

Project:	Lexington High School	Project No:	
Subject:	School Building Committee Meeting	Meeting Date:	04/14/2025
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
28.7	Review scope & cost implications of moving the mechanical room to Wing B	SBC	SMMA/Turner
28.4	Research other options of temporary/rented field lighting other than diesel and any costs needed for use	SBC	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	Action
28.1	Call to Order & Intro: Called to order by Kathleen Lenihan at 12:00pm	Record	
28.2	Approval of March 24 - 2025, Meeting Minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A motion to approve the March 24, 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 – Yes, J. Hackett – Yes, J. Himmel – Yes, C. Kosnoff – Yes, J. Pato – Yes, K. Slavsky – Yes, H. Sha – Absent, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss – Yes, S.Bartha - Yes, M.Barrett - Yes 11-0-1.	Record	
28.3	Public Comment Please click here to view the recording for public comment	Record	
28.4	Introduce Off-Site Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.Prestileo reviewed the offsite improvements topic for the project (Slide 7) 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic Impact Report (draft) is anticipated by 4/18, which will include recommendations ○ Off-Site Improvements will include safety recommendations and may include opportunities to improve roadway and intersection operation (Level of Service, LOS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Signage ● Traffic Calming ● Sight Distance ● Shared-Use Paths ● J.Pato noted that the ultimate authority for this topic will be the Select Board not the School Building Committee however the SBC can make recommendations ● L.Finnegan added that these recommendations could be for future projects that town will handle themselves ● K.Slavsky asked if the project team is seeing any potential recommendations that may have to be requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.Prestileo noted there may be both but it is hard to know prior to getting the report 		
28.5	<p>Discuss Lighted Fields & Field Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● M.Dowhan reviewed the lighted field scope (Slide 10 & 11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing Lighted Fields to Remain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C1 Varsity Baseball ● C2 Varsity Softball ● C7 Multi-Use Rectangle Overlay ○ Proposed Relocated Fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C3 Jr. Varsity Baseball ● C4 Softball Field ● C5 Crumb Football Field ● C6 Practice Field ● C8 Multi-Use Cricket ○ Currently no relocated fields are proposed to be illuminated ● M.Dowhan reviewed the potential field materials (Slide 12 & 13) ● A.Baker noted that at a recent meeting on the topic they would like to get a better sense of what other towns/districts in the Middlesex league are doing for their varsity football fields. A.Baker noted that currently they rent lights for the Friday night games using loud diesel generators and Baker sees value in lighting this field as part of the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K.Slavsky noted she likes this idea and thinks that even if it is not included the field should have conduit for a future project 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.Pato noted that it will be important to have a deeper conversation with the abutters because if the fields are lighted they may be used more often. • J.Pato noted he has concerns about the new traffic patterns coming off of Waltham now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ E.Prestileo noted that the current traffic pattern is the same as the proposed one • J.Himmel asked if they could provide infrastructure to plug in rented lights instead of having to use diesel generators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ E.Prestileo noted that the issue may be that the rented lights are often not tall enough • C.Kosnoff asked how the overlay of the fields will work for fencing the main football field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Dowhan noted that they will fence in the whole overlay not just the football field • C.Favazzo shared that rented lighting can now be battery powered or plugged in and do not have to be diesel. • A.Levine asked if it will be an issue for abutters to have the lighted fields and maybe the football field should be moved to where C.4 currently is • M.Cronin noted that C.7 currently hosts night time cricket and that the field is not regulation. He noted that there should be a conversation about this as they may be moved to C.8 and they will need to know what amenities they will require • J.Hackett asked if there will be work done on the existing to remain fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Dowhan noted there may be some work along the edges of it but they will not be rebuilding the fields or doing upgrading • J.Hackett asked what the process would be for lighting the field <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted they will need to conduct a photometric study and hold another abutter meeting to share this information. ◦ M.Burton also noted that this was not included in the PSR cost estimates so there will be an add on of around \$800,000 to \$1,000,000. • J.Himmel asked why football could not be moved to inside the outdoor track <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted it works well for practice but not for the games as they cannot enclose the area, the sidelines will be on the track and there are no bleachers • A.Baker asked if there are ways to be smarter about lighting the fields for the future instead of just the diesel generators. • J.Himmel asked if it makes sense to rent some of these lights now to place in the parking lot and see how the abutters like or dislike them <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M.Dowhan reviewed the field materials (Slide 12 & 13) • K.Lenihan noted she has environmental concerns about synthetic turf 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine noted that there is a difference between grass and grass fields that require a lot of management and asked if there is a large cost to install irrigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Dowhan noted they carried a sand base and irrigation at PSR but did not carry a gravel drainage system • K.Lenihan asked that all the potential costs for these systems are provided by the confirmation. • K.Lenihan asked if any SBC members have interest in synthetic turf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ No members raised their hand • J.Himmel asked if Kentucky Blue Grass was carried in the PSR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ It was not there was a mix but it yes it was mostly Kentucky Blue • A.Levine asked how the flood plain may change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ E.Prestileo noted that with the passing of Article 31 the high school is now in a Flood Zone A and they are working to establish a flood elevation. 		
28.6	<p>Discuss Exterior Design & Building Entrances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the exterior design & building entrances (Slide 16 - 28) • C.Lamb asked for it to not look like Belmont • H.Min Sha noted that the most important aspect will be for the students, staff, and community to be proud of what it looks like and to build for the future. Min Sha noted that he thinks everyone will be tried and move on from the "red brick" school buildings soon. He noted he likes Option C the best • K.Slavsky looks at this from a perspective of how to make a large building feel less oppressive and finds that lighter and warmer tones are better and likes the pallet of Option C but prefers the vertically of the other options. Slavsky also asked if they are keeping the structure under places like the stairs as strong as the rest for future expansion. • J.Himmel asked if the stairs in Option A are flush with the façade <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted yes • J.Himmel asked what the finish in the raised courtyard will be <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted the same as the exterior as it would continue through • J.Pato also noted he does not like the horizontal layout of Option C but prefers the vertical aspect. He also likes the overhang in Option C 	Record	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K.Lenihan noted she prefers Option A and likes the traditional red brick look. She also noted that these look very flat and not detailed or dimensional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted the renderings may have that look to them but it is also hard to achieve a higher performance • M.Cronin he likes the Option A color, Option B stairwell, and Option C overhang • A.Levine asked what the light gray color is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted it is a rainscreen material • C.Favazzo noted that having a flatter look to the façade helps keep the cost lower so any tricks to make it look like it has depth is important • J.Pato asked if there will be a stone base around the school instead of brick all the way to the ground <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted yes there will be 		
28.7	<p>Confirm Space Layouts, Circulation & Future Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the current space layouts, circulation, and future expansion (Slide 31 to 41) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black noted the goal here is to confirm they can proceed with this layout so they can work on refining the smaller details • J.Himmel asked if the mechanical room near the auditorium provides all the space needed and if the geothermal wells are on the other side of the building should that space be located closer to that side of the building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ B.Black shared they have been looking at it and if it will work, he noted that currently they are not planning on it as it will displace program and will require additional square footage. ◦ SMMA and Turner will review scope & cost implications of moving the mechanical room to Wing B • C.Kosnoff noted she is not a fan of how large the field house has expanded but is okay with the overall plan. She also asked if the central office space has been reduced wouldn't it affect the potential future expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ R.Park noted that as they honed down the layout they were able to remove a couple small classrooms ◦ J.Hackett noted they removed the community education space from the high school • B.Black reviewed the central office space (Slide 38 & 39) • J.Hackett asked if the reduction in central office square footage is helpful for the project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted helpful • C.Favazzo shared that the PBC preferred the larger expansion option and noted the only difference is how they save space in the plaza on ground level 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.Levine asked what is being prepared in this project for the future expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted nothing currently and they are reviewing if it will be worth it to include ground improvements in this project • C.Kosnoff noted that it seems impractical to not include the two classrooms from central office and that they won't go back to just build out two classrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan noted that even without them they will still be above the 3000 student upper limit that has been shared and that they would do the two classrooms the same time as the full central office space fit out • J.Himmel noted that they will still be building the same amount of exterior enclosure with or without the two classrooms and also noted they could remove the stairwell also so the edge is not notched. • R.Park noted that every line on the central office space is not an actual wall as they will have an open office concept to reduce interior walls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ J.Himmel asked how the net to gross multiplier works with that ◦ L.Finnegan noted you would count anything that is yellow on that plan • B.Black clarified that they would be removing the stairwell and the images are more up to date than the plans are • J.Pato asked that when they do the central office fit out would they be including these spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ They would most likely recommend not including them ◦ J.Hackett noted they have two spare maker spaces that could be converted to classrooms • J.Pato asked why they are removing the two central office spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ M.Cronin noted to help maintain total gross square footage ◦ L.Finnegan noted that yes during Schematic Design the goal is to tighten the project and they have found that this space is not needed for central office • J.Pato asked if the expanded field house is contributing to the gross square footage and if not where does it come from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ R.Park noted that during the space summary review in Schematic Design some spaces increased and others decreased which left the total slightly over so they found this comprise to reduce central office that does not decrease any educational space • H.Min Sha noted that either way there should not be more than 3000 students in the school • K.Lenihan asked for which expansion option is preferred <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Option 1 count: 12 ◦ Option 2 count: 1 • K.Lenihan asked if they have to decide on the central office layout now 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L.Finnegan noted it can be done at the May meeting but is a very busy meeting already ● K.Lenihan asked if anyone is against the overall layout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No one made a comment 		
28.9	<p>Confirm Spaces to be Air Conditioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A.Oldeman reviewed the spaces to be air-conditioned (Slide 44 & 45) ● A.Levine asked what the outside temperature was based on and noted it will be more often in the 90s going forward ● J.Pato noted that they carried this cost in the PSR so they should keep it for now and can look at it further down the line ● J.Himmel asked if the gym air conditioning is the same system and if they could be switched from one to another <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A.Oldeman noted that it would be hard to manage both at the same time and get large ductwork to connect both ● K.Slavsky noted she feels strongly that any occupied space should be air conditioned and any energy saving requirements should be handled operationally and not by design ● The SBC noted to continue with what was carried in the PSR 		
28.10	<p>Reflections/Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C.Dell Angelo shared the timeline for Schematic Design estimating process (Slide 47 & 48) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C.Dell Angelo noted that it is important for the SBC to mark these dates and provide a quorum to review these topics ● J.Himmel noted that at the PBC they discussed how it is the role of the School Committee and Select Board to provide a number that the project should not exceed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J.Pato noted that he thinks they should be holding as close to the PSR estimate as possible knowing that there are items outside of the control but any costs being added to the project should also be accompanied by options that reduce costs equally ○ L.Finnegan noted that is why they have been trying to show what is carried in PSR ● C.Favazzo agrees with K.Slavsky that all choices with numbers should include operational costs but noted that using target value design should start now and not after schematic design 	Record	
28.11	<p>Adjourn: Motion to adjourn at 2:18 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 –</p>	Record	

Project: Lexington High School
Meeting: School Building Committee
Meeting No. 27 – 03/24/2025
Page: 9

	Yes, H. Sha – Yes, K. Lenihan – Yes, D. Voss - Yes, S.Bartha - Yes, M.Barrett - Yes 12-0-0.		

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.