

# MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: October 23, 2024  
 Project Name: Lexington High School  
 Project Number: Click or tap here to enter text.  
 Subject: LHS Communications Working Group Meeting  
 Attendees:

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

| Item No. | Action Item                                     | Requested by  | Ball in Court |
|----------|---|---------------|---------------|
| 2        | Slide showing how the two options were selected | J.Himmel      | SMMA/DWMP     |
| 2        | Print flyers for K.Lenihan and J.Miller         | C.Dell Angelo | DWMP          |
|          |   |               |               |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

| Agenda Item | Description   |
|-------------|---|
| 1.          | <b>Introduction:</b> Refer to attendees list.   |
| 2.          | <p><b>Review Community Forum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thought Exchange <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The team discussed the use of Thought Exchange, a tool for gathering community feedback, in their project. They found it effective but raised concerns about its representativeness, suggesting the need for demographic information. The team agreed to continue using Thought Exchange but also to consider ways to improve its representativeness. They decided to create a clear and concise presentation explaining the reasoning behind their decision to advance the C.5b and D2 options, and why the Add/Reno option was deemed unfeasible. The team also agreed to close the presentation on November 8th and provide the information to the SBC members on November 11th.</li> <li>o M.Burton highlighted the tool's effectiveness in understanding community preferences, with new construction on fields being the top-ranked option. However, concerns were raised about the representativeness of the feedback, with K.Slavsky suggesting the need for demographic information to contextualize the results. The team agreed on the value of the tool but also acknowledged the need for more diverse input. They decided to continue using Thought Exchange but also to consider ways to improve its representativeness.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Advancing C.5b and D2 Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The team discussed the need for a clear and concise presentation to explain the reasoning behind the decision to advance the C.5b and D2 options. They agreed that the presentation should include the key criteria and discussions used to narrow down the options. J.Himmel emphasized the importance of explaining why the Add/Reno option was deemed unfeasible, citing factors such as disruption, duration, cost, and a disjointed final product. The team agreed to distill the key points from their previous discussions and create a slide for the presentation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The team also discussed the cost implications of building a radius versus a straight wall, with J.Himmel noting that while there is more engineering involved, the cost difference is not significant. The team agreed to prepare for the next meeting by drafting key criteria and reasons for eliminating certain options. K.Slavsky highlighted the need to explain the increase in renovation and addition costs, and J.Himmel suggested a breakdown of the estimate by system to better understand the trade-offs. Mike agreed to try to prepare a summary for the next meeting.</li> <li>- Refining Survey Questions for Community Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o J.Pato proposed adding a third question to the survey to gauge discomfort with the given options, suggesting a clear separation between the multiple-choice questions and the open-ended comments. A.Krafian suggested adding 'neither' as a third option to the multiple-choice question, while J.Miller proposed a separate question asking if the respondent is in favor of the project overall and which design they prefer if it moves forward. J.Greco clarified that only one open-ended question could be included in the survey. The team agreed to further discuss and refine the survey questions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| 3. | <b>Review Videos</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not discussed</li> </ul>  |
| 4. | <b>Review Additional FAQ Topics/Adjustments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not Discussed</li> </ul>   |
| 5. | <b>Close</b>  |

**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