MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: July 24, 2024

Project Name: Lexington High School

Project Number: Click or tap here to enter text.

Subject: Attendees: LHS Communications Working Group Meeting

Christina Dell Angelo (CA)	DWMP - Project Manager
☑ Mike Burton (MB)	DWMP- Partner
☑ Jacob Greco (JG)	DWMP - Assistant Project Manager
Lorainne Finnegan (LF)	SMMA – Principal in Charge
Anoush Krafian (AK)	SMMA – Assistant Project Manager
Mark Barrett (MB2)	LHS- Public Facilities Project Manager
Mike Cronin (MC)	SBC Vice Chair & LPS Facility Director
✓ Joe Pato (JP)	Select Board
☑ Julie Hackett (JH)	Superintendent
Jon Himmel (JH2)	PBC Chair
☑ Kathleen Lenihan (KL)	SBC Chair
☑ Kseniya Slavsky (KS)	SBC Community Representative
☑ Hsing Min Sha (HMS)	SBC Community Representative
• Jonas Miller (JM)	Communications Director

Action Item	Responsibl e Party:	Action By:
Recommendation to the SBC for August 14 th Community Meeting	J.Pato	Communicati
Format		ons WG

Agenda Item	Description
1.	Introduction: Refer to attendees list.
2.	 Review list of topics that should be discussed at the August community meeting (follow-up on action item from last meeting) J.Pato noted the concerns raised by the public about the 8/14 community meeting being the last week of summer vacation. Pato noted when planning this that the team was aware of the date as there was very limited time available to host this. H.M Sha noted that every week should be used it is a matter of what is discussed. It may be good to host this Q/A as it is important to engage community members who are not tied to the school calendar. K.Lenihan noted that time is very valuable and the meeting should be held J.Pato asked if anyone feels that this meeting should be canceled J.Hackett noted she has many concerns given the time and does not want people thinking it is on purpose. Hackett thinks virtual community meeting will be better. J.Miller noted virtual is a great idea but believes also having it in person is important. J.Hackett noted she shared a rough draft for the stakeholder engagement timeline
	 Topic J.Pato asked if everyone agreed that this should be a panelist Q/A session M.Cronin agreed this is the best approach J.Pato asked if everyone agreed that questions regarding finance will have limited response as it is not the key goal given the information available to us K.Slavsky said she is not conferrable with cutting anyone off or pushing off responses

- H.M. Sha noted he thinks there should be 3 topics at most and the moderator will allow drift and follow where the conversation is wanting to go within reason
 - Total Cost
 - o Why build a big school and future proofing
 - o Return on Interest (ROI)
- K.Slavsky noted she sees this differently than H.M. Sha. She believes the cost and size of the schools are the same topic and ties together. Slavsky noted where the school is being built/impact to fields may be the next big topic.
- K.Lenihan thinks it is important to keep the forum focused on the "main road" of what is going on and not the branch off avenues. Lenihan thinks it is important to focus on why it is important to build this version of the school and a "new" LHS not why we have to build a school in general as Covid proved nothing replaces in-person learning. She noted it could help to show the existing conditions.
 - K.Lenihan also thinks net-zero should be discussed
- J.Hackett noted that we have Thought Exchange data on key concerns so why not use those?
 - H.M. Sha thinks the themes shown is helpful to eliminate certain topics such as design topics as we are not at design a stage.
 - K.Slavsky noted the AI ranks them in an order but it may not be the best order for the current stage of the project, the largest concerns now are cost concerns and location.
 - o J.Hackett noted the list of topics in the Retreat Agenda may be better to use
- K.Slavsky noted she is seeing three groups of people
 - People who want "add-ons" such as the field house etc., which is important to complete the school
 - o The people who are overly concerned about the cost in an unrealistic manner
 - The silent group in the middle who wants the students to have a school that meets their education as soon as possible
 - K.Slavsky noted that these groups sometimes over power the conversation and do not allow the meeting to talk about the actual school
 - o J.Pato noted moderation and the shape of the meeting will be important
- J.Pato noted the chosen topics
 - Cost/size implications
 - Location of the school and associated disruptions
 - Relationship to the community values (net-zero, etc..)
 - K.Slavsky noted that the Life Cycle Cost Analysis presentation shared by SMMA could be very useful to those who are doubting these methods in lieu of saving money. She noted that this should be shared to the front of the meeting to help limit that discussion.

- M.Burton asked for the conversation of the impact of the school construction/location to be expanded
 - J.Pato noted it is mostly the long term impact on the choice of location but some smaller items may be brought up
- J.Miller noted that even if it is a phased in place reno it still will impact the fields. Pato noted the main topics can be labeled as:
 - Scope
 - Scale
 - Values
 - J.Pato noted he likes this idea of having high level topics but is not sure if these three words are the best
- K.Slavsky noted other impacts would be those on the students and the abutters
- M.Burton asked if the SMMA team is developing phasing plans
 - A.Krafian noted she thinks there is very preliminary ones that were shared at the last SBC Meeting
- M.Cronin noted that this is more of a listening session with some responses. In the
 future meetings it will be good to show in a timeline style which fields will be affected
 when with each option.
- K.Lenihan noted she is worried that she does not want the SBC to be limited and say we cannot talk about certain topics
 - o J.Pato noted that the message needs to be conveyed to the public about what is available at the time and not everything will be in a clean package
- J.Pato noted to wrap this up the minutes will be sent out on the topics and who the subject matter experts will be must be decided
- 1. What we should expect the community will want to learn
- Topic not reviewed
- 1. Who will be the subject matter expert for the item from the SBC
- Topic pushed to next meeting
- 1. What we are able to say
- Topic not reviewed

3.	 1. Continue review of the FAQ items as listed in https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1jQ74fJlK3gX2kUW9HbRdTNFu1XBR2gVf-cZA17DDYKA/edit?usp=sharing J.Pato noted there has been some progress but J.Miller was on vacation last week J.Miller noted he has gotten to each one that was submitted aside from the sustainability one and article 97
4.	Close
	It was noted that this will be continued during the SBC Retreat and the next Communications Working Group

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