

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	03/24/2025
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

✓	Claire Sheth	Recreation Committee		Melissa Battite	Recreation Department

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court
27.4	Cost to air condition the Field House	A.Levine	SMMA
27.4	Impact air conditioning the Field House would have on the energy model & requirements	J.Pato	SMMA
27.5	Provide square foot cost differentials and install timelines for exterior façade materials	C.Favazzo	Turner
27.5	A graph comparing the cost (x-axis) & embodied carbon (y-axis) for exterior materials	A.Levine	SMMA
27.7	Add the Article 97 schedule to the FAQs page	K.Lenihan	DWMP

- 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	Action
27.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:03pm	Record	
27.2	Approval of March 10 - 2025, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the March 10, 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 – Absent, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Absent, S.Bartha - Absent, M.Barrett - Yes 10-0-3.	Record	
27.3	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olga Guttag 273 Emerson Rd. Lexington Ma: 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Asked when there will be a schedule for the Article 97 land swap ○ Asked for the cost for converting the central office space into classrooms 		
27.4	<p>Confirm Spaces to be Air Conditioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan shared a diagram of what spaces will not be air conditioned as it is easier than showing what will be which is most of the space (Slide 7) ● A.Levine asked if this means that stairwells are closed off? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted they will have doors on hold opens and will be ventilated ● A.Baker asked if the WON doors will be included in the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted there has not been a choice made on that yet but they are recommending the three main stairwells have these at the top. ● C.Favazzo asked if the stairwells have their own HVAC units? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted they do not ● J.Himmel asked if any of the spaces deemed not to be air conditioned would be repurposed in the future that would need it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted that the only one she could see being converted is the storage room near the auditorium but it is unlikely as it is the main storage area. ● A.Levine asked what it means for them to be included in the air conditioned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted that the air duct size would increase, the energy model would change as the spaces would take more energy total, and they would have to bring the cooling pipe to those spaces. ○ A.Levine asked what the cost would be to air condition the field house? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan noted she is not sure but can get that cost ● K.Lenihan asked if our climate was closer to Virginia would the stairwells need to be air conditioned with warmer weather. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted she is not sure but would think no as they are just passage areas ● J.Pato noted that he is concerned with the aspect of the operational costs including the field house as it will increase the total electrical needs of the building and if it will have a serious impact on the models? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Jimenez noted he is not able to answer that currently ● C.Favazzo noted they need to know what it means for the design plan for including the field house ● H.Min Sha noted that if the expense is small it would be worth it to just air condition it all but it may be easier to just leave them unconditioned (stairwells) ● A.Levine noted that it does not seem like the stairwells should be air conditioned 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan noted that the SBC agrees that the stairwells should remain unconditioned • K.Lenihan noted that if the field house is not air conditioned it will be unusable in the summer • J.Pato agreed and said they could plan on having it conditioned and make operational choices of when to use it. • C.Favazzo shared that SMMA and the project team needs to complete the study of including the field house before any choice is made 		
27.5	<p>Introduce Exterior Design & Building Entrances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the building entrances for the school starting on Slide 10 <p>West Entrance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly visible from Worthen Road – good civic presence • Connected to bus drop-off/pickup • Visitor and accessible parking nearby • Main Office / main security check-in for visitors • Close to Guidance and Student Support hub • Access to Central Office elevator/stair lobby in Wing A • Entrance Plaza Pedestrian Zones should be large enough for mass groupings of students • Plaza Design to frame entrance and develop scale transition • Limited Program <p>East Entrance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected to car drop-off/pickup • Visitor and accessible parking nearby • May be used for after-hours events • Should it be used for primary Gym access? • Largest Entrance Plaza – design to frame entrance and develop scale transition • Program Flexibility <p>Field House Entrance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby connected to both Field House and Gym • Visitor and accessible parking nearby • May be used for after-hours events • Should it be used for primary Gym access? <p>North Entrance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LABBB entrance close to drop-off/pickup loop • Limited parking nearby • Smallest Entrance Plaza- potential for intimate gathering space • North facing – more limited planting opportunities • A.Baker asked if the gym competition court is able to be in either location for both entrance options? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted yes but it will affect adjacency and circulation 	Record	

- L.Finnegan noted that the image of Wakefield (slide 19) is a rendering not image. She also noted that the Waltham image is about the size of the east entrance.
- B.Black clarified that the west entrance is for visitors based on A.Levine's question.
- A.Levine also asked how close the dining common tables are to the west entrance
 - B.Black noted roughly 40 feet

- B.Black reviewed the exterior building materials (Slide 22-40)
 - Potential Material Options and Scope Assumptions

Opaque Masonry Walls (~60% of solid wall area)	Brick Masonry, Precast Accents, Stone Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of Wall Enclosure • High Insulation Value
Rainscreen Accent Walls (~40% of solid wall area)	Pre-finished Metal Panel Spandrels and Fascias; Accents in Porcelain, Terra Cotta, Pre-formed Metal or Fiber Cement	
Windows (~50% of glazed area)	Triple Insulated-Glazed, Aluminum Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% of Wall Enclosure • Utilizes Low-emissivity glass
Curtain Walls and Storefront (~50% of glazed area)	Triple Insulated-Glazed, Aluminum Frame	
Roof Edges & Canopies	Pre-finished Metal	
Soffits	Pre-finished Metal, Phenolic or DEFS (stucco)	
Roof Screens	Pre-finished Metal	
Roofing	PVC Membrane	

- Performance requirements for building envelop
 - Window to wall Ratio (WWR) = **25%**
 - Wall Insulation = **R-40**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof Insulation = R-60 • High-performance glazing system • Low U-value: 0.23 or better • High Solar Heat Gain Coefficient: 0.30 or better • High Visual Light Transmittance • Thermal Bridging Mitigation • Air Infiltration Testing - Reduction Goal = 0.15 cfm/sf@ 75 PA or better <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Cronin asked on the rain screen systems if there is different lifespans for the rain screens compared to just brick <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted no he does not think that there is a recognizable difference in the systems but some of the surface or panel materials will have different lifespans • C.Favazzo asked for Turner to provide square foot cost differentials and noted they should also be comparing install timelines. • J.Meiser noted that the graph on Slide 24 is pretty accurate even when labor costs are included • C.Kosnoff asked for the axis' to be labeled for the graph on slide 24 • A.Levine asked for a diagram similar to slide 24 where the X-axis is cost and the Y-axis is embodied carbon • C.Favazzo noted the fiber cement brand 'Tactile' he has used before and recommends • J.Hackett asked if the sloped ceiling makes the room feel bigger <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted possibly but not necessarily, maybe a bump up pocket at the edge for the room would work better but the plan for now is flat ceilings • H.Min Sha is very excited about this phase and think sit is critical for the function of the school and community. He noted on slide 36 he likes the bottom right option the best. Min Sha also shared that they should move away from the classic red brick look. • C.Favazzo asked for the screen walls to be included on all the renderings and elevations going forward as they are part of it. C.Favazzo also asked to confirm what the ceiling height is? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black noted they are currently at 16 feet • C.Favazzo would like to see that down to 14 feet and he thinks that is very adequate • K.Slavsky asked that as the design options are shared with the broader community any extremely expensive options should not be shared and then later removed as a value engineering move • J.Pato asked what the proportion of these materials are compared to the steel and concrete? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMMA will provide a response 		
27.6	Introduce Lighted Fields & Field Material	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Dowhan shared slides and information on which fields will be lighted (Slide 43-45) • M.Dowhan reviewed the field material (Slide 46 & 47) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Natural Turf (seed or sod) <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Aesthetics • Cooler Surface • Environmental Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon sequestration, reduce excess stormwater runoff • Cost Effective to Install <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mowing, watering, fertilizing, pest control • Water Usage • Durability Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overuse and excessive traffic lead to compaction and bare spots; saturated soils/standing water limit playability • Inconsistent Surface • Pesticide and Fertilizer Use • Seed Requires 2 Full Growing Seasons Before Use • Sod Requires a Minimum of 2-3 Weeks for Root Establishment Prior To Use ◦ Synthetic Turf <p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Maintenance • Durability • Consistent Appearance • Long-Term Cost Effectiveness • Able to Use Field Immediately <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Initial Cost • Heat Retention • Environmental Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel asked for any comparison costs to be escalated to the project costs • C.Favazzo noted some of the baseball fields will need considerable netting for protecting the road and school from foul balls • C.Sheth asked where the throwing cages will be for the track program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Dowhan noted possibly the outer field area of C.1 • K.Slavsky asked if the town has a philosophy on using irrigation systems for fields? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted that the playing fields will probably be irrigated • H.Min Sha noted Arlington has a big local issue with using synthetic turf and asked if anyone on the committee would like it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted there will be a public discussion regarding this for this project just as there is for Harrington. • L.Finnegan noted they will be proceeding with sod for the time being • J.Himmel asked if the MSBA/LEED has any input on these issues 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Dowhan noted no, LEED allows for irrigation of playing fields but not plantings around the school ● J.Himmel asked if the playing fields remain grass if there is a way to compartmentalize them to get CPA funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C.Kosnoff noted it may be interesting to see what funding is available for CPA but shared that the amount of CPA money may be pretty small and does not think it will have a material impact ○ C.Sheth agrees and noted that competition for those funds is increasing ● C.Favazzo noted that with LEED you can use temporary irrigation to establish the plants 		
27.7	Reflections/Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● K.Lenihan referred back to the public comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Pato noted that the Article 97 cannot go to the state until after it is voted for at the local town meeting but they are already working with the legislators ○ K.Lenihan asked for the schedule to be added to the FAQs ○ M.Burton noted that the cost to convert the central office to classrooms is roughly \$500/sf or \$10 million in construction costs. He noted this was not an estimate just a SF conversion 	Record	
27.8	Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 1:52 was made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Absent , J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, S.Bartha - Yes, M.Barrett - Yes 12-0-0.	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.