

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	11/12/24
Location:	Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)	Time:	12:00 PM
Distribution:	Attendees, Project File	Prepared By:	J. Greco

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

	Andy Oldeman			Melissa Battite	Recreation Department

Item No.	Action Item	Requested by	Ball in Court

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

Item No.		Description
22.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A report out of the Student School Building Committee was conducted noting that they preferred the C.5b 'Bloom' option for many reasons but mostly the least disruption to students and the fastest duration. 	Record
22.2	Approval of October 28 - 2024, November 4 - 2024 Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve October 28 - 2024, November 4 - 2024 Meeting Minutes made by J.Hackett and seconded by M.Cronin Discussion: None Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes , M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H.M Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, S.Bartha - Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 13-0-0. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.Dell Angelo reviewed the Thought Exchange results from the most recent survey. (Slide 4) 	Record
22.3	Report out on the November 4th Summit (Discuss Position Statement)	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• K.Lenihan reviewed the School Building Committee's draft position statement. This can be viewed here.• K.Slavsky noted that it has been a long-complicated process to get to this point. She noted that there is a real issue that currently hits Lexington Highschool, and most people would not tolerate this in their workplace. She noted how the building systems are already beyond their scheduled life. Slavsky noted that in all metrics option C.5b is better than option D.2.• H.M. Sha noted he was in favor of option C.5b• C.Kosnoff noted that the draft position statement summarizes her findings very well and she supports it.• J.Pato noted that he helped create the position statement and support it. He also noted that he shared the select boards input from their most recent meeting.• A.Baker noted he will be voting for option C.5b. He has been at Lexington Highschool for 20 years and has never seen their needs be met. He noted the current building is not suitable and the students deserve spaces that are common across high schools around the country. Baker noted that the students need these spaces not just deserve. He also noted he hears the issues the community raises.• C.Lamb noted that the Capital Expenditure Committee is fully in favor of the C.5b option.• M.Cronin noted he had a conversation with the building commissioner, and he noted that if work was done to add a building per the proponents proposed plan the existing building would be fully required to have full code upgrades.• C.Favazzo noted that he is in favor of C.5b for all the reasons listed so far.• D.Voss noted that he views this project from a resource standpoint and both options meet the town's standards. Voss noted he will be voting for option C.5b for the reasons listed prior.• J.Himmel noted he is in favor of Option C.5b as it is time for the town to build a new school properly as they have tried other options in the past. He noted C.5b has so many positives and few negatives such as dividing the fields, if that is a negative. Himmel thinks 'Bloom' will offer the best layout for educational adjacencies and construction. He noted C.5b is much less likely to have any construction delays while working with D.2 would impact students in every way possible.• K.Lenihan noted she also helped curate the position statement, so she supports option C.5b. She noted how this process has made her proud of being a Lexington Community member.• S.Bartha noted that although he is new to the town and project, he has been able to review ample material. He noted that there are well placed concerns being shared by the community but he has seen that a lot of these issues have already had mitigation efforts started. He noted that he also supports the C.5b option for three main reasons: The impact to students, risk mitigation, and the cost of the project estimates.• M.Barrett noted that the position statement was effective in sharing his views and he supports the C.5b option.• M.Cronin noted that he agrees with the position statement and K.Slavsky summary and fully supports the C.5b option.	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> J.Hackett noted that she supports Option C.5b for all the reasons shared. She referred back to the Statement of Interest submitted to the MSBA. She noted that through that process there was a large concern for safety with the current 'campus' style layout. She also noted that the School Building Committee is charged with bringing the best educational and financial option to the MSBA. 	
22.4	<p>Vote: on Preferred Schematic Report Option to move into Schematic Design (C.5b – D.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to approve Option C.5b 'Bloom' as the preferred option to move into Schematic Design by J.Hackett and seconded by A.Baker <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H.M Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss – Yes, S.Bartha– Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 13-0-0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This motion passed 	Record
22.5	<p>Vote: Renovation or Addition/Renovation for Base Field House Option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan noted that currently the renovation is being carried out but there was some input for an addition/renovation. She noted the project team would like another confirmation on this. L.Finnegan reviewed each option for base field house (Slide 9) L.Finnegan noted the 200m track will be very tight in the addition/reno option but the 146m track could be used to gain more room. H.M. Sha asked if there was a recommendation from the project team if the community does decide to build new ones later. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan noted it would be assumed that the existing would be removed K.Slavsky asked if the square footage of the addition/reno could be changed to make the 200m track fit better or does it have to be that size. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L.Finnegan noted they are expanding toward Worthen Rd and there is site limitation C.Lamb noted that the CEC is in favor of the add/reno option due to the potential increase in student enrollment and general population. A.Baker noted he would hope the add/reno could accommodate at least half the school enrollment in the bleachers. He noted that for \$75 years the value of the increased cost for the add/reno would be worth it. J.Pato asked A.Baker to expand on the school's use of the facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A.Baker noted that what he has in mind would be partial or full school events could be held aside from athletics. He noted that current program in the field house could be expanded. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Barrett noted he is worried that if they must place a new large field house the money for a renovated field house would be wasted • C.Favazzo noted that with the expanded gym in the new building many of the field house programs would be moved and provide new room for program in the normal renovation. • J.Himmel noted that they should choose the add/reno so they can explore the option further in Schematic Design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that they could pull back in Schematic Design if they decided to just do the renovation, but it is not ideal as they would like to know what the base project is and be able to submit the preferred one to the MSBA. • C.Kosnoff asked if the add/reno option would have any height, shadow, or location impacts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted that there would be no height impact, but the 'knoll' would be impacted. He noted that it does not impact any critical site design • C.Kosnoff asked what the difference is between the renovation and the option to keep the field house running. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted that the 5–10-year fix is just to keep the basic building systems functional and not fix any of the issues. • H.M. Sha noted that his position on the field house has shifted greatly. He is in favor of the most feasible option that will pass votes and Article 97. He noted he is advocating for renovation only and saving space for a large field house. • J.Pato noted that he was the only member of the select board inf favor of saving space for a new large field house. • K.Slavsky noted she is not convinced that the 5–10-year option for the field house will not be code compliment and therefore could not stand alone. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted that it does meet ADA and does not need to meet energy codes. • K.Slavsky noted that it should be noted that if the community wants to build a new field house, they will have to tear down the newly renovated one and no one in town would support this. She noted they should design the chosen reno/ or add/reno option and also vote on the larger one to let the town choose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Burton noted that they would have to reserve the space, and this would affect how the site is designed if the larger one is then not chosen. • J.Himmel noted he does not think the MSBA would allow further design to continue with both options. He thinks there needs to be a group of people to sit down and figure out the work that needs to be done. • C.Lamb noted that this would require all new designers and OPMs and Lexington do not have funds for design and engineering in the FY26 budget. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve Addition & Renovation Field House as the preferred option to move into Schematic Design by K.Slavsky and seconded by D.Voss 	
--	--	--

	<p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – Yes, M. Cronin – Yes, C. Favazzo – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H.M Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, S.Bartha- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 13-0-0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This motion passed 	
22.6	<p>Vote: One New Field House option to be carried into Schematic Design for site design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.Lamb noted that the CEC does not endorse saving space for a future new field house unless there are guarantees that the high school project or site are not impacted • K.Lenihan noted she thinks the large field house takes up too much space on the site and constricts the design team. • A.Baker noted that he sees concerns with the large field house given it would be removed from the school presence and hearing things like private investors and management as it is a school facility first and used by the school from sunrise to sunset. • S.Bartha noted he is in favor of saving space for future town meetings but is concerned with how they can save this much space without impacting the current site. He does not see voters approving anything after spending money to renovate • M.Cronin noted he is not in favor of saving space • C.Favazzo noted he is in favor of saving space for a small new field house in the northeast corner but nothing else • J.Hackett noted she is in favor of just renovating the field house as she has been but could agree with the add/reno as being able to fit everyone in the school would be great and something that cannot happen today. She is not in favor of saving any space for a future field house. • J.Himmel noted that is they renovate or add/reno the current field house he is not in favor of saving any space for a future new field house as that would be a misuse of public funds. He thinks they should do the add/reno and save a small amount of space • C.Kosnoff noted she is leaning towards a renovation or possibly an add/reno. She noted that if they were to do either of those, she does not think they should save space for a future new field house. • J.Pato noted he had been hopeful of saving space but after examining the site at the summit last week it seemed not viable and there is no reason to build a new field house and not do the large one. He noted none of the select board would like to save space and he agrees. Pato noted he is leaning towards just a reno but is not locked in. • K.Slavsky noted she is in favor of the add/reno field house as there has been a lot of public comment around the importance of the programs that occur in there and the safety of them occurring all at once. She also noted she is in favor of saving space for the large field house as she would dislike making a choice that removes options from the town, and it is not in the purview of the committee. She is not in favor of building a new large field house, however. 	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H.M Sha noted his position has shifted greatly and he thinks that a large field of house space should be saved so the community can make their case. D.Voss noted he supports add/reno and would like to save space to give the town the opportunity to vote but noted the timing of that is critical and would like to know when they can walk back saving space. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M.Burton noted that Schematic Design is when they lock in the cost with the MSBA and if the town wants to use that space, they will have to pay 100% of the costs if there are increased costs for using the space saved. M.Dowhan shared the current site plans for saving space starting on Slide 19 K.Slavsky noted she would pick the northeast C option for reserving space S.Bartha noted that after seeing the sites and learning more he would vote to not save space for a new field house A.Baker noted he is not in favor of saving space after reviewing the site plans M.Barrett noted he is not in favor. C.Kosnoff and C.Favazzo also noted they are not in favor of saving space. <p>Motion to approve saving space for a large new field house as the preferred option to move into Schematic Design by H.M. Sha and seconded by K.Slavsky</p> <p>Roll Call Vote: A. Baker – No , M. Cronin – No, C. Favazzo – No, J. Hackett – No, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – No K. Slavsky – Yes, H.M Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – No, D. Voss - Abstain, S.Bartha- No, M. Barrett - No 4-8-1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This motion did not pass 	
22.7	<p>Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review public comment please view the recording here 	Record
22.8	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K.Slavsky noted she looks forward to moving into Schematic Design and she would like to say that they dedicate the next SBC meeting to how the SBC will be included in the process and be able to provide input. C.Lamb provided his thanks to the committee and project team. 	Record
22.9	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:41 was made by K.Lenihan 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 - Yes, S.Bartha- Yes, M. Barrett - Yes 13-0-0.</p>	Record

Project: Lexington High School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 22 – 11/12/2024
Page: 8

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.