

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	03/10/2025
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	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.
- Below is a summation of key points, please view the recording for full transcript.

Item No.		Description	Action
26.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00pm	Record	
26.2	Approval of February 24 - 2025, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion to approve the February 24, 2025, Meeting Minutes made by J.Pato and seconded by J.Hackett. • 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 - Yes, M.Barrett - Yes 10-0-3.	Record	
26.3	Discuss/Confirm: Add/Reno Field House Scope and Constructability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the key takeaways form the field house programming sessions (Slide 6) • B.Black reviewed the potential field house options and their scope (Starting on slide 7) • J.Himmel asked when this work on the field house will begin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o L.Finnegan noted it has always been the plan to wait for the gym to be opened to move some of the field house program into the ne gymnasium 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel asked if that all of these options would be voted on as one project at the fall debt exclusion? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted yes ◦ J.Himmel noted that they will be saving some of the foundation and structure and this is handicapping the design. Himmel asked how long and the cost for a basic rectangle new field house?Kosnoff ◦ M.Burton noted at the PSR they had three options for new buildings and J.Meiser noted they did a rough cost estimate in a vacuum and it was around the cost of option c. ◦ L.Finnegan noted that if it is all new it will have to be a separate project and it will need its own utility plan ◦ K.Lenihan noted that the committee has already voted for an addition/reno field house and not a new one • H.Min Sha asked what they gain from making it a rectangle new box compared to the option b <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ H.Min Sha noted that he views the a lot of the stakeholders as needing a rectangle shape for rooms outside of the track. He thinks that if they cannot make the best state of the art option the community wants then they should just revert to base renovation option. • A.Baker noted that the addition/renovation would improve safety by creating different zones for different sports • J.Himmel asked if any of the proposed spaces in the add/reno field house would allow for community use during the day <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ A.Baker noted that it would have to be a very serious discussion about how that would work. ◦ J.Hackett underscored that if Option B progresses the space would be available during the day for community use • C.Kosnoff asked if any of the proposed field house program will also be in the new building? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted yes there will be locker rooms and fitness center/P.E. alt space and that they are for the exclusive use of the school. The ones in the field house can be used by the community as well. • K.Slavsky noted she does support option b after reading the programming notes. She asked about why the school locker rooms could not be used for the field house also and she has heard that the field house is used during the school day currently for program. She does not want to see money wasted on duplicating program that could be used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that by removing the locker rooms from the field house you would be ultimately removing the potential for community use during the school day. With the larger gym in the high school the day time program could be moved there which may allow for daytime community use. • J.Himmel noted that the layout of the field house should account for daytime access by the community and the policy can follow. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Barrett asked what the programmatic improvements are between Option B & D? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted the larger ones expanded the space that the track can occupy, going from three lanes to four ◦ B.Black also noted there is a lot more room for program to exist but it is mostly improvements for the track • J.Pato noted that last meeting he was in favorite of Option A but he noted that now the value of Option B makes sense and he supports it. J.Pato asked how the project team can recoup the value from Option B being over the PSR estimate by 1.6 million dollars • C.Kosnoff noted she is still in favor of Option A and thinks maybe there is something in the middle between Option A and B where they can widen it without adding 14,000 sf. • A.Baker asked about the MSBA limits for support on the athletic space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that 18,000sf is the largest they will support no matter the enrollment. • L.Finnegan clarified that the program in the Option B field house is not duplicative and has separate program uses. • M.Cronin noted again that the committee has already discussed why option A is not right for this project and that they voted for addition/renovation already <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ He believes the only options should be Option B or D. • M.Cronin asked if there will be full height columns along the dashed red line <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted yes ◦ M.Cronin noted there may be safety implications for that and for that reason he is in favor in Option D • J.Himmel noted he is a fan of Mark's idea of carrying the Option D and working to VE it closer to B for MSBA purposes • L.Finnegan noted that these costs will not be changing much on the SD pricing and to note that the solar cost is not included in these either. Solar would have to be removed from other parts of the site and be moved to roof. • S.Bartha noted they have to be really careful when increasing the cost and agrees with J.Pato about finding ways to decrease the delta in the future. He noted that last meeting he was open to Option D but does not think so anymore. • D.Voss noted that last meeting he was between Options B or D and it is helpful to get some more solar information. D.Voss noted he cannot choose between them but if D was off the table he would go with Option B. • J.Himmel noted under the right conditions he would go with Option B • J.Hackett noted she is in favor of Option B but wants to make sure they enter into knowing the community will get use out of it • H.Min Sha noted that he is leaning towards using option A as and the delta of cost as a head start to the community to try and build a 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>brand new large field house. If the community says no he is happy with the Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Pato noted that they cannot just save that money it will be a vote for the cost of the project and that is all. ● K.Lenihan noted that it seems the group is largely in favor of Option B although not everyone ● C.Kosnoff wanted to clarify that she does not support Option B and supports Option A ● S.Bartha noted if A and B are the only options under consideration, then he is in favor of Option A ● H.Min Sha noted he is also in favor of Option A ● J.Hackett asked about value engineering for Option B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Burton noted the 1.6 million dollar delta for Option B could be found in value engineering ○ J. Hackett clarified that in that case, a vote for option B does not necessarily mean that there will be any additional costs for the fieldhouse from what the SBC originally voted. 		
26.4	<p>Square Foot/Per Student Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L.Finnegan reviewed the student per square foot including the MSBA standards (Per M.G.L 963 CMR), the expectations you need to account for to be able to compare schools and a comparison of recent high school projects to Lexington. (Starting on Slide 18) 	Record	
26.5	<p>Double Height and Learning Stair Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● K.Slavsky noted that this question comes from creating the most cost effective building. She noted that double height spaces are more expensive during construction and it also adds to the future maintenance cost as everything is harder to get to. She also noted that they could run a floor there instead and reduce the size of the wings to create a smaller footprint which may save on foundation costs. K.Slavsky asks the design team to clarify that if that space is only aesthetic (including social and emotional) or is there other benefit? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Lenihan noted that she views social and emotional as very important ○ B.Black noted they do not take these large spaces lightly but noted they are common in the industry for cafeterias, media center, large group instruction rooms. B.Black noted that the larger a space is the higher the ceilings have to go to make someone feel comfortable. He noted that the commons area being double height is integral to the design 	Record	

	<p>of the bloom option and having a one floor height ceiling would feel oppressive for that location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Baker noted that there are also school program incentives along with social and emotional to have these locations along with the social and emotional benefits. • H.Min Sha would like to see the cost differences between these options because if they are not large he would support the cost for these benefits • J.Meiser noted that they could have the infrastructure ready to maybe add the floor in the future for expansion. • J.Himmel noted that he is trying to picture what a one story space for 800 students would look and feel like and he cannot see how it would function well. There is a lot of positives and energy that comes having the double height space and that should be something the committee wants for this school. 		
26.6	<p>Public Comment</p> <p>To view public comment please see the recording here</p>	Record	
26.7	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Himmel noted that the presentation was nicely done. He asked for them to give a sense of scale of spaces by relating them to other spaces they have been to 	Record	
26.8	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 1:52 was made by J.Hackett and seconded by J.Pato</p> <p>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.</p>	Record	

Project: Lexington High School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 25 – 03/10/2025
Page: 7

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.