MEETING NOTES

Meeting Date: June 12, 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
☑	Lorainne Finnegan (**LF**)	SMMA – Principal in Charge
☑	Anoush Krafian (**AK**)	SMMA – Assistant Project Manager
☑	Mark Barrett (**MB2**)	LHS- Public Facilities Project Manager
☑	Mike Cronin (**MC**)	SBC Vice Chair & LPS Facility Director
☑	Joe Pato (**JP**)	Select Board
☑	Julie Hackett (**JH**)	Superintendent
☑	Jon Himmel (**JH2**)	PBC Chair
☑	Kathleen Lenihan (**KL**)	SBC Chair
☑	Kseniya Slavsky (**KS**)	SBC Community Representative
☑	Hsing Min Sha (**HMS**)	SBC Community Representative
☑	Jonas Miller (**JM**)	Director of Communications

Action Item	Responsible Party:	Action By:
Report out to the SBC at next SBC Meeting	Dr. Hackett	Communications WG

Agenda Item	Description
1.	**Introduction:** Refer to attendees list.

1.	**Website – FAQs (FAQ vs Community Forum/Dialog)**
	- **KS** FAQ for cost comparison to other high schools and the value of today's dollar
	○ **MB** D&W has been working on a deep dive into cost comparison of four other high schools (Revere, Belmont, Waltham, & Arlington) also adding a deep dive into the Lexington (Priorities/Local Requirements?). Using this cost comparison to escalate the values and make it a truly apples to apples comparison.
	○ **HMS** thinks this may be too much information for an FAQ and a draft should be reviewed and debated for word smithing offline prior to bring in front of the committee
	○ **JH2** notes that through this cost comparison are defining a baseline for the project and thinks including some charts should be useful for sharing with the community.
	- **JM** introduced himself and how he has been working with the project team. Miller recommended creating a detailed write-up for all the information on cost comparisons but also thinks a video would be very useful to share with the community.
	- **KS** Believes that video format is the best way to share information. She thinks the last attempt to restore the high school should be compared
	○ **JP** noted maybe a short FAQ on what the 90s project was
	- **HMS** Agrees that the 90s proposal is not relevant but that needs to be stated to the public. The FAQs should have the important topics at the top of the page. FAQ descriptions should be drafted by the OPM and sent over for a review and edited by the WG.
	○ **JP** noted with open meeting law it must be attached to the agenda and provided beforehand. The group cannot co-edit on a google document or discuss via email it must be completed at the working group meeting. If the topic is assigned it must be assigned to an individual.
	- **JH2** noted that the Integrated Design Policy needs to be reviewed for language as it is not law, it was not voted in a town vote. The current cost comparison holds a lot of value to strive to hit Lexington's desired goals. Himmel suggested a chart showing the increase in cost and then can place the comparative high schools bid date on the chart. This comparison should have been completed when the first costs were presented. More action should be taken to get ahead of items like this and not just follow MSBA guidelines strictly.
	- **KS** noted that facts must be provided in the most digestible and factual way. The nest public forum should focus on the financial aspect of the project. The local requirements or add-ons should also include the savings that will be made in the future. The Taxpayer impact presentation should be added to the FAQ. Whoever writes anything should bring a first draft review partner with them.

2.	**Website - Videos** - **KS** noted that the videos should be created by the SBC and not the Design Team but that they should be used to fact check

3.	**Project Narrative Outline**
	
	- **CD** noted that there are three dates selected for community meetings this summer
	    ○ **JH2** noted that there should be multiple meetings to discuss the cost and presentation prior to the meeting.
	    ○ **JH** noted that any summer community meetings will have to be repeated in the fall for due to low attendance
	- **JP** that costs should not be discussed till august so there is ample time to prepare for it. The costs are high due to meeting the educational program for the student population. IF we want a smaller or cheaper school it will not meet the program.
	- **HMS** said that a high-level review of why the cost is so high now should be add and a more detailed review later in the design process.
	- **KL** noted that there is no other option as we have to build the school for a certain population of students.
	- **JH** noted that "I think we need to be very clear on what we want by September. What is the anticipated outcome for this group. And what do we hope to achieve? And I think what we hope to achieve is to educate people on. Why the costs are, or the concept massing costs are coming in at what they're coming in at and educate them, that there is more work to be done on cost, because this is just the beginning of the process. We do have to catch up like John said earlier, because we haven't timed up our communications exactly right. I do think there is some logic and keeping the 3 dates"
	- **KL** July 16th will be here before we know it so what is the goal for this one
	    ○ **KS** This is too soon for the cost meeting, but the presentation should be public prior to the meeting so people can review it. A larger Q&A session would be useful as it is a common want from the community. The SBC should be front and center for public meetings.
	- **MB** noted that this phase is where the SBC needs to decide on what extra scope items will be carried into design, with a November vote this will have to be decided by the end of the year. Burton also reviewed the timeline slide
	- **MC** asked for a simplified 3011 for the SBC.

		○ **MB** noted that he can run through the program and how it works but a 3011 at this stage is too soon and the confidence in them is very low. He also noted that by July the MSBA feed back can be shared and the historical data for other high schools compared to Lexington will be good to go.
	Close	

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