

Click or tap to enter a date.

## SCHOOL COMMITTEE / SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES



Project: Lexington High School  
Subject: School Building Committee Meeting  
Location: Hybrid (146 Maple Street & Zoom)  
Distribution: Attendees, Project File

Project No:  
Meeting Date: 11/30/23  
Time: 2:00 PM  
Prepared By: R. Rincon

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	✓	Steve Brown	DWMP
	Jim Malloy*	Town Manager		Mike Cox	DWMP
	Joe Pato*	Select Board Chair	✓	Rachel Rincon	DWMP
✓	Mark Barrett*	Public Facilities Manager		Jason Boone	DWMP
✓	Charles Favazzo Jr.*	PBC Co-Chair		Brad Dore	DWMP
✓	Jonathan Himmel*	PBC Chair		Elias Grijalva	DWMP
✓	Andrew Baker*	Interim Lexington High School Principal		Chris Schaffner	Green Engineer
	Carolyn Kosnoff*	Finance Assistant Town Manager	✓	Lorraine Finnegan	SMMA
✓	Hsing Min Sha*	Community Representative	✓	Rosemary Park	SMMA
✓	Kseniya Slavsky*	Community Representative	✓	Matt Rice	SMMA
✓	Charles Lamb	Capital Expenditures Committee	✓	Brian Black	SMMA
✓	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee	✓	Erin Prestileo	SMMA
✓	Dan Voss*	Sustainable Lexington Committee		Anthony Jimenez	SMMA
	Maureen Kavanaugh	Director of Planning and Assessment	✓	Martine Dion	SMMA
			✓	Anoush Krafian	SMMA

Item No.	Responsible Party	Description
5.2	DWMP	Follow-up on comments and actions from SBC meeting
5.3	DWMP	Schedule communications, agenda and schedule working groups
5.3	DWMP, SMMA	Discuss engagement timeline during the communications working group
5.3	DWMP	Update FAQ's on the project website regularly
5.10	DWMP, SMMA	Follow up on J. Hackett's "Next Meeting" list
5.11	DWMP	Post Article 97 WG meeting notes on the project website
5.11	DWMP, SMMA	Improve on outreach to seniors

Item No.		
5.1	<b>Call to Order &amp; Intro:</b> 2:03 PM meeting was called to order by SBC Vice-Chair M. Cronin with 10 of 13 voting members in attendance.	Record
5.2	<p><b>Previous Topics &amp; Approval of October 12, 2023, Meeting Minutes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A motion to approve the 10/12/2023 meeting minutes with A. Levine's amendments made by H. Sha and seconded by M. Cronin. Discussion: H. Sha requested when there are cases where comments require a response, it would be beneficial to know the follow-up actions taken. H. Sha provided an example. J. Himmel expressed the need for a more effective method to track topics and their history. D+W will look into a better way to maintain records. A. Levine mentioned that his corrections were not reflected in the minutes he received. R. Rincon responded that she had corrected the minutes but would ensure they were accurately reflected. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, J. Himmel – yes, A. Baker – yes. H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss – yes. 10-0-0</li> </ul>	Record  DWMP
5.3	<p><b>Preliminary Schedule / Work Plan Review:</b></p> <p><u>Feasibility &amp; Schematic Timeline</u> – M. Burton explained that the same slide has been presented in several meetings. The projection indicates that the preliminary design program work is scheduled to take place between now and May. The 3 key dates are June 2024 for completion of Preliminary Design Program (PDP), which means they have reached the point where they have come up with a minimum of 3 options required by the MSBA. The Preferred Schematic Report (PSR) phase is where there are multiple options narrowed down to the most preferred option for Lexington. A portion will be concluded in December of 2024. Moving to schematic design, the preferred option will be developed to a decent level of design (roughly 50%). Estimators and constructability reviews will then ensue. The estimates are what will be presented to the MSBA and that is what the MSBA grant amount will be set at. Once a deal is made with the MSBA, it then goes to local actions and approvals for town vote. After the town vote, Lexington would enter into a project funding agreement (PFA) with the MSBA. That is a representation of the project over the next 2 years.</p> <p><u>Preliminary Design Program (PDP) Nov '23 – June '24</u> – L. Finnegan shared she wanted to walk through the activities during the PDP and give a sense of when those activities occur, along with wanting to identify areas where they are expecting and anticipating stakeholder engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Develop Educational Plan and Vision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ed Plan drafted by District reviewed by SMMA team</li> <li>○ Four (4) Visioning Workshops scheduled <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 12/05; 12/20; 01/10 &amp; 01/24 <b>(STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT)</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Record

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Educational Programming Meeting with District and High School Leadership; Staff and Students being coordinated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Between 12/11 and 01/11 (approx. 5 days +/-)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Existing Building Condition Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Full Design team to walk existing building and site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Architects, Structural engineers, HVAC, Electrical, Plumbing, Fire Protection engineers, civil engineers, landscape architects – 2-4 days in December</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Existing Site Analysis &amp; Investigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultant Team scheduling site investigations – will occur over December and January <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Survey – Property line, utilities and features</li> <li>▪ Existing Traffic patterns and counts</li> <li>▪ Wetland Flagging</li> <li>▪ Geo-Environmental research</li> <li>▪ Environmental Acoustics – Measures existing background noise</li> <li>▪ Geotechnical – To be scheduled during Design Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Geothermal – To be scheduled during Design Alternatives</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Design Alternatives <b>(STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generate a space summary that defines the existing spaces and the proposed spaces to be evaluated – following evaluation of existing school and programming meetings.</li> <li>○ Develop design alternatives that must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Code Upgrade Only - repair of systems, no modifications to spaces or their functions</li> <li>▪ Renovation(s) and/or additions</li> <li>▪ New Construction</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Site Development requirements <b>(STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Define project requirements related to site development including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pedestrian routes; bicycle and walking paths; parking counts</li> <li>▪ Emergency vehicle access</li> <li>▪ Safety and Security requirements</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fields and Open Space</li> <li>▪ Wetlands</li> <li>▪ Utilities</li> </ul> <p>➤ Systems and Sustainability <b>(STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generate Project Targets collectively for inclusion into Alternatives including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LEED Lexington - Established</li> <li>▪ LEED Gold– Established at 09/14 SBC Meeting, strive for Platinum</li> <li>▪ EUI 25 or 30% better than ASHRAE – Recommendation from PBC</li> <li>▪ All Electric building – Established at 09/14 SBC Meeting</li> <li>▪ Net Zero Energy – Recommendation from PBC maximize renewables.</li> <li>▪ Battery Storage - Recommendation from PBC evaluate and present options.</li> <li>▪ Embodied Carbon – Goal TBD</li> <li>▪ Ground source or Air Source heat pumps – System TBD</li> <li>▪ Photo Voltaic &amp; EV Charging locations – Roof and Parking quantity TBD</li> <li>▪ Health and Wellness - Goal TBD</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>➤ Massing and materials <b>(STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generate Project Goals collectively for inclusion into Alternatives including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Exterior materials and massing</li> <li>▪ Interior Materials – Red list materials, Maintainability</li> <li>▪ Define expansion potential.</li> <li>▪ Safety and Security</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>L. Finnegan mentioned all of this is planned in the live Microsoft Project document. It will be updated regularly to reflect the events that occur. As meetings are scheduled, such as the educational visioning meetings, they will be put into the schedule. The decisions that need to be made collectively to continue to advance will be noted in this schedule as milestones so that everyone is aware of the decisions being made. For example, when the education plan needs to be approved, it is both a school</p>	<p>DWMP SMMA</p>
--	--	----------------------

committee action and a building committee action. It is important to understand who needs to act as well because there are certifications that must be submitted as part of the submissions. M. Burton suggested that this should be added to the website so that people understand the schedule and it can be updated weekly or monthly.

Integrated Design & Community Engagement (Engagement Timeline):

L. Finnegan shared a different visual that shows all the engagement meetings and the different types of focus group meetings that are occurring. (Please refer to slide 11 in the presentation)

Discussion:

- A. Levine asked if they are available, can they attend the in-person visioning meetings? L. Finnegan responded, absolutely. J. Hackett shared she sent out a communication and all SBC members should read it because it has updates for the project. She explained they are looking for 60 people to participate and discussed the fact that the SBC is a representative body of the community, and they would be nice additions to the visioning process. If interested, it is best to fill out the form. The goal is to have 2/3 of the participants be educators and students while the remaining 20 individuals being community members.
- J. Himmel suggested adding the date and time to the bottom of the Microsoft Project document. L. Finnegan responded, in the top right corner there is a date and there is a run date at the very bottom. This will be uploaded as a PDF.
- J. Himmel asked what is the educated decision of which the ball gets rolling as it relates to Article 97? L. Finnegan responded there was a kickoff meeting on November 13<sup>th</sup> to talk about Article 97 specifically. The process has already begun. SMMA's civil engineering team is doing an analysis of hardscapes and softscapes of the building footprint. Also, wooded areas of the current site and what falls within what might be designated park land and what is not designated park land. We had a meeting with Lexington's attorneys and the town administrator to talk about getting in front of the EEA (Energy & Environmental Affairs). Also, the law is being looked at. There was an amendment to Article 97 in 2020 and it will be reviewed for the changes. J. Himmel expressed concern about potential promises regarding the building's location without considering cost implications. L. Finnegan explained that detailed design alternatives must be submitted to the EEA for analysis to see if the right steps were taken to avoid an Article 97. Looking at this property, it is going to be very difficult regardless. Parts of the existing building are already showing up on park land, but detailed design alternatives must be produced to show other opportunities were looked at to avoid this. L. Finnegan also mentioned the Microsoft project document shown does not show the permitting section that they are starting to fill in.

- K. Slavsky asked if portions of the existing building sit on Article 97 land, would even the renovation option that is being studied require this Article 97 work? L. Finnegan says they need to go back and review what was done at the time of the building permit to see if there are any records. K. Slavsky added the Article 97 work takes a substantial amount of time which means it is best to get started before design alternatives have been presented or decided on. K. Slavsky asked, is that work necessary regardless? Also, is the land swap being applied for even if it might not ultimately be needed if a particular design alternative is chosen? L. Finnegan responded that the design alternatives must be detailed enough to be legitimate. It is unlikely that the PDP design alternatives will be satisfactory as a submission. The aim is to conduct a thorough analysis during the second phase of feasibility, where the chosen option will emerge after the conclusion of PSR. Regardless of the option selected, considerations related to Article 97 will come into play.
- K. Slavsky asked if there are opportunities to participate in meetings other than the visioning meetings? L. Finnegan explained yes but they have not sent out an invite list yet for focus group meetings and integrated design meetings.
- H. Sha commented that there is a need to send the engagement timeline to the communications working group. Additionally, clarity is essential for both the SBC and the public regarding opportunities for participation. Emphasizing the importance of balanced participation and timely progress, H. Sha suggested that, since not everyone should engage in every issue at every point, the SBC must be very clear, very early, about opportunities for general public input. There was also a query about whether design alternatives are an output or a meeting for public participation. L. Finnegan explained that design alternatives involve both input and output. The result is a product describing the design alternative. During the PDP stage, cost estimators provide order of magnitude pricing, but it is at a broad level, considering factors like dollars per square foot without specifying details like brick type or window specifications. Input involves discussions on the possibilities and differences in various renovation or addition options. It includes considerations of site development, system sustainability, massing, and materials, all of which contribute to shaping the design alternatives. H. Sha emphasized the need to clarify who can participate in what ways at different times. He suggested creating a clear chart within the communications working group, specifically addressing the public's perspective. H. Sha proposed making a motion and establishing a list to be formally posted on the website, outlining when and where public input is required. J. Hackett recommended working within the communications group rather than making a formal motion, and H. Sha agreed, framing it as a motion to commit the topic to the committee.
- A. Levine inquired about the appropriate channel for submitting comments on the drafted educational plan. M. Burton advised that comments should be

	<p>directed to the superintendent's office. J. Hackett supplemented this information by mentioning a link in the communication forwarded to the SBC, providing guidance on how to submit comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ K. Slavsky mentioned to make sure that the frequently asked questions on the website are being regularly updated.</li> <li>➤ D. Voss asked, when we submit the PDP binder with the 3 alternatives to the MSBA, how much of the scope must be in that? In those alternatives, is there anything we get locked into at that point or are there elements that would be excluded going forward if we didn't have them in that binder? L. Finnegan explained the PDP is focused on the educational plan, so the concepts are a reaction to the educational plan. You are not locked in if you don't say you want something during PDP. That does not prevent you from having it in PSR or schematic design. Schematic design is where you lock in the scope, the budget, the schedule, and the size of the building. That is when you are signing the agreement with the MSBA. The school building committee selects the option and the MSBA is just reviewing what is being submitted. The MSBA's focus for the preliminary design program is the existing conditions information and the educational plan. Also, note that the project could be funded differently depending on which of the 3 options is selected. For example, you get additional reimbursement for a renovation. When Dore + Whittier sends out the project budget (3011), it will show you the differences between each of the 3 options. M. Burton commented there are also contingencies that are built into any of the numbers that are going to be discussed. Design contingency is a big one. We know that once numbers go out, they are hard to take back. DWMP will walk you through that process when it arrives but that is how we protect ourselves. As Lorraine mentioned, one of the things that could be done is share a couple of examples of PDP's that either one of our firms has worked on. DWMP and SMMA could make those available to you, the committee, or the public. This way people will understand what the PDP is and how large the document is. <p><u>Vote:</u>  A motion was made by H. Sha and seconded by K. Slavsky for the communications working group to develop a public participation flow chart specifying clearly where and when the public will have opportunities to provide input and where and when the public will be able to access readouts. Discussion: H. Sha commented I think the reason this is worth taking some time and being a little more formal is that we want to make it clear that we are all dedicated to being very transparent and very accessible. There are many ways to communicate and please do communicate. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hackett – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, J. Himmel – yes, A. Baker – yes. H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss – yes. 10-0-0</p> </li></ul>	
5.4	<b>Stakeholder Engagement:</b>	Record

L. Finnegan said SMMA has a lot of experience with designing high schools and has found that organizing around these topics has really benefitted communication, flow of information, ideas, aspirations, and goal setting. They are looking to create 4 focus groups (see below). They will be asking town boards, committees, students, and staff to participate in them. An email request will be sent out shortly to all. There will be an initial kickoff meeting with everybody the week of December 11<sup>th</sup> that they are scheduling right now and from there they will break into the 4 groups and work independently. Then, they will come back together at the end to share what the recommendations to the building committee are. As focus groups, they do not approve anything, but they make recommendations back to the building committee.

- Educational Planning & Equity
  - Reviews overall goals from educational planning perspectives, educational programming meetings and visioning sessions.
- Sustainability/ MEP Systems
  - Reviews preferred MEP systems, and sustainable design features and components, product selection for low/no VOC and renewable materials, site design and landscape features for environmentally friendly design.
- Site, Safety & Security
  - Reviews development of the site design for traffic, circulation, safety, and security. Includes conversations about parking, driveways and circulation, fields and offsite improvements and coordination with Town Departments.
- Exterior & Interior Design
  - Reviews exterior design concepts including composition of form and material selections such as brick, precast, metal panels etc. Review of the products and materials selected for finishes such as flooring, tile, ceilings, wood paneling, paint colors etc.

Discussion:

- M. Barrett asked SMMA to clarify what is the activity or the discussion during the first stakeholder engagement meetings and who are they expecting to be there? L. Finnegan responded they would like all the town boards and committees that are going to be involved to be there. It is a 2-hour meeting where SMMA will explain the focus of the 4 different focus groups, making sure that people understand that it is an open form of communication where they also want to hear and share lessons learned. They also want to understand the reasoning behind why people might be asking for something so that they can evaluate it. They want to be able to take that information as they are doing the existing conditions analysis, as they start design



	<p>alternatives and measure against what some of those requests were and be able to provide feedback.</p> <p>➤ A. Levine added there is an appropriation committee and a capital expenditures committee which will be extremely interested in this process. At some point, there should be meetings with the full committee. Getting people to attend this meeting that is not the typical meeting, will be difficult. The focus of those committees more so comes at the end. L. Finnegan explained in the past, they have attended those meetings to provide updates at a certain stage during the project. They do not wait until the end. They will provide updates and give a status update on where they are. They won't necessarily always have numbers, but they may have information on where they are trending. A. Levine asked when would be the first time you think would be appropriate for that meeting? S. Brown commented it might be best to have a representative attend that first meeting to get a general sense of what is the discussion, and does it make sense to attend regularly scheduled meetings just to report back to your own committees. A. Levine noted he is concerned that there will be a lot of people asking for a lot of things and the cost of the project will rise. At the end, people will say it is too expensive and that will require rework causing the schedule to drag out. The debt exclusion will not pass unless community members are satisfied by these discussions, even if they do not agree with the result. M. Burton added they will not have numbers in hand, but they cannot wait until then. They will know a lot more by the end of February and can share what they have then, but again, they will not be estimating until the end of preliminary design program.</p>	
5.5	<p><b>Updated MSBA Reimbursement:</b></p> <p>S. Brown shared the great news that the MSBA recently increased their funding capacity on a per project basis. The MSBA has agreed to reimburse projects a little bit more than what was historically reimbursed. In 2009, the MSBA had set their construction cap limit at \$275.00 a square foot. Over the past 14 years, that has increased 8 times and most recently in October. That funding limit is now at \$605.00 a square foot. S. Brown provided an example of how it has made an impact. M. Burton noted there are still 2 more years to go and the MSBA could improve upon that again.</p>	Record
5.6	<p><b>Article 97:</b></p> <p>L. Finnegan explained this is a graphic of the high school site.</p> <p>Article 97 "establishes a right to a clean environment including its natural, scenic, historical, and aesthetic qualities for the citizens of the Commonwealth".</p> <p>➤ Affects athletic fields and park.</p> <p>➤ Any change in use must show that the affected land will be exchanged for an equivalent.</p>	Record

	<p>➤ Change in use/purpose requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2/3 Town Vote</li> <li>○ 2/3 Legislative Vote (typically takes ~1 year; must begin after Town Vote)</li> </ul>	
5.7	<p><b>Community Meeting Update:</b></p> <p>R. Park shared the Mentimeter results from community meeting no. 2.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are you most excited to learn about this process? (74 total responses) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 30% - Schedule/Timeline</li> <li>b. 28% - Building Design</li> <li>c. 12% - Cost</li> <li>d. 12% - Sustainability</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. What community insight can you offer to the design team? (66 total responses) (response examples below) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The community will stay involved every step of the way!</li> <li>b. We are a historic community.</li> <li>c. Visual balance.</li> <li>d. Academic excellence is top priority.</li> <li>e. Historical reference or nod to our town.</li> <li>f. Listen to the teachers and students who will be physically in the building.</li> <li>g. Lexington youth STEAM team.</li> <li>h. This community is committed to revolutionary thinking.</li> <li>i. A variety of educational experiences, all being offered at a high level, is important.</li> <li>j. There is too much traffic congestion at LHS. We need to design for more walking, biking, public transit, carpools.</li> <li>k. While overall perceived as an affluent town and community, we must remain THRIFTY, in pursuing the very best solutions.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Record
5.8	<p><b>Website:</b></p> <p>M. Burton shared this as a reminder to check out the project website for minutes, agendas, recordings, and presentations. There is also a “contact us” page that encourages feedback.</p>	Record
5.9	<p><b>Upcoming Meetings:</b></p> <p>SBC#6 –December 21, 2023 @4pm</p> <p>SBC#7 - January 18, 2024 @4pm</p>	Record

	<p>SBC#8 – February 15, 2024 @4pm</p> <p>Community Meeting #3 – February 26, 2023. Designer updates, timeline review</p> <p>SBC#9 – March 21, 2024 @4pm</p> <p>SBC#10 – April 25, 2024 @4pm</p> <p>Community Meeting #4 – May 1, 2023. Review preliminary options</p>	
5.10	<p><b>Other Topics not Reasonably Anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Working Group Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Burton noted there was discussion with some of the members of the SBC earlier and received some feedback wanting to have a little more clarity on the schedule and setting of the agenda. DWMP was going to make a recommendation to form 2 new working groups for schedule review and agenda review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Schedule – J. Himmel, D. Voss, C. Favazzo</li> <li>▪ Agenda – K. Slavsky, K. Lenihan, D. Voss</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ C. Dell Angelo shared a communications working group needs to be scheduled in the next couple of weeks. They will send out a schedule Doodle to that group and figure out a time that works best for everyone and they will walk through comments from today's meeting.</li> <li>➤ J. Hackett shared notes for the next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use a shared agenda to clear up any future possible issues.</li> <li>○ There were discussions today that are probably better placed in working groups. Otherwise, the SBC will not get through the business of the agenda.</li> <li>○ People who have given feedback on what it looks like in the meeting room when you are calling in virtually, you are 100% right. It is problematic that it is hard to see who is in the room.</li> <li>○ Public comment should be reserved for the designated part of the meeting.</li> <li>○ Suggested that there is a quick virtual meeting prior to the SBC meeting so that the SBC knows what is happening before the public.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Record</p> <p>DWMP SMMA</p>
5.11	<p><b>Public Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Cindy Aarons, chair of the Sustainable Lexington Committee, commented she wanted to make sure that the sustainability benefits are always highlighted versus the cost.</li> </ul>	<p>Record</p> <p>DWMP SMMA</p>

- A community member mentioned there is a significant population of seniors in town and emails have not been reaching them. There hasn't been much or any outreach to them and they are a large stakeholder. M. Burton responded there is a communication working group and they have identified the seniors and worked out ways to reach them with mailings, mass emails, and flyers. The community member responded they are not receiving anything. C. Dell Angelo shared for the last couple of community meetings that were had, additional flyers and posters were printed and distributed to the senior center as well as some of the senior communities. C. Dell Angelo mentioned if there are email addresses that should be distributed to, that communication can be done going forward. DWMP was not aware of the additional email groups where they should be distributed to. DWMP is more than happy to communicate in that way as long as they receive those email addresses. D. Voss commented that a lot of members can't get access to emails, but they would respond to a card in the mail. That could be part of the strategy moving into this important focus group phase. C. Dell Angelo explained for the last 2 community meetings flyers were printed and mailed to residents as well as additional flyers were printed to be distributed throughout the town to the library, senior centers, community centers, etc. M. Burton added that the mailers were sent to the abutters; not everybody in town. K. Lenihan mentioned they can do town wide mailers, but they are very expensive, and they will not be able to do that repeatedly. It is cost prohibitive. D. Voss added with a half-billion-dollar project and the important phase of input being the next 10 weeks, it is better to send town wide mailers now rather than to wait until sometime in the future. It is understood about the cost issue but if the concern is that we are not getting to people or need to get input in the next 10-12-week period, it is probably a good use of money for such an expensive project. K. Lenihan responded they can talk about it but again for something coming up. J. Himmel pointed out there are 6 town wide mailers per year and maybe they can be piggybacked.
- A community member asked if there was an Article 97 working group? M. Cronin responded yes, there are 2 people and Recreation does sit on the working group. C. Lamb asked if the Article 97 working group is posted as a public meeting? If not, that working group should be a public meeting.
- A community member asked for clarification on the scope of the educational visioning workshops. The community member noted that LHS is being used for educational activities after school hours and asked would that be a part of the discussions? L. Finnegan said yes. M. Burton shared on the website there is a place where you can share your feedback so that would be an opportunity to share with us.

5.12	<b>Adjourn:</b> 3:50 PM a motion was made by H. Sha and seconded by M. Barrett to adjourn the meeting. Roll Call Vote: K. Lenihan – yes, M. Cronin – yes, J. Hacket – yes, M. Barrett – yes, C. Favazzo – yes, J. Himmel – yes, A. Baker – yes. H. Sha – yes, K. Slavsky – yes, D. Voss – yes. 10-0-0	Record
------	---	--------

Sincerely,

**DORE + WHITTIER**

Rachel Rincon

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.