

Greenwich Board of Education
Minutes of the New Lebanon Building Committee Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, January 13, 2016
LOCATION: BOE, Staff Development Room
TIME: 8:00 - 9:40 a.m.

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chairman
Patricia Baiardi Kantorski - Clerk
Bill Drake - Vice Chairman (BET)
Clare Kilgallen
Peter Bernstein (BOE)
Dean L. Goss
Jake Allen
absent: Brian Harris

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Laura Erickson (BOE Chair)
Tony Turner (RTM)
Will Schwartz (DPW)
Nick Macri (P&Z)
Drew Marzullo (Selectman)

Others Present:

Ryszard Szczypek – Tai Soo Kim
Ronald Matten (DOF-BOE)
Barbara O’Neill (BOE)
James Hricay (MDO-BOE)

1. Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:00 am
2. Presentation of 2 Schematic Design Options by Tai Soo Kim Partners
 - a. Ryszard Szczypek (TSK) began the presentation by outlining the Project limit lines. He noted that the existing property line jogs.
 - b. Then Tai Soo Kim presented Options 3 and 4. For each option he showed slides of the site plan, the floor plans, a model and a perspective drawing of the front elevation of the school.
 - c. Tai Soo Kim also showed a slide superimposing the foot prints of each building.
 - d. Ryszard Szczypek showed a slide of and discussed the Budget and Variance Report comparing Option 3 and 4 as well as a Task Timeline for the Project.

- e. The Committee was given a hard copy of the entire presentation.
 - f. Mr. Szczypek informed the Committee that TSK has completed 50% of the Schematic Design Phase.
 - g. Mr. Szczypek said that there would be some cost savings if the building was reduced in size. He also said they had not decided if the building would be constructed on columns or fill. He assured the Committee they would use the most cost effective solution.
 - h. The following Schematic Design (SD) Schedule was discussed by Mr. Szczypek: The NLBC would select their preferred Option this week, the BOE to approve preferred option at their 1/21/16 meeting, then TSK would finalize the SD Documents including the estimate and budget alignment by 2/19/16. Once the SD has NLBC approval to proceed on 2/24/16, the BOE Approval would be 2/25/16 and BOS referral for MI approval to P & Z on 1/29/16.
 - i. The Committee was directed to review the Task Timeline for the Portables, line 25 - 34 of TSK's handout dated 1/12/16.
3. Discussions on the possible layout of the New Lebanon playing field.
- a. The committee discussed the pros and cons of creating a full size soccer field and orienting it in a North/South direction.
 - b. TSK recommended a multi-purpose field, 140 ft. x 185 ft. which would be good for youth soccer and multi-purpose use.
 - c. It was noted that in order to build a full size soccer field oriented N/S, the new school would have to be located closer to I95, further into the woods and outside of the approved building area. It would also require a large quantity of rock blasted and removed, a high expensive retaining wall built and Richard Street would need to be dead ended making the requested emergency entrance to the site impossible.
 - d. Mr. Szczypek informed the committee that the cost of creating a larger playing field was not included in the original project estimate or the architect's fee.
 - e. Mr. Szczypek said TSK had not made any revisions to the Ed. Specs and the field was not part of the Ed. Specs.
4. Discussion of Owner's Representative and Commissioning Agent.
- a. The process is moving forward.
 - b. The Subcommittee is waiting to hear from the Town Law Department.
5. Update and discussions on Project Timeline.
- a. The Timeline will be updated with the information presented by TSK.

6. Update by Communication's Subcommittee.
 - a. The committee will make a presentation at a future meeting.

7. Approval of Meeting Minutes.
 - a. A motion was made by Peter Bernstein and seconded by Dean Goss to approve the minutes of the meeting as amended for January 6, 2016. The motion was approved with a vote of 7-0-1 absent.

8. Discussion of Next Steps, including Q & A:
 - a. The first question asked TSK was concerning safety regarding access around the entire building. Mr. Szczypek said both options had access on all 4 sides. He clarified that access did not mean a paved road. He also said TSK would work with the Town Fire Marshall and they would decide.
 - b. TSK said the cost estimate included soft costs, but not all site improvements.
 - c. TSK will meet with the Community & Educators after the Schematic Design is completed.
 - d. The Town Tree Warden will make recommendations to replace and/or add trees.
 - e. Both Option 3 and 4 have a 13 month construction timeline.
 - f. All designs will comply with SSIC Standards.
 - g. The horizontal and vertical travel time in Option 3 is shorter than Option 4.
 - h. Option 3 has the best operating efficiencies.
 - i. TSK will provide the BOE with the presentation materials electronically.
 - j. Steve Walko asked the Educator's to provide the Building Committee with a list of Pros and Cons of each option and the differences with respect to education.
 - k. The Superintendent, Dr. McKersie, said Option 3 is similar to both Cos Cob and Glenville Elementary School. He said the layout makes it easy for the children to work together, is more conducive to the community, has a cushion to the classrooms, has a lot of breakout areas and is good for the IB Program. His only concern was that the services were all on the Lower Level.
 - l. Option 3 has better traffic flow and greater vehicle capacity.
 - m. The Building Committee will meet on January 15, 2016 at 8:00 am to vote on their preferred option.

9. The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 9:40 am.