

Greenwich Board of Education

Minutes of the New Lebanon Building Committee Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, November 16, 2015

LOCATION: Havemeyer Board Room

TIME: 7:00–8:35 pm

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko – Chair
Bill Drake – Vice Chair (BET)
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski – Clerk (via phone)
Dean L. Goss
Clare Lawler Kilgallen
Peter Bernstein (BOE)
Jake Allen
Brian Harris

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Drew Marzullo (Selectman)
Barbara O’Neil (BOE Chair)
Nick Macri (P&Z Commission)
Will Schwartz (DPW)
Tony Turner (RTM)

Other:

Ryszard Szcypek – Tai Soo Kim
Tai Soo Kim – Tai Soo Kim
Jessie – Tai Soo Kim

- 1) Meeting was called to order by Stephen Walko at 7:00 pm
- 2) Recap of what was presented at the previous meeting. Questions and comments from the public and building committee members have been sent to all committee members. None of the questions or comments were edited when sent to Tai Soo Kim but the questions sent were highlighted.
- 3) New perspective drawings were handed out.

- 4) Goal is to reach a conclusion by 12/2/15 on a design.
- 5) Mr. Walko turned meeting over to Tai Soo Kim to address questions
 - a. Why do we have to pave the site on Eastern side? Response is that it is required by Fire Marshal/code for emergency response. Confirmation was made by Shawn McDonnell, Fire Marshal, who was present. For current presentation it was shown to have a paved road.
 - b. Transportation questions presented – School of this size typically has about 85 spaces using practicality, not a requirement. Principal and Vice Principal were present and their guess was probably similar, around 75–85 spaces needed on a daily basis to handle staff and visitors. During off hours, using cuing lane there will be about 100 spaces that can be used. One of the options had a 3 lane. A traffic engineer will be assigned and will discuss the flow of traffic exiting the school drive. No intention of using the connection or flow of traffic using Richard and Church Street in any of the options. This is early schematics and another 50% of schematics needs to be completed and opportunities for revision using committee and public concerns.
 - c. Trees and natural landscape questions – Option D requires removal of 62 trees, Option 1 requires removal of 103 trees and Option 2 required removal of 74 trees. A tree is defined as a tree of 6” in diameter or larger. Surveyor provided rough estimate of trees he deemed looking. Replacement of trees will be determined by working with P&Z and IVVWA of how many and what species the trees should be replaced. Goal would be to make it a net of zero loss of trees in the end, if the budget and placement allows.
 - d. Can you take the building in Option 1 and move it closer to the hill/West? Tai Soo Kim answered that you would be putting it in a steep hill and going against the idea of working with the topography.
 - e. Can move more north, but would be difficult to move west as it would be climbing up the hill. Would fewer trees be removed if moved more toward ball field? All footprints can be shifted and revised per Ryszard Szcypak.
 - f. Drew Marzullo asked Tai Soo Kim if they knew the MI process and where it stood. There was an 11x17 plan submitted for the MI application. Town Planner has 1 document that was endorsed by the Board of Selectman.
 - g. Topography – Do any plans as they stand today require blasting? Maybe was the answer. There is need to remove Earth and Rock and depends on

whether the rock can be ripped or needs to be blasted but geotechnical consultant will need to determine.

- h. Noise and proximity to I95 – A diagram was presented about decibel level readings that Ryszard at Tai Soo Kim conducted. The number along highway is 80 decibels, move away from highway and go down slope on Eastern side about halfway down hill gets a reading of 65 decibels. Go down ravine and go back up toward existing building and reads 72 decibels. Around from of front of building is 65 decibels. 80 decibels is considered loud. Highway would be constant noise. The architects were confident that the noise can be reduced. Hired an acoustic company that will help. 50 decibels is background level such as leaves rustling and should be the level inside school. Tai Soo Kim is very aware of noise and decibels. On approach side of the building would be no different than the noise you hear now. The back corner will be closest to 95 but because of the slope it would be about 65 decibels probably in any of the options. The higher the building the greater the impact from highway. Scheme D would probably get the most impact because it is higher than the other options. Option 1 & 2 about the same as current height as existing building 3–5, D would be 16–18' above the current building. Natural contour has a built in barrier. Non natural way would be to build a barrier like the DOT barriers. That would require removing more trees.
- i. Day lighting – Using 3 dimensional models were able to clock the track of the sun and at different time of the year. The architects looked at the worst case scenario, which would be the lowest level of light on the Western side of the building in Option 1 and plotted the sunlight at the worst time which would be 9am to see if light would actually get into that room. The light coming in and hitting the floor would be 80 light candles. Guideline for classrooms is 50 light candles. They would control the light by using light shelves, horizontal planes that allows light to be reflected to the ceiling and get deeper into the room. All rooms will have sufficient natural daylight except internal rooms, across all options. How close is the rock outside the windows in option 1? It is about 40–50 feet high and is sloping up so there would not be a block of wall outside the window. It is about 10 feet wide of flat land and then the then the land starts to slope up. Tai Soo Kim was asked to provide a view prospective to the Committee of what the students would be looking at.
- j. What is the Propensity to have specialized materials, glass, greater issues? What are the things that the committee should be looking at in differentiating the models to current and ongoing costs options that might impact their decision? Cost is comparable except for some contingency costs. As far as maintenance costs are concerned, there is

nothing in the schemes that suggests that one option is more costly than another in regards to exterior material, landscaping. The only difference would be that Option D revised has less roof area than the others.

- k. BOE specifications and differentials and variations. There were lot and typographical errors or blanks. A revised variance report was made that corrects and fills. Gymnasium storage falls short on specs but will go back and fix that.
- l. Travel distance to cafeteria and play area, distance from gym to field. Time to get from one end of the building to another. Took distance horizontally in feet and vertical distance in the number of steps. Kindergarten line walking speed is hard to predict but using a pediatric Physical therapy article from 2005 says it is 3.7 feet per second. Multiplied lengths. Time cafeteria to play area: Option D was 2 min 15 sec., Option 1 was 58 seconds and Option 2 was 58 seconds. Time from gym to field: Option D was 41 sec, Option 1 was 1 48 sec and Option 2 is 1min 38 sec. To go from one end to another: Section D is 2 min 49 sec, Option 1 is 1 min 41 sec and Option 2 is 2 min 1 sec. Stairs are going to be harder to negotiate.
- m. Is there a way to use the existing footprint without having 3 floors? The answer was no, not with the Ed specifications and requirements.
- n. Option 2 – Is the rear wing set back a bit in order to create staff parking and can it be shifted more North (to the field). Tai Soo Kim states that all options can be shifted. Peter Bernstein asked if TSK could draw this idea.
- o. Maintenance/operation cost differences. Based on square footage they are all comparable but is a lengthy process to determine and has not yet been done and depends on the heating systems, etc. No schemes would lend itself to having more operational costs per Ryszard Szcypek. Option 1 has 64,000 square feet, option 2 has 76,000 square feet and Option D has 85,000 square feet, but they all meet the Ed Spec.
- p. Question about air quality inside the building was asked, Ryszard answered that there are many options to ensure inside building air quality. What would air quality entail. It would require hiring an environmental company and would take air samples.
- q. Distance from the highway property line to the edge of school building: Option 1 is 115 feet, Option 2 is 150 feet, Option D is 250 feet. to
- r. Tai Soo Kim will be present at the next meeting on Wednesday, Nov. 18th.

- 6) Concerns about MI process and timing were made. If the committee votes on a certain option that does not fall within the plan presented in MI, the process would have to go back to BOE, BOS and P&Z.
- 7) The public will continue to have input after the Building Committees votes at the Board of Ed and Planning & Zoning Stages.
- 8) The agenda for November 18th meeting still needs to be posted and will be given to Pat Spooner.
- 9) Meeting was adjourned at 8:34 pm.