

# MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: November 6, 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
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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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	Draft a Position Statement	Working Group	J.Pato/K.Lenihan/J.Miller
4	Share draft review of the LHS4ALL plan.	Working Group	M.Burton

4	Review Schematic Design work plan and meeting requirements	Working Group	L.Finnegan

Agenda Item	Description
1.	<b>Introduction:</b> Refer to attendees list.
2.	<p><b>Review SBC Retreat and SBC Statement for Preferred Option</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The team discussed the need to draft a joint statement on the positions for the committee, with a focus on making it concise and clear. They agreed to list key bullet points and assign members to develop a narrative for each. The team also discussed the lack of a clear decision from the recent summit, with M.Burton suggesting that each committee should issue a position. The Select Board will review the statement on Friday morning, and the team will aim to have it ready by Tuesday.</li> <li>- The team discussed the consensus reached during the SBC retreat and summit regarding the mission statement and field house renovation. They agreed on Bloom as the preferred option, with the understanding that the full design would be developed before endorsing it. However, there was no clear consensus on the field house renovation, with two groups supporting a renovated field house with possible future expansion and one supporting an addition/renovation. The team decided to focus on the Bloom option first and then address the field house issue. C.Dell Angelo reminded the team about the different field house options and the need for votes next Tuesday.</li> <li>- The team discussed the problem of overcrowding in the existing school and the need to address it. They considered various options, including renovations, additions, and building on wetlands, but ultimately chose the preferred option of building on the fields. They acknowledged that some ideas, like the weave, were not viable due to cost and disruption concerns. The team also discussed the importance of</li> </ul>

	<p>addressing the issue now to avoid further delays and the need to consider community growth and its limits on a single school. They agreed to continue refining their statement to address these points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The team discussed the need for a draft statement to be reviewed and commented on by the committee before finalization. K.Lenihan, J.Pato, and J.Miller agreed to draft the statement, with the rest of the committee able to see and comment on it. The team also discussed the agenda item for the vote on the Field House, clarifying that it was about leaving space for it rather than designing it. The team decided to cover the draft statement and vote in the preferred schematic report item, with each member expected to speak about their choices. The conversation ended with the team agreeing to review the timing for the discussion and vote.</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Thought Exchange</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The team discussed the results of the latest Thought Exchange, noting that participation was lower than expected. They reviewed the results of a survey, which showed a high favorability score of 81%. The team also discussed the construction costs of a similar project, North Attleboro, which were found to be similar to their own. Mike presented a detailed analysis of the LHS4ALL plan, highlighting its issues and the impossibility of its presented timeframe. The team agreed to share the information with the full SPC.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Review Videos</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not reviewed</li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Additional FAQ Topics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mike presented a detailed analysis of the LHS4ALL plan, highlighting its issues and the impossibility of its presented timeframe. The team agreed to share the information with the full SPC</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M.Burton proposed sharing a draft of the group's thoughts on the community's proposal for a new school building. J.Pato suggested that the group should address the community's proposal in detail, explaining why it doesn't work and why the preferred option is better. B.Black expressed concerns about the feasibility of the community's proposal, highlighting issues such as lack of swing space and the need for significant renovations. Hsing emphasized the importance of transparency and respect for the community's proposal, while K.Slavsky advocated for acknowledging the community's intentions while also explaining why their proposal isn't practical. M.Burton struggled to understand the community's plan for accommodating everyone once the kids move into the new wing. K.Slavsky clarified that the community's proposal would trigger code on all existing buildings, not just the language building. The group agreed to review M.Burton's draft and provide feedback.</li> <li>- There was also a discussion about the frequency of community meetings during the schematic design phase, with a consensus that it may not be necessary to meet monthly. The team also discussed the need for a deeper dive into the schematic design work plan to understand when key decisions will be made. The importance of funneling work through professional committees like the PBC and SLC was emphasized. Lastly, the team discussed the need for a more cost-effective approach to design decisions and the potential for disruption if changes are made too late in the process.</li> </ul>
6.	<b>Close</b>

**Sincerely,**

**DORE + WHITTIER**

Jacob Greco

Assistant Project Manager

Cc: Attendees, File

The above is my summation of our meeting via Zoom Smart Chapters. If you have any additions and/or corrections, please contact me for incorporation into these minutes