 3.5 minutes ● A.Levine asked how the rooms in the central corridor get daylight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted that they are showing extra classrooms currently and some can be removed to create bays that bring light into the building. ○ He also noted that these central rooms will be bathrooms, storage spaces, and teacher planning rooms. They will not be general education spaces 	
25.6	<p>Introduce: Confirm future expansion GSF (Gross Square Footage)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B.Black reviewed the current expansion plans (Slide 19) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design Enrollment: 2,395 students ○ Upper Limit of Future Expansion*: 3,000 students ○ Total Future Expansion Need: 605 students ○ Capacity of Central Office Conversion to Classrooms: 322 students (14 classrooms) ○ Remaining Expansion GFA Needed: 283 students (~13 classrooms) ● B.Black reviewed expansion option 1- 53,760 GSF (Slide 20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adds (4) full Gen Ed Classroom bays per floor Total 16 ○ Adds (2) Science Labs and (1) Prep Room per floor Total 8/4 ○ Adds an egress stair at end of wing ○ Allows space for exit from internal egress stair ○ Includes internal zone for support space, toilets ○ Additional Capacity: 552 students 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total Capacity at 85% Utilization: 3,269 students (target + 269 or 9%) ● B.Black reviewed expansion option 2 - 40,320 GSF (Slide 21) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adds (4) full Gen Ed Classroom bays per floor Total: 16 ○ Adds (1) Science Lab and (1) Prep Room per floor Total: 4/4 ○ Adds an egress stair at end of wing ○ Allows space for exit from internal egress stair ○ Includes internal zone for support space, toilets ○ Additional Capacity: 552 students ○ Total Capacity at 85% Utilization: 3,177 students (target + 177 or 6%) ● B.Black reviewed expansion potential for the common space (Slide 22) ● J.Pato noted that it is important for the community to understand that these are options that could be chosen in the future and that they are based on 85% utilization rate. He also noted the administration has noted they do not want to go above 3000 students ● A.Levine asked what will be done in the current project to prepare for the expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted they are reviewing completing the ground improvements for that space now and if it would be worth it economically to do that now. ● A.Baker noted that the facilities staff would much prefer the extra seating for future dining to stay on the ground floor so all the food stays in the same location ● J.Himmel noted there needs to be some way to describe the information prepared for the various options based on the design enrollment of 2,395 and why this number is being used. ● J.Pato asked about the impacts of the construction space for the expansion zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted it would be just like the construction of an addition/renovation space. All the classrooms would still be usable. ● A.Levine asked if the MEPs (mechanical, electrical, plumbing) connections would be prepped and ready for the expansion zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted yes they would plan for that in those zones ● J.Himmel asked for Turner to provide impacts of early foundations for the expansion space ● A.Baker wanted to note that pushing to four (4) lunches is too many and is very poor for educational learning 	
25.7	<p>Introduce/Discuss: Spaces to be air conditioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A.Oldeman shared a diagram for the spaces that will be air conditioned and noted that almost the whole building will be (Slide 25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Oldeman shared that the only spaces planned not to would be exit stairways, vestibules, and the loading dock areas 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Slavsky wants to clarify what level of air conditioning is being mentioned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Oldeman noted full air conditioning and being able to control the temperature ◦ K.Lenihan noted that the gymnasium is also used as a performance space so having it air conditioned may be of value • K.Slavsky asked what the existing level of air conditioning is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ J.Hackett noted that based on square footage it is around 40% of the school 	
25.8	<p>Discuss/Confirm: Add/Reno Field House 146 m or 200m Track in Field House and Scope and Constructability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the key takeaways from the programming meetings with key stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Safety is a major concern and should be considered as part of every decision ◦ Providing space for programs that don't have sufficient space in the existing field house (i.e. trainers, weight room, cheer, etc.) is a priority ◦ Flexibility of space to accommodate the number of different groups utilizing the field house is a priority ◦ Strong preference for 146-meter track from athletics coaches and trainers. Track coaches still preferred a 200m track. ◦ Unanimous preference for 146-meter track among athletic director, principal, PE coordinator, and recreation dept. ◦ Track coach requested consideration of a banked track if 146-meter track is pursued. ◦ A few individuals expressed a preference for Option B (trainers and AD) as it would compartmentalize uses in a way that would enhance safety, scheduling and monitoring. • B.Black reviewed the four (4) field house options starting on Slide 30 • K.Slavsky asked about the considerations for MSBA agreeing with these options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted that was the point of the call with the MSBA but that he has concerns with option D as there is not much of the original structure being saved. • J.Pato noted that these costs are higher than what was discussed and are crossing a threshold for him aside from Option B which is right around what they were projecting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Baker agreed with J.Pato • K.Lenihan asked if solar can be located on the flat addition portion of Option B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted yes • J.Himmel asked if in Option B the straight aways could continue under the addition portion of the space • K.Slavsky asked if the estimate costs were raised due to the environment of the current market 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Meiser noted they have not accounted for tariffs as they are still unknown ● A.Levine asked if C.Kosnoff's projections include these field houses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted it would include the cost of Option B not the others ● A.Baker asked if the P.E. Alternative space in Option B could account for raising wrestling mats <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted they could look at that and other options ● A.Levine noted that his understanding is that the MSBA would not allow a new field house and maybe the town should build a new one without the MSBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted they have proposed those numbers and reviewed this and the committee voted to not go that direction ● H.Min Sha asked how much PV will be removed from the parking if Option D was chosen and solar was added ● C.Kosnoff noted she thought the point of the addition was for the track program mainly and it seems the track is the same ● P.Poinelli noted that from the programming meeting the end users of the field house would not have adequate space if Option A was chosen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Baker noted that the decision to go with add/reno seems to have been forgot along with all the reasons. He noted one of the main reasons is for the community use that would come with the additional space. The locker rooms would allow for community use outside of the school locker rooms. It would provide the PE alt space for a full wrestling room, the trainers would have space to treat athletes, and the safety aspect would be improved greatly. ○ A.Baker noted he feels the committee is rushing into a decision here ● M.Barrett would like a deeper dive on the solar potential of the Option D and how much it could offset the cost ● C.Kosnoff noted she is still struggling with how the expansions portion would be used by the community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted that the recreation department noted in the programming meetings how having separate locker rooms, trainer/medical space, a check-in area would be of a great benefit ● K.Lenihan conducted a straw poll vote on the field house options (options on slide 30) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option A: 6 ○ Option B: 3 ○ Option C: ○ Option D: 2 ● The SBC confirmed they are all in favor of the 146m track ● A.Levine noted as the liaison to the Appropriation Committee there is a lot of concern with the cost. He noted maybe Option A or B could be the baseline with the project and have Option C/D as an add alternate ● J.Hackett asked if they have another meeting to conduct this would there be more information on the topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The project team noted another meeting will be required on this on March 10 	
25.9	Discuss/Confirm: Mass timber versus Structural Steel	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan reviewed the Mass Timber on Slide 42 • B.Black noted that wood finishes can be provided without using Mass Timber if that is the goal • L.Finnegan reviewed the three different Mass Timber options and asked for the SBC to confirm which of three if any to be used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ (add in three options) • K.Lenihan asked if anyone is in favor of using Mass Timber on this project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ No SBC members were in favor of using Mass Timber 	
25.10	<p>Confirm: Confirm maximum assembly size in Gym/Field House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T.Faust reviewed the bleacher counts in the gymnasium and showed visually what it would look like (Slide 49) • The SBC confirmed 1000 seats for the gymnasium 	Record
25.11	<p>Community Submissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Meiser reviewed the discussion that occurred at the PBC which the recording can be found here • J.Himmel asked if any of the options meet the educational plan or MSBA requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted that no none of the meet the MSBA requirements because in turn they do not meet the educational plan of the District. ◦ J.Pato noted that is why the SBC did not dive into these options as it was outside of their scope because they do not meet the educational plan • J.Pato asked that if these schemes would reach a 30% reimbursement rate from MSBA if they provided funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that the same cost caps and rules would be applied to these projects • J.Pato asked for this information to be added into the FAQs 	Record
25.12	<p>Public Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review public comment please view the recording here at roughly the 2:28 mark 	Record
25.13	<p>Reflections/Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan noted they will provide more information on Mass Timber as asked by C.Arens in public comment 	Record
25.14	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:31 was made by J.Pato and seconded by J.Hackett</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss -Absent, S.Bartha- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 12-0-1.</p>	Record

--	--	--

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Jacob Greco

Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes.