

MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: September 4, 2024
 Project Name: Lexington High School
 Project Number: Click or tap here to enter text.
 Subject: Educational Planning and Equity Focus Group Meeting #5
 Attendees:

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
	Cynthia Arens	SLC Chair	x	Anoush Krafian	SMMA- Asst. Project Manager
	Barbara Adolf	ESL Teacher	x	Matt Rice	SMMA-Project Architect
	Ariana Akram	METCO Social Worker	x	Phil Poinelli	SMMA-Learning Environmental Planner
x	Andrew Baker	High School Principal	X	Rosemary Park	SMMA-Project Manager/Educational Planner
	Julie Hackett	Superintendent of Schools	X	Brian Black	SMMA-Design Architect
x	Tom Buckley	Special Education Teacher	x	Mike Burton	DWMP- Project Director
	Jon Himmel	PBC Chair	x	Christina Dell Angelo	DWMP – Project Manager
	Mike Horesh	Science Teacher	X	Jacob Greco	DWMP - Asst Project Manager
	Nidhi Inamdar	Student	x	John Albright	DWMP – Project Manager
x	Suzanne Lau		x	Vincent Lerow	AV Manager
x	Kathleen Lenihan	SBC Chair	x	C.Arens	
	Deepika Sawhney	SC Vice Chair	x	Deepika Sawhney	
x	Sanjana Thesayi	Student	x	Mark Barrett	
	Malakai St. Fleur	METCO Student			
	Skip Avery	LABBB Teacher			
	Mike Cronin	SBC Vice Chair			
x	Alan Levine	Appropriation Committee			
	Alex Mao				
	Andy Joynt	Sustainable Lexington			

Abbreviation Legend:

SLC: Sustainable Lexington Committee

PBC: Permanent Building Committee

SBC: School Building Committee

SC: School Committee

Agenda Item	Description
1.	<p>Introduction: Refer to attendees list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SMMA shared a presentation that will be referenced throughout these minutes, please view it HERE
2.	<p>Recap Discussion Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educational Planning & Equity<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Review overall goals from educational planning perspectives, educational programming meetings and visioning sessions• M.Rice reviewed the current project timeline (Slide 6)• M.Rice shared the recap of the discussion topics (Slide 8) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Community Building & Connection2. Dining3. Academic Space Needs4. Circulation & Transition Periods5. Flexible Spaces6. Pool & Field House7. All-Gender Restrooms8. Lockers9. Inclusive Design10. Student Resources Outside of School Hours11. STEAM labs12. Environmental Graphics
3.	<p>Review Current Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• R.Park reviewed the total gross square footage of the existing and proposed options. Park also shared the adjacency bubble diagram (Slide 56)• P.Poinelli reviewed the space adjacencies (Slide 64)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.Black reviewed the current options that are present in the Preferred Schematic Report phase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Please view the details for these in the linked presentation starting on Slide 10 ○ These included Renovation & Addition - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B.1 • B.4 ○ New Construction - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.2 ○ New Construction - On the Fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.1b • C.2b • C.5b
4.	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.Arens asked if there are any spaces in the square footage that are not reimbursable by the MSBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R.Park noted the space summary that is on the website shows what space is reimbursable. Park expects all program spaces will be reimbursable, but all these sections have caps on the amount of space that is reimbursable • D.Sawhney asked if the central office space was shown on the previous diagrams shown <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R.Park noted yes it was but not under the admin space • S.Lau noted that a lot of the photos shown show some very tall ceilings and pretty designs. Lau asked if having these tall sections is a constraint with the design and circulating air as an example <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted it is a design challenge, but SMMA has a qualified team to handle it and there are parts of the school that should have double high sections • S.Lau asked if the team is concerned about noise leakage in these large spaces with academics next to them <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted there is no direct solution, but they plan the adjacencies around this and do not place quiet places directly next to these larger loud spaces • O.Guttag thought that one of the goals of the new high school was to make it available for the whole community and she can imagine in the summer there are programs for children or other programs. She noted that in order to provide safety for adult and children safety there has to be a way to separate areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Rice noted this has been discussed before and the notion of an open common space is not mutually exclusive but there can be separations included in the school • A.Levine asked if LGI stood for large group instruction and how large is that

- R.Park noted yes that is correct and it is slated around 2,000 square feet and can fit around 100 people
- A.Baker noted that he thinks the future Lexington High School has many opportunities to be used by the community and it is already currently the number one rented location in the Town of Lexington.
- D.Sawhney asked if the 3-D models could be available to the public somewhere in Lexington for them to view
 - B.Black noted these are good suggestions and they will also be bringing the models to the community forum on September 18th
- A.Baker noted that for the matrix shared displaying the educational criteria of the six options himself and the team at LHS vision some key ideas they want to help their educational program. The matrix shows that some of these meet the standards which would be green boxes, some don't which are yellow, and some excel at these key ideas and those have a "+" in the box. Baker noted that the promotion of student adjacencies, hands on learning, and the interdisciplinary adjacencies are key for him.
- A.Levine noted that he did not see the wetland, called the basin, was not shown on the plans
 - B.Black noted that this location is not carrying the same designation as the other wetlands, and it should be confirmed soon that this can be removed without any issues
- A.Levine asked what kind of issues will arise from encroaching on wetland
 - B.Black noted they are allowed to impact less than the set 5,000 square feet threshold and all the land has to be replaced in double
- M.Rice noted that there is a premium associated with large curves in some of the schemes but there is the ability to make them more rigid, but the design is too early to know exactly how much more it will cost
- D.Sawhney noted she is concerned about the strangers that will visit the central office and how traversing through the whole building may not be a good idea. She also noted that having the admin heads stacked in locations may be good but may also limit the ability for some of these departments to function
 - A.Baker noted that with the central office they will have their own direct access to the location separate from the functions of the school. Baker agrees there are efficiency that can be created by condensing office together, but it is also good to have these important adults spread throughout the school where students may need them. Baker noted he is not a fan of having the administration clustered and tucked away from the life of the school
 - R.Park noted that SMMA was advocating for a whole separate entrance for the central office with an elevator vestibule, so it is not truly connected to the high school

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • V.Lerow asked why they chose that the auditorium was chose for renovation when it is already not sufficient when they did not decide to keep the gym due to its ineffective program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B.Black noted that is somewhat how the cards fell, and it was not really chosen. He noted they will look into this thought. • S.Lau asked what the sizes would be in the outdoors classrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P.Poinelli shared that the largest he could see being out there would be one classroom ○ R.Park noted the main idea is that wherever you are in the building you are able to have access to one of these outdoor learning spaces • S.Lau asked which off the outdoor spaces are free from for students to eat and hangout and which are structured <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P.Poinelli noted they are not far enough in the design for this ○ M.Rice noted that is important to remember that the goal of this is to keep the culture that the current school has through the existing quad • O.Guttag noted she sent a list of questions, and she is really concerned about the maintenance of the space. She has seen how much they hate any two-story space due to the work associated with replacing lighting and cleaning in those areas, etc... She would like the team to rethink this if it cannot be maintained as well as manufactures can require. Guttag asked if there are any figures on the square footage of glass to compare with the new school to see how much the budget would have to be increased. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M.Rice noted they often provide operable windows as it is the best way to allow students to instantly affect their environments and sensors can be added to these to help the HVAC system ○ A.Baker noted that one of the major reasons that people open windows they are not supposed to is because of poor HVAC systems which will not be happening in this new building
5.	Close

Sincerely,

DORE + WHITTIER

Christina Dell Angelo

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.