

# **Greenwich Board of Education**

## **Minutes of the New Lebanon Building Committee Meeting**

**DATE:** Wednesday, November 18, 2015

**LOCATION:** Havemeyer Board Room

**TIME:** 8:00–9:00 am

**Committee Members Present:**

Stephen Walko – Chair  
Bill Drake – Vice Chair (BET)  
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski – Clerk  
Dean 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

- 1) Meeting Called to order by Stephen Walko at 8:00 am
- 2) Condolences extended to Patricia Kantorski for her and her families loss.
- 3) All emails that Stephen Walko received regarding deliberations were sent to all Committee Members.
- 4) Voting Issues
  - a. Process question of a tie breaker vote was brought up by Stephen Walko. Motion made by Drew Marzullo, Seconded by Peter Bernstein to allow the Chairmain to cast a tie breaking vote in the event that there is a tie vote.

- b. Potential way to address voting on 3 options that does not garner enough votes in the first round. Consideration of 3 rounds in which you would eliminate the lowest vote, with a minimum of 2 rounds. If there was a tie of the lowest vote, then there would be a vote between those two to see which would be eliminated before going to the 2<sup>nd</sup> round. Motion to adopt the structures was made by Bill Drake and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Brian Harris.
- 5) Discussion was opened to non voting members for their comments. Confirmation via charter and Town attorney confirms that they are not eligible to vote.
- 6) Tai Soo Kim sent out a corrected version of drawings with overlays regarding MI site. Stephen Walko handed out drawings to those that did not receive.
- a. The dotted red line is the existing building and the pink outline is the building as presented in the MI application. The green shaded area is the play areas as submitted with MI application. The darker of gray areas is the transportation areas as presented. The white building is Option 1. The lighter gray is the transportation areas for Option 1. The 2<sup>nd</sup> page is option 2.
  - b. Footprint area was described by Ryszard Szcypek. According to his estimations the footprint/building portion of option 1 is approx. 30% greater than what was previously submitted for portion in the ravine, but not for the total campus.
  - c. Total percentage of the 2<sup>nd</sup> option vs. what was presented s a little harder to determine.
  - d. All plans have been moved more North (near ball field).
  - e. None of the plans utilize Church and Richard thoroughfare. It is not needed for security.
  - f. Can not move more North as then it would be encroaching upon Right of Way or would need to create a right of way for utilities.
  - g. Stephen Walko asked if any of the 3 Option were superior to the any other option regarding safety concerns. Ryszard Szcypek replied that Option 2 has access for first responders all the way around but that all 3 designs can be made to allow for it as well.

- h. Drew Marzullo asked about safety during physical construction and the learning ability during construction. Tai Soo Kim has done 4 schools with schools occupying while construction was being done. Only major issue was dust and it can be mitigated and accomplished while school is not in session. Recommends testing of air quality before, during and after. Currently demolition is scheduled for right after the students move into the new building. Suggestion to do demolition during summer of 2018. Ryszard Szcypek said that it is possible but puts a lot of pressure on the contractors. Would need to have a contingency plan in case problems arise. As for learning environment, Richard stated that the contractors are mandated to be aware of the school calendar, to allow for loud noises to be done during school breaks and off hours. Contractors and school officials will have cell phone numbers in case of any issues. Dr. McKersie is very confident that all measures to protect the students physically and in their learning environment will be taken. Principal thinks it is a great learning experience for students to be part of the building process and they will be on top of their game for student safety.
- i. In Option 1, contractors would need access around the entire site and would gain access from Richard Street. The ball field would be the staging area.

7) Committee members gave their opinions on the options.

8) Voting members were asked by Mr. Walko which Option they would vote for.

9) Votes were taken

- a. Round 1: Option D = 0, Option 1 = 5, Option 2 = 2, Abstaining = 1
- b. Members restated their opinions and/or made comments
- c. Round 2: Option 1 = 7, Option 2 = 0, Abstaining = 1
- d. Option 1 is the option that the building committee will put forward

10) TSK was encouraged by Stephen Walko to work with plan 1a to move the building more North West.

- 11) Stephen Walko recommended presenting the plan to the BET so they will understand where the building committee is.
- 12) All Town governing agencies will need the committee to present the plan to them. Mr. Walko will attend and invite all the members to attend the meetings. The hope was that the agencies would allow them to comment and present.
- 13) Next meeting is scheduled for December 2<sup>nd</sup> at 8 am.
- 14) Building Committee will not be presenting the Schematic Designs to the P&Z at their meeting next week, because they have not been fully developed and are not ready for the MI. It needs to be an infinitive plan per Mr. Macri.
- 15) Clarification was made on how the MI approval is different than the P&Z Site Plan approval.
- 16) The CM RFP's are coming back on Nov. 25<sup>th</sup> and will be opened at 10 am. The committee needs to choose a date for the interviews. Dates discussed are Dec. 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup>. An email will be sent out for members to respond to.
- 17) A vote to approve the meeting minutes for the November 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> were postponed.
- 14) The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 am.