

# MEETING NOTES



Meeting Date: September 5, 2024  
 Project Name: Lexington High School  
 Project Number:  
 Subject: Exterior and Interior Focus Group Meeting  
 Attendees:

Present	Name	Affiliation	Present	Name	Affiliation
	Kathleen Lenihan (KL)	SBC Chair & SC Member		Timothy Lee (TL)	Design Advisory Committee
	Michael Cronin (MC)	SBC Vice-Chair & LPS Facilities		Henrietta Mei (HM)	Permanent Building Committee
	Julie Hackett (JH)	Superintendent		Todd Rhodes (TD)	Sustainable Lexington Vice Chair
✓	Cynthia Arens (CA)	Sustainable Lexington Committee Chair		Elizabeth Yan (EY)	LHS Student
	Mark Connor (MC2)	Tree Committee Co-Chair		Luke Yung (LY)	LHS Student
	Jeff Harris (JH2)	Computer Science Teacher		Lorraine Finnegan (LF)	SMMA Project Manager
✓	Jon Himmel (JH3)	Permanent Building Committee Chair	✓	Matt Rice (MR)	SMMA Project Architect
	Chris Bouchard (CB)	Project Engineer	✓	Brian Black (BB)	SMMA Design Architect
	Rachel Jayson (RJ)	Performing Arts Teacher		Alicia Kosasih (AK2)	SMMA Interior Designer
	Wendy Krum (WK)	Permanent Building Committee	✓	Michael Dowhan (MD)	SMMA Architectural Designer
✓	Anoush Krafian (AK)	SMMA Assistant Project Manager		Mike Burton (MB)	Dore + Whittier
	Damian Barneschi (DB)			Christina Dell Angelo (CD)	Dore + Whittier
	Alan Levine (AL)	Appropriations Committee		Rachel Rincon	Dore + Whittier
✓	Vincent Leroy (VL)				
	Lin Jensen (LJ)		✓	Jacob Greco (JG)	Dore + Whittier
	Tina McBride (TM)		✓	Tom FAUST	SMMA
✓	Mark Barrett	DPF	✓	Sarah Sopelak	SMMA

Agenda Item	Description
1.	<p><b>Introduction:</b> Refer to attendees list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SMMA shared a presentation that will be referenced throughout these minutes, <a href="#">please view it HERE</a></li> </ul>
2.	<p><b>Recap Discussion Topics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exterior &amp; Interior Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss the architectural and interior design of the school building, and its integration with the site and landscape design. Includes conversations about sustainability, functionality, performance, cost-effectiveness and aesthetic expression. As design progresses, conversations will focus on feature elements such as building entrances, signature spaces, and material and color selections.</li> </ul> </li> <li>M.Rice reviewed the current project timeline <b>(Slide 6)</b></li> <li>M.Rice shared the recap of the discussion topics <b>(Slide 8)</b></li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designing for the Future – Economy, Flexibility and Growth</li> <li>Sustainability – Lexington’s Integrated Design Policy and Building Performance Requirements</li> <li>Access to Outdoors &amp; Integrating Exterior and Interior Learning Environments</li> <li>Balancing Educational and Community Space Needs</li> <li>Designing in the Context of Lexington – Creating a Sense of Place and Identity</li> </ol>
3.	<p><b>Review Current Options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.Black reviewed the Massing Options – Discuss and Evaluate according to the areas of focus: <b>(Slide 10)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designing for the Future – Economy, Flexibility and Growth</li> <li>Sustainability – Lexington’s Integrated Design Policy and Building Performance Requirements</li> <li>Access to Outdoors &amp; Integrating Exterior and Interior Learning Environments</li> <li>Balancing Educational and Community Space Needs</li> <li>Designing in the Context of Lexington – Creating a Sense of Place and Identity</li> <li>These included Renovation &amp; Addition - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.1</li> <li>B.4</li> </ul> </li> <li>New Construction - Phased in Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D.2</li> </ul> </li> <li>New Construction - On the Fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C.1b</li> <li>C.2b</li> <li>C.5b</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>B.Black reviewed Exterior Material Options <b>(Slide 33)</b></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S.Sopelak reviewed Healthy Interior Material Options &amp; Goals (<b>Slide 38</b>)</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O.Guttag asked for an hour meeting with the design team to review her groups plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o M.Rice noted they will bring this back to the SBC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• J.Himmel noted that the adjacency diagram should be highlighted which spaces will be public for community use. Himmel also noted that the schemes have different clarity to them and the renovation schemes are harder to get that clarity due to the nature of the project. He noted the public community aspects should be closer to the core of the building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o B.Black noted they are at the stage</li> <li>o M.Rice noted yesterday, A.Baker noted how the existing building is already used by the community and rented often. Rice noted it'll be important to note how to close off portions of the building.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• J.Himmel noted it is interesting to see the narrative proposed and to reflect on the questions about how LEED Gold is too far of a reach. Himmel also noted it might be nice to look at these recommendations provided today and see if they are not required in other communities. He noted it would be good to break these out so they can be compared without going back to the estimators. Himmel noted it may be useful to look at the more expensive exterior options and see if they could ultimately save construction time due to their easy install compared to some easier options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o B.Black noted it would be interesting to study this and there will be some tradeoffs for each of the options</li> <li>o M.Rice noted this will be best to dive into during the Schematic Design Phase when the team has a construction manager at risk on board</li> </ul> </li> <li>• J.Himmel wonders how drastically a scheme can change from PSR to SD and still be considered that scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Somerville scheme was pretty fully formed in PSR because constraints were so definite</li> <li>o Waltham was less similar to the eventual design but in early SD there was a lot of iterating on form finding to get to ultimate design</li> <li>o Recognizable form PSR to CD</li> <li>o Trying to focus on the opportunities of each of the 6</li> </ul> </li> <li>• J.Himmel noted on slide 43 it is a very optimistic way of looking at the red list materials and it would be more encouraging to flip the timeline that is on slide 44 and then section them out by each category <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o B.Black agreed as there is no point to talking about materials that they will never use</li> </ul> </li> <li>• J.Himmel noted it was very promising to see all the red list free materials already</li> <li>• O.Guttag asked if the construction could occur on second shift to help with disruptions to students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o M.Rice noted that the abutters also probably would find that disrupting given the hour of the day, and it would cost a lot more money to complete</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Close</b></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.