

**School Building Committee Coordination Meeting**  
**Monday, January 29, 2024, from 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.**  
**Remote Meeting**

School Building Committee Members: Andrew Baker; Mark Barrett; Michael Cronin, Vice-Chair; Charles Favazzo Jr.; Julie Hackett (absent); Jonathan A. Himmel; Carolyn Kosnoff; Charles W. Lamb (absent); Kathleen M. Lenihan, Chair; Alan Mayer Levine; James Malloy; Hsing Min Sha (absent); Joseph N. Pato; Kseniya Slavsky; Dan Voss

Members from Dore & Whittier: Jason Boone (absent); Steve Brown (absent); Mike Burton; Mike Cox (absent); Chrsitina Dell Angelo; Brad Dore (absent); Elias Grijalva; Rachel Rincon; Chris Schaffner (absent)

Members from SMMA: Brian Black (absent); Martine Dion (absent); Lorraine Finnegan; Anthony Jimenez (absent); Anoush Krafian (absent); Rosemary Park (absent); Erin Prestileo (absent); and Matt Rice

The minutes were taken by Sara Jorge, Office Manager, to the Lexington Superintendent.

The School Building Committee Chair, Kathleen Lenihan, began the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

Mike Burton reviewed module 3, the feasibility study, where we are today. We are looking to wrap this up in May of 2024. After that, we enter the next phase of module 3, which is the preferred schematic report. This will conclude towards the end of this year. Then, we go into schematic design, which will conclude in October 2025. This then leads to Town Meeting and debt exclusion votes.

Kathleen Lenihan: When will we see real options of what the school will look like and where it could be located?

Lorraine Finnegan explained that this will be during schematic design, but until then, it will be very high-level conceptual.

Matt Rice gave an update on the meetings that have taken place to date. We finished the fourth and final educational visioning meetings on Wednesday last week. Similarly to all three meetings before it, we really did have some excellent attendance, both from stakeholder groups and from students, which always makes it a little bit more valuable regarding our perception of it. The activities we went through were a partial recap of some of the prior discussions that we had to ratify our guiding principles regarding the educational vision that the group determined. We also did a bit more hands-on activity as part of that meeting, which involved some model pieces, really moving things around, and sort of a bubble diagramming approach. One group looked at the Performing Arts area, and one looked at the Health and Wellness area for examples. People really enjoyed the ability to get hands-on and talk a little bit more tangibly about how different parts of the building might come together, just as a way of generating ideas. Last week, we also began our Focus Groups on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. These groups are intended to bring together stakeholders from various committees and board groups throughout the Town to really bring expertise together in a way that can really inform and let us understand what the Town's community is thinking and what we need to be paying attention to. In terms of the first round of the focus groups we had, these were really listening meetings to understand the goals and aspirations for the project from the members who attended. Eventually, the Focus Gropus will bring to the School Building Committee their recommendations for each of those focus areas for inclusion in the Preliminary Desion Program (PDP) as we move forward.

Lorraine Finnegan: These meetings were recorded, and minutes were taken as well. Those will be posted for those who could not attend.

APPROVED

Jim Malloy: The High School Recreation Group met to review schedules of when we would have a better idea of where the school's footprint would be. The next will be sometime around April, and then starting in July, we will have a monthly meeting to work through all the Article 97 issues and where any land swap would be.

Jim Malloy explained that the High School and Center Recreation Area Working Group is not required to post or take minutes, but out of full transparency, we will post these meetings, as they are open to the public.

Christina Dell Angelo stated that she did take minutes during the High School and Center Recreation Area Working Group and will also work on getting those posted on the LHS Project Website.

Kseniya Slavsky: It is easy to provide an update saying we met with these people, but it is hard to summarize takeaways. I suspect that takeaways across these many meetings and many hours of input can probably be consolidated because I am sure the same things get brought up in multiple spots and reading all the meeting minutes from each meeting. This does not necessarily speed up the process, and I would like to know if we can have some sort of an extracted summary of takeaways like guiding principles.

Kathleen Lenihan: This sounds like something to take up at a Communications Working Group Meeting.

John Himmel: Regarding the visioning sessions, many points were made. Some of them are a must-have, and some of them would be nice to have, and it would be interesting to hear what those are at a subsequent meeting. I think we need to differentiate and be careful about how it's presented.

Mike Burton reviewed the master schedule with the committee. We have highlighted the four School Building Committee Meeting Coordination meetings on February 5th, February 12th, March 4th, and March 11th that Dore & Whittier would like to extend a little longer than an hour. These meetings should be treated more like a full School Building Committee meeting instead of a Coordination meeting. We need to follow up with Julie Hackett and Kathleen Lenihan to check on these dates to extend the time past an hour if needed and see if we can let them know what needs reviewing and approval on these dates. Mike Burton also pointed out School Committee meetings that will be of importance. On February 13th, the draft educational program will be reviewed; on February 27th, SMMA will present the educational program and space summary; and on March 12th, the School Committee will vote on the educational program and accept the space summary.

Lorraine Finnegan explained that part of the reason for sharing the master schedule is that they are trying to forecast agenda items for everyone. Hence, people understand what they will be asked in plenty of time.

Jon Himmel: This is a very helpful chart. I am thinking about the postcard that has been discussed during the communications working group. I suggest having something on the front of the postcard that actually allows you to QR code yourself to this particular schedule.

Kseniya Slavsky agreed with Jon Himmel on having the master schedule easily accessible to all. She signed up on the Town website to receive notifications for this project and all public meetings. You will get notifications for meeting postings with agendas and Zoom links. I support longer meetings if necessary, as long as we do it sufficiently in advance. It is also a matter of making it very clear to the School Building Committee members which meetings are essential and mandatory as voting is expected and which meetings are if you can't, you can't.

Chuck Favazzo: I have no problem with what Mike suggested and having specific agenda items and not just a report on a schedule update. We do not need a schedule update each week. I am all on board with having more focused meetings where we get something done.

Jon Himmel requested that when there is a meeting that is structured around a review of an item and then a vote at the subsequent meeting in 7 days, the next meeting be structured so that the members who were not in attendance for the review can be provided that information prior to the next meeting. The presentation could be presented again at the beginning of the voting meeting so that members who could not attend could listen to that portion before the meeting began. This way, everyone will understand what they are being asked to vote on.

Kathleen Lenihan: Something like this master schedule should be on the website, where it clearly lays out every meeting in chronological order, who the meeting is with, and what is happening at it. It would be helpful to have it on the website, and the communications group will take this up to make it happen.

Mike Burton explained that we planned on attaching the master schedule to the full School Building Committee meeting every third meeting of the month. Whether or not a monthly basis is adequate enough, I will leave that up to the communications working group.

Christina Dell Angelo: Our marketing department is currently working on changes to the Community Forum #3 postcard. Once received, we will send the revised version to the communication working group and a Doodle poll to schedule our next meeting.

Kathleen Lenihan: The flyer is looking great already. We just have some very small tweaks to make it.

Mike Burton: Lorraine Finnegan and I met last Friday and spent time working on the schedule over the weekend. I will send out the version it's in right now. Also, a reminder to folks that we had given a homework assignment for feedback from the Committee on the evaluation criteria. We haven't received that much feedback, so please get that by to us by February 16, 2024.

Kathleen Lenihan: The next item is the community talking points. This refers to what Kseniya Slasky has brought up before about ensuring we are all on the same page and supplying the community with the same basic information.

Kseniya Slavsky: I think that we have done some really good work in the working group meetings, and Mike, you have some really great schedule graphics; it is a summarized schedule graphic that gets vaguer as you get further to the right of the page which is the construction years, so I do think that addresses a lot of it. Other items that could even be discussed at the following community forum meeting: finding a more elegant and concise way to discuss how much this will be projected to cost the Town, how much is projected to come from reimbursement, what funding would look like for tax impacts and when those decisions would be made, and explaining debt exclusions. We should have nicely developed, concise talking points that all members agree to as we move forward, especially into the next Community Forum.

Joe Pato: There have been presentations to Town Meeting members on anticipated costs and how we plan to integrate them into our financial planning. There is a plan for this to be presented again this year at Town Meeting with updates. We will look into making that slightly more accessible to non-Town meeting members because language is used that the general public may not follow quite as readily.

Jim Malloy: What we intend to put together is basic language so that everyone who does not sit through these meetings and doesn't understand the lingo has the ability to understand. It will either be a part of the Town Manager's report to Town Meeting, or it will be under Article 33. We will also email a copy to the School Building Committee.

Kseniya Slavsky would also like to add another item to the talking points: Families are concerned for the students that will be attending the existing high school as it is now and also while the project is taking place and is an active construction site.

Kathleen Lenihan: This is something I will connect with School Committee Members and other communities that have had the experience of going through building a high school and what that means for the students there currently. I am always looking to learn from people who have been down that road before us.

### **Public Comment:**

Dawn McKenna - 9 Hancock Street - I am a Town Meeting Member and am very familiar with school projects over the years with two children who have gone through the Lexington Public Schools. As someone who knows how to understand this kind of stuff, navigating which meetings are open to the public and which aren't has been challenging. I highly suggest that you get that master schedule posted online on the LHS project website and have it updated weekly. I also agree with Kathleen that there is a balance that is going to be difficult between must-haves and wants. I think that is a conversation that should be a public discussion, and it should be made very clear when that line of discussion will take place. Someone also mentioned vital takeaways, and I agree with that. You could just put a few bullet points of significant things that people are looking for and whether they are being pursued or not. The other thing I want to remind everybody, having been through the debt exclusions multiple times, is that part of the communication really is the Town.

Jim Malloy has done a great job of making what he presents accessible to people who aren't familiar, but the campaign debt exclusion will have a lot to do and say about the messaging. What is a little unclear is about the educational athletics portion; who is talking about it? I heard Jim Malloy discuss a meeting about the High School Center Recreation and Article 97. One of the most significant components of the property is the athletics, whether it be the tennis courts, the track, or the indoor track. Where are those meetings being posted, and how can we get involved? My particular concern, knowing the history of it all, where is the educational athletics, as part of the visioning, being represented and being discussed, because it's not just after-school sports teams, it's actually there is not enough room in the fieldhouse for the actual programming that goes on right now, and it is only going to get worse as we improve this high school. I think we need to clearly understand what MSBA will pay for if we want to include replacing the field house. We must ensure the athletic component is included, just like we do with musical theater and the arts. So I would like an answer as to the best way for people concerned about that to get involved.

Ms. Slavsky made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:57 p.m. Mr. Pato seconded the meeting. Ms. Lenihan took a roll call vote, passed 10-0.