

MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: February 9, 2024
Project Name: Lexington High School
Project Number:
Subject: LHS Communications Working Group Meeting
Attendees:

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Christina Dell Angelo (CA) | DWMP - Project Manager |
| Mike Burton (MB) | DWMP – Partner |
| Jacob Greco (JG) | DWMP- Assistant Project Manager |
| Lorraine Finnegan (LF) | SMMA – Principal in Charge |
| Matt Rice (MR) | SMMA |
| Rosemary Park (RP) | SMMA |
| Brian Black (BB) | SMMA |
| Anoush Krafian (AK) | SMMA |
| Mark Barrett (MB2) | LHS- Public Facilities Project Manager |
| Mike Cronin (MC) | SBC Vice Chair & LPS Facility Director |
| Alan Levine (AL) | Appropriation Committee |
| Jon Himmel (JH2) | PBC Chair |
| Kathleen Lenihan (KL) | SBC Chair |
| Hsing Min Sha (HM) | Community Representative |
| Julia Hackett (JH) | Superintendent of Schools |

| Action Item | Responsible Party: | Action By: |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Update the working group criteria based on the comments from today's meeting | SMMA/DWMP | The Working Group |

| Agenda Item | Description |
|-------------|--|
| 1. | Introduction: Refer to attendees list. |
| 2. | <p>Evaluation Criteria Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal of the meeting is to assure that the working group can properly fill out the evaluation worksheet and review the example filled by SMMA & Dore + Whittier • H.Min Sha: How the responses are weighted and how they are used to come to a decision. Adding up the totals won't work as people have judgments and value some higher than others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Skinnier version would be better ◦ More data is required, and it must be combined with dialogue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important because the data could be interperated wrong by the WG • J.Hackett: Noted that the OPM & Designer selection worksheets were efficient • J.Himmel: Added two columns for "Can be evaluated now" & "Can not be evaluated now" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ There is a vast difference between all the schemes and it is hard to establish how long student travel time will be, access to outdoors, what areas can be open to the public, etc.... ◦ It was very helpful for SMMA to add the data to it as a footprint ◦ More information is needed: Number of floors, SF of roof space, move-in dates, etc..... • C.Dell Angelo: The original plan was for this WG to report to the SBC on Monday with either a recommendation or questions. The team is aware this won't be an easy or quick process the goal is to work out the kinks and start early so hopefully this can be the tool that will be used to select a recommendation • M.Burton: This worksheet has been used successfully several times before; it can be changed or adjusted but it is too far along to use a new one altogether, The MSBA likes to see how the WG came to their conclusion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ April 29th will be when this is used officially for the first time by the SBC • A.Levine: Agrees that more data is required such as footprints for the various schemes (with and without fieldhouse), a shaded location for where a future expansion would go, where the field house and central offices would go, etc.... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ There is no basis for making a decision on a large number of these. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MB: The ones that can be filled out should be and maybe an option where they all stay on there but the ones without enough info could be "grayed" out ◦ Agrees that some of these options should be weighted ◦ A total should be removed at the bottom and just the colors should be used to help guide • MB: Noted that this is a tool used to stem SBC discussion and does not lock in any scores or recommendations • L.Finnegan: The central office is included in all the schemes and each scheme is assumed to have 450 parking spots (100 more if CO is included) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Noted that site maps are not generally created at the PDP level • J.Himmel: noted that just because a taller building fits all the programming in does not mean that it is the best option. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Agreed that the WG needs designs with more information and the spreadsheet with notes/a tutorial ◦ Knowing how many fields of each type exist before/after will be important • J.Hackett: Finds that what exists in this tool can be used to stem discussion and does not have to be this technical as everyone is always going to have subjective views with great reasoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ MB: Agreed that keeping this is a "color coded" exercise at the PDP stage will be sufficient to achieve the goals |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H.Min Sha: Does not have an objection to this stage but noted that goals need to be set on how this will be used in the future stages to reach a decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Emphasis on having dialogue with the Design team as they know most the information the best • A.Levine: Noted that the "C" & "D" options have the same square footage and there is no interior design so it is hard to differentiate them. The main focus is on the site utilization, as all the required things are added it becomes more difficult to vision where the additional items will go. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Requested that the parking/fields/field houses be added to the designs for the WG to easier vision it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan: Wanted to emphasis that everything the town desires will not be able to fit on this site as it is small, and all future expansions will have to go upwards ◦ Noted that the first three (3) criteria do not make sense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.Finnegan: These are facts or information not criteria and SMMA will add the footprint also • K.Lenihan: There should be a criteria section for safety and security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan: Noted that section 7.9 is for improving the safety and access of the public. There is no section for safety as it is a project requirement, and it will be included in any options selected • J.Himmel: Noted that something gained from this is that just a Code/Reno does not work. The worksheet can show why Reno/Add may or may not work or why New Construction may be the best <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Noted that temporary classrooms can have a negative impact on the embodied carbon goals as all that steel will be sent back into the waste cycle • MB: Noted that the final sheet will be shared with the MSBA, and it could be shared with the public to help show how the decision was made • MB: Asked for the WG to mark up the sheet on which criteria cannot be decided now <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ L.Finnegan: SMMA will provide updates on the matrix for Monday • A.Levine: Noted that 5.3 & 5.8 are redundant criteria • K.Lenihan: Asked for the massing studies to be added to the front of the Website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Can be labeled "Current Alternatives" <p>The WG will send in their recommendations for the sheet and the Design team will update and provided a revised version</p> |
| | <p>Close</p> <p>A doodle Poll will be sent out for days/times availability for next Evaluation Criteria Working Group Meeting.</p> |

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.