

## **B. Questions and Answers from NLBC and the public to TSKP**

A compendium of the questions/comments by NLBC members and the public. Question for TSKP are highlighted in yellow and for the NLBC in green:

### **ROUND I – Q & A**

#### **1. NLBC member: Observations:**

1. Richard and Church Streets. In all of the options, Richard Street should be terminated and become a dead end with a turnabout at the last (western-most) house. The eastward thrust of Church Street should be terminated where the auto traffic turns north into the library parking. The area in-between should be landscaped gym-to-field transition with no paving or vehicles. Thus, students emerging from the gym at the north end of the building will step directly into their athletic field, providing an excellent phys. ed experience, like most elementary schools in Greenwich. This area between the new western end of Richard Street and the new eastward end of Church Street should be student outdoor space free of autos, buses, vehicle traffic, and unsightly asphalt paving. Vehicles should be eliminated from this area, for the benefit of students headed to their field.
2. Gym at the north end. In all schemes, the gym should be located as close to the ball field as possible, to optimize the phys. ed. experience, which is vital for elementary schoolers. We can't expect to attract magnet students from other schools if their recreational opportunities aren't as good as their current schools.
3. Vehicular traffic and parking should be in one place, west of the building, not in two places (east and west) or north of the building.
4. Playground: there should be one playground. Why would we build two? The separation impairs the students' sense of a shared community, and also doubles the burden of supervision. Separation is required per the report issued by Connecticut's School Safety Infrastructure Council (SSIC), paragraph 3.3. "Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten play areas shall be separated from play areas designed for other students."
5. Why should there be any paved road on the east side of the building? Green space should be maximized, and asphalt minimized. Paved roads are typically required by local fire departments for emergency vehicles. This will need to be determined by the Greenwich Fire Marshal.
6. Is it imperative to build a new media center, when 100 feet away is the children's room of the Byram Schubert library? A school media center is shown in the plans because it is listed in the BOE's Educational Specifications. This question should be referred to the BOE. This new facility was part of the Library's \$5.6 million expansion in 2009. This beautiful modern library space duplicates many of the functions of a school media center. The library childrens' room is empty when the school's is full, and vice versa. Since the library has more resources than a school media center, integrating the two is an opportunity to provide a best-in-Greenwich media facility at New Lebanon, helping to draw magnet students.
7. The architects are professionals who we've chosen. They deserve the liberty to think creatively, and provide new ideas.

8. The wow factor is not as important a criteria as practicality and longevity.

2. **NLBC member:** Below are my thoughts on additional factors that I'd like the architects to address to assist NLBC's assessment of the 3 presented options:

- Student Access to Fields and Playgrounds
- Transit (Non-Instructional) Time to get from one end of the building to the other
- Energy Efficiency and Operating Cost of Each Building
- Student Pick-up
- Safety
- Construction Safety if Students are On-Site
- Sunlight Exposure
- Trees
- Siting of the School Building
- Water Drainage
- Soil Quality
- Sound/Noise
- Air Quality

1. Student Access to Fields and Playgrounds

How far do you need to cross around, grade change, stairs, etc.

2. Transit (Non-Instructional) Time to get from one end of the building to the other. See the attached spreadsheet containing an analysis of transit time.

#	Quantity Description	Unit	Option D Rev	OPTION 1	OPTION 2a or 2b
2.1	Horizontal Travel distance from Cafeteria to Play area	ft	500	125	217 58.64864865
	Vertical travel distance from Cafeteria to Play area	steps	0	24	0
	Travel Time from Cafeteria to Play area*	min:sec	2:15	0:58	0:58
	Horizontal Travel distance from Gym to Field	ft	85	180	275 74.32432432
	Vertical travel distance from Gym to Field	steps	18	0	24
	Travel time from Gym to Field*	min:sec	0:41	0:48	1:38
2.2	Time to get from one end of the building to another*	min:sec	2:49	1:41	2:01

\* travel time is based on kindergarten line walking speed of 3.7ft/sec as found in Expectations for Walking Speeds: standards for students in elementary schools from Pediatric Physical Therapy, 2005. Also based on a stair climbing speed of 1 step per second.

**3. Energy Efficiency and Operating Cost of Each Building** Energy efficiency and operating cost analysis will be done by consulting engineers Kohler Ronan after details of the preferred option are developed.

#### **4. Student Pick-up**

Currently parents cannot drive in front of the school during pick-up. Will all proposals remedy this problem? Yes, all options include proper queuing for parents dropping off and picking up children at the school.

**5. Safety, Understanding that all the options will be safe, for each of the three options:**  
a) How does the building meet or exceed the mandatory SSIC standards (all-hazards approach, sightlines, location of playground, accessibility by first responders to all sides of the building)? All options will be able to meet the mandatory SSIC standards.  
b) Are any of the 3 options superior in this regard? If so, how? ~~Option D-Revised and Option 1 have better sightlines than Option 2.~~ Update on November 16th: First responders' access to all sides of the building is not as good in Option 1 as in D and 2. Sightlines in 2 would be improved by the inclusion of a fence to limit access to the two reentrant areas on the slope.

#### **6. Construction Safety if Students are On-Site**

Explain the measures that would be taken to ensure student safety i.e., physical, timing, etc. Construction specifications will include fencing to separate the occupied school site from the construction area. In Options 1 and 2a, the playfield will need to be a contractor staging area, which will be fenced as well. Construction personnel will be required to wear identification badges, and they will be prohibited from entering the occupied school area on school days. A school calendar will be issued to the Construction Manager and the subcontractors so that they are aware of testing days when noisy construction activity is prohibited. School vacations and holidays will be included in the construction schedule prepared by the Construction Manager so that noisy activities are done when school is not in session.

#### **7. Sunlight Exposure**

There is a notion that with certain options the building's elevation would be low and dark. Please give us your professional assessment of that perception and a description of the light exposure of all three. The Architect looked at the worst-case scenario. Attached is an illuminance analysis made with Revit for the lower level classrooms in Option #1. The classrooms are west-facing, so the analysis was made at 9 AM on the winter solstice. Even in this worst-case scenario, there will be 80 FC (foot-candles) on the floor in front of the window. Recommended illumination in classrooms is 50 FC. We can distribute the light from the windows deeper into the classrooms using light shelves, which are horizontal devices designed to reflect light upward and across the ceiling

#### **8. Trees**

For each of the 3 options:

a) How many live trees would be removed?

Option D Revised = 62

Option 1 = 74

Option 2 = 103

b) How many dead trees? Cannot be estimated at this time because dead trees were not surveyed.

c) How many new trees will be planted? To be determined.

#### 9. Siting of the School Building

In any of the 3 options, are any of the sites sub-par? If so, how? Any of the Options can be developed to meet State guidelines for reimbursement.

#### 10. Water Drainage

Are there any water drainage issues in the wooded area? If so, can you characterize the severity and how easily any issues could be addressed? ~~This has been referred to site engineers Milone & MacBroom. We expect their response by Monday the 16<sup>th</sup>.~~ Recall that the Architect reported on November 11<sup>th</sup> that surveyors found a pipe at the low end of the site that appeared to be blocked. Surveyors are examining that area now. Meantime here's an update from site engineers Milone & MacBroom: "We have concerns relative to how the wooded area drains as well, particularly the low valley area that has been flagged as inland wetlands. Based on my field visit, that area appears to trap stormwater, which may affect the planned redevelopment of the school. We will need the additional topographic survey that was requested in order to characterize the severity of the issue and understand what options can be pursued to address it."

#### 11. Soil Quality

Is there any concern with the soil in any of the areas of the parcel? The surveyor conducted two borings which contained no indication of soil contamination. However, a Phase One environmental report still needs to be done, and if required, some additional borings along with a Phase Two analysis.

#### 12. Sound/Noise

There was an allegation that the noise from I-95 would be appreciably louder in the wooded area. A report comparing decibel readings would be helpful (e.g., current school, and the 3 options). The architect took decibel readings on the existing site. Please refer to the attachment. Readings cannot be taken at the 3 options because they are not built yet. However, the architect's acoustical consultant Jaffe Holden will be involved in the design of the new school, and estimates of anticipated noise levels, plus strategies for mitigation will be part that consultant's work.

#### 13. Air Quality

There was an allegation using the wooded area would expose students to air pollution from I-95. Is there a study that quantifies the exposure, if any, to the NL students (a) currently and (b) with the proposed locations? We are not aware of any air quality studies done previously on the New Lebanon site. However, any new school on the site will include features to ensure good air quality in the building, using new technologies for filtering out



pollutants, controlling humidity, mitigating radon, and eliminating off-gassing material in the building. In addition, monitoring devices can be installed to verify that indoor air continues to be free of pollution.

**3. Member of public:** First, the score sheet used by Tai Soo Kim Partners was biased. If the building committee is going to make decisions based on a ranking system, the criteria within it needs to be unbiased and include "stakeholder" input.

The criteria for scoring each option should include the following:

1. Preservation of the woodlands (Heavily weighted as this item is central to the neighborhood's concerns).
2. The "hole" factor: the appearance that the structure sits at the bottom of a hole adjacent to a multistory cliff.
3. Proximity to I95 traffic noise and the impact on learning.
4. Proximity to I95 diesel fumes and the impact on student health (A comparative air quality test should be completed).
5. The amount of sunlight received at ground level (Desire for natural light, potential for mold growth).

The criteria for scoring each option should not include the following:

1. The Tai Soo Kim "wow" factor. It simply is too subjective.
2. Cost to relocate students. At this time, the town has not committed to keeping students on site during construction. Rather, there is every indication that students would be moved off campus regardless of the construction site.

This leads me to wonder if the above mentioned recommendations were included, how would each option rank? The ranking presented by the architect used a score sheet with criteria that he suggested. The Committee may use an entirely different method of evaluating the options. In my opinion, Option D Revised would be recommended.

Secondly, the architect did not consider community input.

Clearly, the architect preferred Option 1, building in the ravine. Unfortunately, this option differed from the wishes of the BOS, BOE, BNA, RTM D#4 Representatives, Friends of Byram Shubert Library, and neighbors. Four options were presented, yet none reflected the wishes of the town (D Revised was close). At a minimum, one of the four options should have been located entirely on the current footprint as directed by the BOS and BOE.

I question the process. Did the architect designed their preferred Option 1 plan and then developed three inferior plans in order to cast Option 1 in favorable light? No. All the options presented by the architect were developed concurrently, and considerable effort was made in all the options to make them attractive and to make sure they can meet the Ed Specs.

Finally, the cafeteria should not be the focal point within a school (Option 1).

As an elementary school teacher with 20+ years of experience, I know the cafeteria is the noisiest place in the building. It should never be located in the center or at the entrance of a school. The optimum location for a cafeteria would have direct access to a playground. Option 1 has the students "exiting and entering" down a hallway past three grade 1 classrooms for "after lunch" recess time. This is extremely disruptive and would be detrimental to establishing a positive learning environment.

**4. NLBC member:** In option 1 it looks like the cafeteria is completely open to the hallway area and that the kitchen is separate. Is that accurate? Yes. The intention is to make the cafeteria a multipurpose space. The acoustic consultant Jaffe Holden will address the acoustic concerns you raised. I'd be concerned about noise levels in the nearby spaces, cleaning issues, etc.

I am quite disappointed by "revised scheme D" and wonder if they can come up with an alternative to building large boxes. While they met the letter, they completely missed the spirit of what we were looking for. Gissolfi presented a mere conceptual design and they did not deviate.

For option 2, can they explore what it would mean to move the building especially the back wing closer to the field area (proposed site of revised scheme D)? The architect can explore moving Option 2 closer to the field if the Committee wishes to do so. Also, I understand the concept of the platform, but quite frankly would like to see a covered communal space that could be utilized year round rather than a courtyard unlikely to be fully utilized.

**5. NLBC member:** I agree about estimating the impact to the woods. Can we make a rough estimate of the number of trees that would need to be removed for constructing option 1 and d and any that might have to be removed for security reasons? See the answer to a similar question above.

**6. NLBC member:** Was it appropriate in the first place for Tai to interject opinion when it comes to "wow" factor. The architect believes that he was obligated to offer his opinion. He can visualize the architectural potential during the early schematic design phase of a project, and he wanted to make sure that that potential was not overlooked. This to me is subjective at best. What you do not want to happen is because of "perception" and because of "wow" factor any choice other than option one will somehow be less "wow." In compliance with MI process Tai should concentrate efforts in designing a "wow" educational faculty as close to the parameter and directive set forth by two governing bodies.

**7. NLBC member** Here are my Questions/Comments:

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

## OPTION 1

- a. The 'WOW Factor' can't be denied. Is there anyway to move the building closer to where the existing school is now and make it longer to accommodate the classrooms against the hill? This can be explored if the Committee directs the architect to do so. This would go a long way in coming closer to the MI and still have the same wonderful building.
- b. I love the large Play Area in the front of the site. It looks like it will be a very happy safe place to play.
- c. I also think the Bus, Parking & vehicle circulation is great.
- d. The one weak link is the bridge entrances. Is it only the bridges that qualify the PreK, K & 1st Grade classrooms as Ground Level? An exit at grade level is required, but they do not have to be in the form of bridges.
- e. The 5th Grade, Science, 2 Reading & ESL Classrooms against the hill seem like they will be very dark.

Note: If my suggestion a. could be accomplished, then b. & c. would stay the same and d. & e. would be solved. And the new building would mostly be located on the hill, not in the ravine.

## OPTION D REV.

- g. Nice solution for strictly adhering to the selected site. If the committee votes for Option D Rev., I'm sure TSK will develop it into a wonderful school.
- h. The negatives I see are the divided parking, creating more vehicle traffic on 3 sides of the building and a divided Play Area in less than ideal locations.

## OPTION 2

- i. This is my least favorite design. My main objections to Option 2 is the footprint of the building takes up too much of the site. My other objections are this type of windows/skylights feel a bit claustrophobic to me and the divided Parking & Play areas (same as h. above).

**8. NLBC member:** I will be the one to say it...TSK is clearly not excited about the site plan for Scheme D. Whether it be pride in being told what to do vs. artistic license, stubbornness towards their original vision or if it's just a bad site; TSK made it clear it was his least favorite option.

In truth, between just us, I feel a little cheated that they clearly just regurgitated the original Scheme D Design without putting any of their professional touch on it. Even if the footprint of Scheme D stayed the same, TSK should have been able to include some of the design features they are known for into their presentation of that Scheme. Architects in the group, am I wrong in saying that?

I was under the impression, maybe naively, that when we voted to allow them to present multiple options, at great risk to public sentiment, that they would spend equal time designing all of the options and not try and sway our opinion...which I believe TSK tried to do.

Think about it...who right now wants to vote for Scheme D for any other reason than we have MI Approval for it? No need to answer as it is a rhetorical question. I am just worried that TSK's negative vision of Scheme D and/or pride regarding using someone else's sighting, is/has affected the presentation of that Scheme. I'm babbling; just wish they had put forth equal effort, without bias, into all of the options.

Steve - I guess that is my question for TSK. Did they look at the sighting of Scheme D, with an open mind, and attempt to design a TSK style school with in it? Wait...that might be a setup question. Try this - If the foundation for Scheme D was already in place, could TSK design a school that they were proud of, on that foundation? If the Committee selects Option D Revised, the Architect will be obligated to design a building that is functional and attractive to prospective parents.

**9. NLBC member:** Will Tai be able to provide specifics in regards to option 1 and 2 pertaining to building in or near ravine/woods. A number of specifics were given in the Architect's presentation on November 11<sup>th</sup>. More specifics will be provided when the preferred Option is more fully developed. Do you think this warrants a site visit before any vote is taken. The plans that were presented yesterday morning ( not including plan D ) seem to at minimum call into question current "MI" that now rest with P&Z. P&Z per town charter is working on a timetable. When does that expire and when will P&Z ask for extension. Lastly is it my understanding that Tai in their professional opinion cannot design ( for various reasons ) a school with a "wow" reaction.

**10. Member of the public:** I was wondering if you could ask the architect how he defines "wow" factor with respect to his one design versus the other designs. When it comes to magnet school design, "wow" factor is what causes visiting parents to be pleasantly surprised by what they see. Parents are surprised and they are delighted because the school exceeds their expectations. This is no ordinary school, and parents want their children to attend. The "wow" factor is unmeasurable in conventional ways, but it's real. The architect believes that Option 1 has the greatest potential for achieving "wow". And he believes that Options 2 and D Revised have less potential. It seems to me that we would want to build a school building that is not only functional but will not incur the Town to potential liability due to safety and noise concerns (which appears to be the Selectmen's concerns over building in the ravine) versus being a "wow" building.

Also, I notice that one of the designs has more square footage than the others - could he explain why the large difference (it's approx. 1500 square feet more)? The square footage in the Options is similar. See the attached spreadsheet containing the Variance Analysis.

**11. NLBC member:** I agree with Clare. I also think it would be valuable to stake the woods where the buildings are planned. It would be helpful in understanding the impact they would have on the woods. If necessary, surveyors can be instructed to stake the woods to



help Committee Members visualize where the building in each Option would be placed on the site. Meantime, see the answer above to a similar question about the quantity of trees impacted by the designs.

**12. Member of the Public: Some concerns.**

It feels like deja vu.

Has anything been learned in the past year?

1) It is hard to believe that the architect would present a plan in the ravine when the directive of the selectmen clearly was/is to build it on the current site. The past experience was a series of disagreements with the board of ed and the selectmen with the selectmen having the final decision. With that history, wouldn't you get the ok from the selectman first even before presenting the ravine plan and potentially voting on it? Isn't more time, energy and money being wasted??? Do you think the selectmen will change their mind now after that whole long back and forth and say yes, build it in the ravine?

2) The community was not informed when the initial direction of the building of the new school was in the field. The community asked for informative meetings/ focus groups so their voice could be heard. Countless meetings / hours later, a decision was made. Now it appears that those meetings meant nothing. Going forth with the school in the ravine is not the final message the community heard. The final message was that the new school was going to be built on the current site. Are you planning to address the community before the vote on Wednesday? (at a BNA meeting) especially when one of the choices is what we were told would not happen (building in the ravine).

3) I am sure you know the concerns of building in the ravine. It is on record. Proximity to the I95, noise and air pollution, water / draining problems, losing trees, poor light, safety. Check the records. Peter Tesei said "we can do better than that" in reference to building in the ravine.

I don't think anyone would mind a compromise (even the selectmen). Plan 2 looked like a plan with great potential.

Please do not go forward acting as if the concerns of the community and all the efforts from the past year don't mean anything.

**13. NLBC member:** I have a question about the Variance Report distributed at the end of the meeting. (By way of background, I was on the NL Feasibility Team and worked on the Ed. Specs). I noticed a few places where in the Option 1 column where the variance was significant or there was no SF at all.

In looking at the interior sectional drawings, I see most of the rooms listed below, so I suspect that the items noted below are just typographical errors. Would you please confirm and issue a revised document to the NLBC? See the attached spreadsheet containing a corrected Variance Analysis.

#### Instructional Spaces

#7-9 1-1 through 1-3 Ed. Spec. = 850 each;

Option 1 has 1-1 = 837; 1-2 = 623; 1-3 = 320. These have been corrected.

#### Administration and Support

# 46 Work. Teacher workroom Ed. Spec = 200; Option 1 = 51. Corrected to 251.

#### Core Common Areas

# 49 CPU Lab Computer Lab Ed. Spec. = 800; Option 1 is blank. Corrected to 774.

# 53 Gym stg. Gym Storage. These do not meet the Ed Specs, and will need design revision.

# 54 Stage Ed. Spec. = 875; Option 1 is blank. Corrected to 847.

#### Service

#60-63 T Toilet (Staff) Ed. Spec. 90 SF each x4; Option 1 is blank. All options have been corrected.

#### 14. NLBC member: List of questions

1. Will all options require an elevator? Yes. If not, what are the issues surrounding the use of an elevator (cost, maintenance, etc)? Elevators are mandatory, so there's no avoiding their cost and maintenance. However, there are two elevators in Options D-Revised, so the cost of elevators in that option is double the cost of elevators in the other options.
2. Can any of the options be moved towards Mead Ave. to minimize the use of the wooded area? All options can be adjusted per the Committee's direction.
3. What are the specific requirements for traffic flow/parking? Not indicated in Ed Specs. Are 3 lanes necessary? Three lanes are strongly recommend by the site engineer. What is the minimum number of visitor spaces needed? The architect recommends approximately 85 spaces, based on his experience, but this can be evaluated further if the Committee wishes to change the number of spaces.
4. Does any option lend itself to off-site construction? All the options can have components pre-built off-site.
5. Do any of the options call for traffic flow through Richards/Church Streets? No.
6. For all options, can you show a perspective looking out of the windows on the lower level facing Mead Ave? This can be developed later in design.
7. Are the staging requirements different for each option? If so, how? Yes. Staging in the playfield will be required in Options 1 and 2b. The other options can be staged at the existing school location.
8. From an environmental impact perspective, how are the options different? See the earlier answer regarding trees.

9. Can you describe any issues with student traffic flow in each option? See the earlier answer regarding travel distance and the attached spreadsheet.
10. From a maintenance perspective, how are the options different? No different.
11. Do any of the options require specialized building material? No.
12. Do any of the options utilize any portion of the old school? No.

**15. NLBC member:**

1. what other design possibilities, if any, were considered but not presented? The designs presented by the Architect, which were developed during the early schematic design phase, were deemed the most viable. Other design possibilities were discarded and not developed further as soon as the Architect determined that they were not workable.
2. how sure are we that the ravine terrain is strong enough to support the structure (e.g. site remediation need and to what degree to avoid cost surprises. Foundations for any of the options can be designed to meet the existing soil bearing capacity. The two borings conducted by the surveyor thus far show no need for soil remediation. More borings will be taken after one option is selected.

**16. NLBC member:** I think it would be valuable to see cross sections of the full site for all schemes showing the proposed building in relation to houses to the west and I-95 to the east. Cross sections through the site will be done after one option is selected. The design can be modified if the building height relationship to its surroundings is undesirable. Given the topography it is important to see the building elevation (height) in relationship to existing structures and highway.

**17. NLBC member:**

Overall Questions:

1A) Please briefly describe for the scenarios how the building circulation/access/security will work for evening events. Please provide a short narrative (verbal is fine) for a typical PTA meeting scenario for the audience to understand how the building will work off-hours. An entry near the gym is provided for an after-hours event. If the event is a performance, PTA meeting, or sporting event in the gym, access will be restricted to only the gym suite of rooms and the toilets in the corridor outside via a gate across the main corridor. If two or more meetings are happening simultaneously after hours, the cafeteria and media center will be utilized. The aforementioned gate will be opened, allowing access to the center of the building. Doors provided at the entrance to each classroom pod, the elevator and the central connecting stair will be locked limiting access to the classrooms.

1B) For each of the scenarios describe how students move from class room to Cafeteria to recess and back again for the different age groups to show how the building circulation works. See the earlier answer regarding travel distance and see the attached spreadsheet.

2) Please describe any sound attenuation strategies through building massing, enhanced envelope, orientation, or landscaping (berming etc.) that could be employed for the scenarios to mitigate highway noise. Building envelopes can be designed for sound attenuation, and they can be constructed of different materials to block various noise frequencies generated by highway traffic. The massing of the building, the location of doors and windows, the windows and glazing, and the surrounding landscape can be designed to mitigate noise. The acoustics consultant Jaffe Holden will participate in the design of the facility, and they will provide input on various details to address noise and acoustics.

3) For general background please show a wind rose for the site that illustrates typical wind flows during the school year. (This is to inform ventilation strategies but also illustrate where highway exhaust typically flows. Wind flow analysis will be prepared later as design of the selected Option is developed.

#### Option 1

1) Please explain if you looked at rotating the orientation of Option 1 so that more of the building has southern facing exposure and thus greater daylight penetration. If not, why was this not explored as an Option 1B that would potentially occupy a portion of the existing school site? An East-West orientation was not examined because of site topography. My concern is that the North-South orientation limits daylight penetration into the classrooms especially at the lower level. How would you address this in terms of orientation, or potentially landscaping modifications to allow greater daylight penetration. A quick daylight analysis run on a digital massing model for 3 points of time during the school year would be helpful. Daylight analysis will be prepared later as the design of openings in the selected Option is refined.

Alternatively, if daylighting is an issue at the lower levels, talk to the potential for lifting the building out of the ravine further and potentially entering on the lower level instead. The architect can look at lifting the building in any option that is selected by the Committee.

2) Please show if and where any Pre-K/K outdoor play space is located. Refer to the site plans for each option. The Pre-K/K playground is the one located closest to the Pre-K/K classrooms.

3) Please show how outdoor learning environments could be integrated into the school. See the answer to a similar question below.

#### Option 2

1) It appears that the lower level class rooms, particularly the 2nd grade rooms will be quite dark and some are windowless. Please explain how these rooms can receive



adequate light levels. See the early answer regarding foot-candles in the worst case scenario.

2) Please look at the potential of the courtyard as a an enclosed 2-story glass atrium space that provides daylight and circulation down to the lower level classrooms (this could also be a performance space as well) The courtyard could be an enclosed atrium space, if the Committee so chooses. However, such an atrium would be considered excess square footage by State guidelines, and therefore ineligible for reimbursement. This would be the Committee's decision. Update on November 16th: In the attached revised Option 2 main level plan, the space that was previously outdoor courtyard is used for the media center. This allows the footprint of the building to be reduced in length by about 20' from what was previously shown.

3) Please show other opportunities for outdoor learning or performance spaces. Other outdoor learning spaces have not been designed by the landscape architect yet. However, the site offers a number of possibilities – perhaps a nature trail with gathering spaces for small group instruction at various points along the way, such as the rock outcroppings, a man-made wetlands, and including basic science tools such as rain gauges, sundials, and bird houses. Trees, plantings, and other elements can have name tags, etc.

## Round II – Q & A

### 18. Member of public:

Our elementary school play spaces in most instances double as community play spaces after school and on weekends. Riverside, NM, and Ham Ave come to mind quickly as key examples of schools located within easy access of their communities and used for recreation and community connection during non-school hours. This should be the case as well, especially for NL, when the project is finished. In that light, which of the designs best lends itself to play space access by the community and which might be the safest with respect to vehicular traffic, crossing parking lots, etc. Also which might be most visible to law enforcement for after dark monitoring. Keeping with that theme, which design option best lends itself to the school being the center of the community as a gathering spot for families like exists in Riverside. Option 1 locates all play areas close to Church Street, which is optimal for law enforcement after-dark monitoring of play areas. With regard to community access, Option 1 offers a play area adjacent to the existing field, which is more readily accessed by community users of the field. Option 2's site design is better than Option D's with regard to separation of vehicular traffic and play. In Option 2 cars take the Western half of the upper site, while play areas are organized to the Eastern half and connected by sidewalks.

Separately, I would like to address a question I have heard related to "Wow" factor and lack of creativity in TSK's D revised design. First, the "Wow" factor piece. I do not believe a 21st century building (one that does not look like it was built in the 1950's) that is aesthetically

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC026

pleasing is mutually exclusive with what we are trying to achieve. "Wow" will be defined differently by different people, but the net reaction would be instant positive notice vs boring and staid. Whether to attract magnet students, people who might be looking to move to Greenwich and choose to locate themselves in Byram vs other parts of town or just for the existing community, I believe the building should be beautiful and enticing. This building will be here for 40 years. Let's think forward and relate how we feel about some of our school buildings built in various eras. Along those lines, and based on the uninteresting design provided for D revised, I would be interested in hearing from TSK about the current school site itself and what limitations it presents to execute the Ed specs in general let alone in a more creative design. The current school site is very tight. However, the Ed Specs can be met with any of the options that were presented on November 11th. I believe I heard in the presentation that the Grisolfi concept did not actually translate into "reality". More clarification about the issues with the D revised site would be helpful. I have a sense that TSK, if hired before other work had been done, would not have ever recommended site D or D revised. I think the community would benefit from hearing why if that is indeed the case. The footprint for site D-Revised, which is the site previously endorsed by the BOE, is too small unless a portion of the building is three [3] stories tall. The Architect would not have recommended a three-story elementary school, and he would have developed a plan for a two-storey building with a larger footprint. This is assuming the Building Committee would have firmly committed to relocating the New Lebanon pupils to temporary classrooms at another site.

Last, I am wondering how the broader community might be able to be included in the process now and provide input to the building committee before a design is selected as well as during the design process. The challenge is for those comments to be based on factual information and a true understanding of the visual (many people cannot translate 2 dimensional into 3D) and to know it is not only a vocal minority speaking (if that is the case) Has the BC discussed how they might try do this while staying on schedule with the timeline that has been created? Has the PTA provided questions or preferences for example? Buy-in at the outset by the broadest group possible would be helpful.

#### 19. Member of public: New Lebanon School Schematic Design Questions:

I - 95

- NOISE, Do you consider highway noise to be a problem, if so, how will you address the highway noise within the school? Highway noise can be a problem because of its decibel level and because of its constancy. The architect's acoustical consultant Jaffe Holden will be involved in the design of the new school, and strategies for noise mitigation will be part the consultant's work. Typically this involves adequate building massing, the proper placement of doors and windows, and the careful design of window details and glazing.

AIR QUALITY, There is concern that removing trees in the ravine will increase the pollution impact from the highway. How will you address that concern? From an outdoor perspective, adding new trees to the site would certainly offset the loss of trees caused by

construction of the new school. From an indoor perspective, the building will certainly include features to ensure good air quality indoors, using new technologies for filtering out pollutants, controlling humidity, mitigating radon, and eliminating off-gassing material in the building. In addition, monitoring devices can be installed to verify that indoor air continues to be free of pollution.

- 

#### TREES

- How many trees will be removed? Option 1 / Option 2 A&B / scheme D revised  
Option 1 = 103  
Option 2A & 2B = 74  
Option D Revised = 62
- Tree replacement and replanting plan. While the highway DOT states that a dense evergreen tree and shrub screen can only reduce 2 – 3 DB of sound, will you include this highway screen in your site plan? Yes.
- How many new trees are included in your site plan and are these trees superior species to those existing in the ravine? The number and location of new trees still needs to be determined after input from the Architect's acoustics consultant.

#### PARKING

- What is the required combined staff, parent and guest parking? The Architect recommends approximately 85 parking spaces, based on his experience. However, there is no specific number in the Ed Specs.
- Do all the schemes meet this requirement? Yes.

#### TRAFFIC FLOW

- Expand on the traffic flow around the school in Option 1. This option appears to have more area for buses and car queuing. Is that correct? Yes. Do you have a traffic engineer to do a study? Yes. The Architect's site engineer and traffic consultant Milone & MacBroom will do a study.

#### SAFETY

- All schemes require construction in this relative location and therefore the same need for after school and weekend security exists for all schemes.
- Discuss your safety concerns, if any, with constructing adjacent to an operating school.  
Safety measures must be designed and specified so that these measures are included in the construction project. Typically, construction specifications include fencing to separate the occupied school site from the construction area. In Options 1 and 2a, the playfield will need to be a contractor staging area, which will be fenced as well. Construction personnel will be required to wear identification badges, and they will be prohibited from entering the occupied school area on school days. A school calendar will be issued to the Construction Manager and the subcontractors so that they are aware of testing days when noisy construction activity is prohibited.



School vacations and holidays will be included in the construction schedule prepared by the Construction Manager so that noisy activities are done when school is not in session.

- Provide examples of schools that you have constructed adjacent to operating schools and whether there were safety incidents. The Architect has designed quite a number of schools that have been constructed adjacent to operating schools, most recently:

Green-Hill School, Bristol CT  
Jettie Tisdale School, Bridgeport CT  
Guilford High School, Guilford CT  
Tokeneke School, Darien CT

Refer to attached diagram that illustrates the proximity of these new buildings next to operating schools.

#### FOUNDATIONS

- What is anticipated for each scheme? Discuss, shallow versus deep foundations and rock blasting for each scheme.
- Foundations can be expensive. Are there structural borings to support the cost estimates for the foundations? Structural borings will be conducted after one of the Options is selected. Based on visual observation, it appears that the site consists of boulders, exposed rock, sand and clay, the usual New England glacial till, which typically does not require deep foundations. Therefore, cost estimates to date are based on shallow foundations. Some soil and rock removal is anticipated.

#### SOILS

- Which scheme requires the least excavation? Option 1.
- Have soil boring tests been conducted to indicate any soil contamination? The surveyor conducted two borings which contained no indication of soil contamination. However, a Phase One environmental report still needs to be done, and if required, some additional borings along with a Phase Two analysis.
- Of concern, the existing school sits on a retaining wall with soil fill, has this area been tested? Not at this time.

#### VILLAGE GREEN

How do schemes enhance the public space and contribute to the community center created by the library and green. In all Options the Gymnasium has been located on the North side of the site, adjacent to Richard Street, the library and the green. Each option has a separate entrance into the Gymnasium that could be used by the community after school hours. The remainder of the school could be locked off from the public if required. In Option D revised and Option 1 the Gymnasium is located on the same elevation as the green, allowing easy access to the fields for use during school hours. Richard Street could be gated off to allow safe passage from one area to the other. In Option 2 the Gymnasium is located on at the Northwest corner of the building site, on the higher elevation, adjacent to the library. In all of the options there are also play areas located on the North side of the site, adjacent to the playfields and library.



In Option D Revised and Option 2 the play area is located on the higher elevation. In Option 1 there are 2 play areas on the North side of the site. One play area is on the higher elevation and the other is at the level of the green and the Gymnasium.

#### DESIGN POTENTIAL

- Option 1 has the most corridor/ flex space and centralized communal spaces, expand on how this enhances the educational programs within the school. Flexible learning environments and centralized communal spaces outside of the classroom allow for social interactions and collaborative work between classes and grades. These spaces also foster a sense of community within the school (unity and belonging). Flexible centralized space also allows for a variety of learning environments and grouping formats that take into consideration all learning style profiles; individual study and reflection, one-on-one instruction, peer-to-peer discussion, small group work, large group work, teacher-directed instruction, and student presentation.
- Have you visited ISD, the other IB elementary school in Greenwich? This school makes good use of the communal corridor and flexible library/ performance space. We have not visited ISD yet. We will visit and talk to the principal. Most of our recently school projects have successfully incorporated the use of communal corridors and flexible spaces, including our Rogers IB School in Stamford.

#### 20. NLBC member: Questions for TSKP:

1. Please explain more about your interpretation of the Revised D design. Our presentation addresses the Scheme D design on two levels. The first level is intent. The second level is with the actual footprint given to us. Option 2 addresses intent only – it locates the building partly on both the upper and lower sites; it maintains the main entrance where the existing entrance is; it has a smaller footprint in the ravine. Our Option D address level 2, it utilizes the footprint given to us with minor modifications. These modifications are intended to make the resulting building more desirable and to allow it to achieve the goals set out in the Ed Spec and conform to building code. For example, we changed the shape of the footprint on the upper site so that the main entrance would be better connected visually to the parking, play and bus drop off.

As a three story building, Option D nearly exceeds the allowable building height as set for R-6 zone. This means that the amount of spaces with higher ceilings (other than the gym where it is an absolute requirement) is limited in Option D. You may have noticed that we show a small amount of sloped roof above the media center to make this large space have a little more vertical height, though this may exceed the allowable building height to be verified in later more detailed calculations.

2. Is what was presented the best configuration that can be created for Revised D? Yes, it is the best of the three initial approaches we took to this footprint.

3. You referred to the challenging "steep hill" and that there were a "number of handicaps". Please explain this in more detail. One difficulty of this footprint with regard to the slope is the location of the main elevator and stairways, which are most appropriately located at the building's center. We have done this in our Option D. However, it results in a significant amount of excavation at the lower level where it is below the existing grade.

4. Is the Revised D design limited by the topography and the constrained physical parameters you were given? The topography and the physical space of the site are constraints on all of the Options. All of the options fit within the property boundaries given.

5. How does the limited physical space interplay with the mandatory Code(s) and SSIC requirements for the building and the total campus design? Limited physical space of the site is something we encounter on many projects. With regard to interplay, we can say that code requirements and SSIC requirements are the priority. The better options succeed at achieving a total campus design while balancing the mandatory requirements.

6. Please explain the vertical flow of the design and long distances to various points in the building's envelope. The vertical flow of option D may be thought of as having the more public program areas on Level 1 and 2, such as the Administration and the Gym. Academic areas are on the third level, with the exception of the PK, K and 1, which are on Level 2. The internal circulation is organized as an L shape with egress stair shafts located at the end of each arm of the L shape and at the intersection. The main elevator is located at the intersection. A second elevator has been introduced to allow the kitchen to access the service area.

7. If you are given latitude (more space, i.e., in the north end of the wooded area) for the Revised D footprint, would that enable you to create a more functional design? If you need more, how much more footprint SF in the wooded is needed? If the footprint at the lower site were allowed to expand, we would have the potential to create a more functional design. We see Option 2 as our response to this suggestion. If your suggestion is that the building expands to the North and does not respect the property line, this may yield another option. As we mentioned above, all options respect the property lines.

8. Would mitigating the steepness of the site by removing some of the rock ledge assist in creating a more cohesive compact design? Is rock removal feasible? Cost prohibitive? Rock removal is expensive and each option that we've presented is judicious in the amount of rock excavation we have assumed. If rock removal were conducted on a much more grand scale, it would alter one of the significant constraints that we have designed around, the topography, and allow for other options to be presented.

**21. Member of public:** See attached.

## ROUND III – Q & A (Dated 11-17-2015)

### 22. NLBC Member:

1) Option 2: The smaller s.f. of playground space to other options concerns me. The site survey shows the existing playgrounds and paved play areas to be 9000sf, which comes to 34sf per student based on the 264 student enrollment reported in the Ed Spec. Option 2 has 16,700 sf of play area, which comes to 45sf per student based on the planned student population of 374 students. However, I can't find in the ed specs what the s.f. of the current playground is so I don't have a good sense of the increase (and I have to believe it's an increase from the current.)

2) I know all the options are ADA compliant. Is there any benefit of one over the other in term of accessibility to playspace and Williams St. field? Option 1 - the gym is adjacent to the field. Option 2 - the gym is on the upper level so how is easy access assured to playing field? All options are equal with regard to ADA accessibility to the field. In Option 2, an elevator is provided for ADA access to the lower level, which accesses the field in a similar way to the other options.

3) Is there a measure of "constructability" that would differentiate between option 1 and 2? No. For example, the fill requirement to raise 12-14 feet at the base of the building for Option 1 - does that add a level of complexity to the project that doesn't exist in option 2? All three options have located the lower level finished floor at the same elevation, so either a crawl space or filled area will be required in all schemes. We have not determined at this time whether importing fill or building an elevated slab which creates a crawl space will be the most economical. Option 1 has the greatest extent of this space. Option 2 has a smaller footprint with this condition and requires some cutting which will generate fill and thereby reduce the extent of crawlspace/imported fill. The site improvement figure of \$1 million for both options seems low to me just based on the dirt we've taken out/brought in for the MISA project.

4) Please confirm that the soft cost budget of \$4,120M is adequate for architect, CM, possible Owner's Rep and other associated soft costs (owner's testing, commissioning services, miscellaneous expenses.) I don't see a FF&E budget included - please confirm where it is and what it is. FF&E is included in the \$4,120M soft cost budget. The breakdown is as follows: A/E fees: \$2.2M, Playground equipment: \$200K, FF&E: \$922K, Technology: \$500K, Other soft costs, such as Owner's Rep, Special inspections, etc: \$300K.

5) I would very much like to stay away from a 3 story building (revised Scheme D wing in the back).

6) Water issues: (Run-off, storm water detention, possible rain garden) Is there a preferred option (e.g. less roof area or impermeable surfaces) which would minimize the

need for elaborate detention systems? We have asked the site/civil engineer to collaborate on this question and will respond shortly.

Option 1 is built further down into ravine than option 2 and does not have a portion on the ridge, thus it fits less well with neighborhood concern to preserve the woodlands

Option 1's use of ramps is a poor design for young kids

Option 1 is closer to I95 traffic and noise and fumes, a concern of the neighborhood

Option 2 as evaluated by architect has less favorable gym location in terms of proximity to ballfield, but I find it very acceptable

Option 2 has better parking capacity than D and better car queuing than any other option

Option 2 although having a smaller play area than option 1, does achieve the benefit of relocating a play area further away from highway than current playground as well as play area in revised D, a neighborhood concern

Option 2 has the most attractive magnet school design and a cohesive community feeling

Option 2 has plenty of natural light, a neighborhood concern

Option 2 has a better location for the cafeteria and better relationship to outdoors

Option 2 has a better location for the media center and better relationship to outdoors

\*\*\*\*\*

QUESTION - *Does Option 1 mean re-opening the MI referral of the BOS?* would not be in favor of that.

QUESTION - *What is the intended use of the playspaces in Option 2 and is there a proportion as to how many outdoor square feet are a good use for how many students?*

For playspace per student see above response. The Southern play area in option 2 was conceived of being for PK, K, 1 and 2, whereas the Northern play area was for 3,4, and 5. Another iteration of option 2 would flip the gym and PK, K classrooms such that the smaller Northern play area would serve, PK, and K, who require different play equipment than the upper grades. The larger Southern play area would then serve grades 1-5.



## **C. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FROM TSKP (11-17-15)**

Here is a brief summary of the revised options:

### **Option 1 Revised:**

- The minimum distance from the building to the property line running along I- 95 has increased to 130'.
- The play area at the lower level has been eliminated. The upper level play area has been split into two. The total area of play in this option is now 18,900sf or 50sf/student.
- The car queue length is now 37 cars.

### **Option 2 Revision #2:**

- The minimum distance from the building to the property line running along I-95 is now 210'.
- By moving classrooms to the North end of the building, the cafeteria acts as a buffer against highway noise incident on the building at the main level.
- The number of trees affected is reduced to a total of 70.
- The car queue length is now 37 cars.
- Parking at the lower level has been moved to the upper level. All parking is now at the upper level. The total number of stalls is now 72.
- The Site plan for this option now shows a green space in lieu of the bituminous drive which currently connects Richards and Church street. Interrupting the bituminous allows the field to extend to the building and pedestrian passage between the building and the field without vehicular interruption. The removal of this bituminous could be achieved in either Option 1 or 2. In option 2 the service entry is shown accessed from Richards Street, whereas in Option 1 it would be accessed via Church street.

One correction from last night: I misspoke with regard to the minimum distance from the existing building to I-95. The actual distance is 200'.

## **D. E-MAILS RECEIVED BY THE NLBC (AS OF 11-24-2015)**

### **E-mail 1**

11/15/15 Subject Line: Please Support Option 1, the Best Way Forward for a New New Lebanon

Tai Soo Kim's designs for a new New Lebanon address the educational and community interests with varying degrees of success. The designs attempt to preserve the beloved qualities of the school in different ways. Some take a literal approach by trying to build within the existing footprint, while "Option 1" takes a more conceptual approach, abstracting and preserving the most beloved qualities of New Lebanon and the larger site. This approach best maintains the spirit of New Lebanon with the potential to unite the community behind the project, not only because it is the best proposal, but because it is the most flexible for continued community input.

The requirements for a new New Lebanon from all stakeholders are clear:

- build a functional, properly sized school, restoring pre-K and Kindergarten
- Improve educational facilities and play fields on par with the rest of Greenwich
- build a compelling magnet school to address the achievement gap and racial imbalance for all of Greenwich, instead of bussing or redistricting
- preserve the bucolic, open green spaces of the site
- continue the concept of the school on a hill
- preserve or improve traffic patterns on the site
- build economically, without wasting money through the process
- build without disrupting the students' educational experience in the process

Option 1 most successfully meets this criteria, preserving the spirit of the school with a low profile on the hill by simply pushing the footprint back, allowing us to build down instead of up, and dramatically opening up the space in front of the school. Subsequently Option 1 has the most positive features:

- creates a compelling cohesive design focused around a sky lit media center
- creates more open space, more play fields, better traffic flow and parking
- maintains the spirit of New Lebanon's low profile and child friendly facade
- most functional, logical floor plan without the constraints of the historical footprint
- appealing circulation and common spaces
- improves field access by siting the school closer to the field
- has the most potential for design improvements without historical constraints
- cost-efficient, sustainable design with concise, economical building envelope
- does not waste money relocating students during construction

Plan D attempts to preserve the quality of the school and the site by literally building in the same location as the existing school. But it is impossible to fit a 58,000 sq/ft school in the footprint of a 37,000 sq/ft school, and it is problematic to build on the top of the hill while being required to connect with the field at the bottom of the hill. The resulting Plan D is awkward and unappealing:

- incoherent discontinuous design
- two story structure on the top of the hill doubles the height of the existing skyline
- three story structure at the bottom of the hill dwarfs the library and field
- awkward floor plan with long narrow hallways and long transit times
- fails to add more green space
- fails to improve traffic patterns or facilitate parent pickup by car
- expensive operating costs with sprawling floor plan and building envelope
- wastes money relocating students during construction

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC035

Options 2a and 2b also attempt to preserve the quality of the site by building in the same footprint as the existing school, somewhat more successfully than Plan D, while still suffering from similar shortcomings. But there are some successful aesthetic qualities to Option 2 that could be integrated into Option 1:

- singular central entrance creating a welcoming focus for the school
- playful zigzag roof line
- outdoor learning space

Option 1 is not perfect, but it is the best starting point with the most potential for improvement as it is not tied to the historical footprint. This footprint could be shifted slightly towards the field to address some additional concerns with the site:

- reduce the number of trees to be relocated
- move the school further from the highway
- move construction further away from students in the existing school

The current Municipal Improvement (MI) based on "Plan D Revised" should cover Options 1 or 2 without delay as the MI already includes building in the wooded area. Tai Soo Kim showed overlays of Option 1 and Plan D demonstrating that they have a lot in common, as their gymnasiums overlap in the wooded area next to the field. But the MI is not just about building a school, it is about developing the entire site as an educational and recreational campus for the community.

We have a unique opportunity to build with the state covering up to 80% of the cost, so we should be looking to improve the entire site, not just the school. The ball field should be updated to regulation specs and re-oriented to properly align with the sun; the ravine should be cleaned out, removing fallen trees and poison ivy, adding nature trails for children. We could work with the Audubon Society to restore the wetlands at the Southern end of the site creating educational opportunities for the children. Tai Soo Kim did something similar to beautiful effect at the Rogers International Magnet School in Stamford:

<http://www.tskp.com/project.aspx/city-of-stamford/rogers-international-environmental-magnet-school>

Please support moving forward with Option 1, it is the best and most flexible starting point for the design process to realize the community's vision for a fantastic new magnet school that compliments and improves this important site in the heart of Byram.

Best Regards,  
Eric Maurer

RTM Member-Elect District 4,  
Architect, Production Engineer, New Lebanon Parent

#### Email 2

11/16/2015 Subject: New Lebanon

Scheme D comes closest to what I hope the committee will ultimately select. Work **\*\*with\*\*** the topography, stay further away from I-95, and design a building that has the 'wow' factor largely on the existing site. The gym @ the north end of the ravine w/ access to the field makes a lot of sense. Otherwise, preserve as much of the ravine as possible for nature study & open space. It is the only land of that sort left in central Byram.

Whatever site/design is ultimately chosen, I find it hard to believe that the current building can be occupied during construction given safety concerns and noise. Eliminate that notion from consideration and build the best school possible on the best site w/ as little impact from I-95 as possible.

Glenn Petersen  
NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC036

**Email 3**

11/16/2015

Option 1 is the best for new lebanon school. . Thanks. .  
[Hector Martinez]

**Email 4**

11/17/2015 Subject option 1 support

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to take a moment to express my support of building option 1.

After reviewing the mock-ups it truly seems to me to embody what we are trying to accomplish for the future learning setting for our children.

By constricting the building to the limitations of the existing footprint we are doing a disservice to the community and the children. It is putting a square peg into a round hole-it won't work.

Start afresh. Build with access to play fields. Give the kids more play space.  
( I would love to see more sports ON SITE, I would love to see a state-of-the art science lab.)

Perhaps tweek the design but please build something that we can be proud of; not something that will be looked on as 'a decent solution at the time, but it should have/could have...'. consider the saying "Do it once, do it right."

Give our children more play space. Give them an example of sustainable living. Show them we can make their learning space safe, fun and environmentally appropriate.

If the architects can utilize the ravine for added space, in a safe manner, I am all for it.

Thank you for considering my words.

Kellie Gilmore  
Mother of a Kindergarten student

**Email 5**

11/17/2015 Subject: Option 1 for New Leb

Hello everyone!

I am a parent of 3 children, 2 at New Leb who are in 1st and K. My 3rd child will start kindergarten right when the relocation/building begins, and this all obviously effects our family in a huge way. I am concerned about the disruption this building will cause. My youngest has had a few (minor) sensory issues in preschool and the thought of moving him around as he gets older seems daunting to me. I worry about how he will adjust.

However, a new school is critical. There is no room whatsoever: it makes me sad to see band students practicing in the entrance way by the front door and teachers smushed into closets turned into offices. I did not move all the way to Greenwich expecting such big issues with our districted school and hope everyone will continue to pay close attention to New Leb and how desperately and quickly we need to fix this situation.

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC037



I love the idea of Option 1 and hope you will consider it. It sounds like a great plan for our school and seems to meet everyone's needs across the board. It seems like a terrific layout, and I very much hope you consider voting for it.

Thanks again for your continued support.

Colleen Wood-Smith, New Leb Parent

**Email 6**

11/17/2015 Subject: Last evening's meeting

Steve,

Did you notice that the Architects completely ducked the question when you asked them about the use of permanent modular construction? I do not have a detailed analysis of the current "schemes" but when I had the leading manufacturer of Permanent Modular schools price out the previous schemes, the results were significant. The importance of this issue is illustrated by two facts:

- 1 The construction time was reduced from 2.5 years to 6 months;
- 2 The cost was reduced by \$8 - \$12 million.

Permanent modular construction/ Offsite Construction should be given very serious consideration for many reasons, in addition to those listed above.

Another cause for concern which is not being given adequate consideration is having the children attending school in the middle of an active construction site for 2 to 3 years with the loud noise and safety risks that presents.

Peter [von Braun]

**Email 7**

11/17/2015 Subject Option 1 is the BEST and only option!

Dear Selectmen Tesel, Marzullo and Toner:

Please endorse option 1 as the design for the new New Lebanon School. Option 1 has all the appropriate design elements, utilizes the land resources in the most efficient and aesthetic way, and will provide our community's children a learning environment that they can thrive in and be proud of.

It is time to make the long term needs of this community a priority. A fresh, modern school facility for our children and families will begin to put us on a level playing field with the rest of Greenwich.

Please support option 1.

Andrea Casson Vaz  
Byram resident  
Former New Lebanon PTA president  
BOE employee (Glenville School)

Email 8

11/17/2015 Subject New Lebanon School Options

Good Morning

I am a parent of New Lebanon School and life long resident of Byram and would like to see the best option for the kids of our community to be executed in a timely manner. The New Lebanon community has been talking about the space issue for many years and we are doing an injustice to the students and faculty. The teachers have done the best they can and have cooperated along the way with lessons in closets, on stages and relocating to other locations. These are just bandages and are not sustainable.

We've had architects, committees and meetings to discuss the options about what is best and we are wasting time and money on pursuing options that pose many issues. Architects Tai Soo Kim Partners initial designs show that Option D is the lowest ranked options for the reasons stated in the presentation. Option 1 gives the community an educational facility for the teachers and students to thrive in for the long term & better market appeal. I've heard many concerns about Option 1 being close to I-95, but I would like to know how different is this from the Cos Cob Park that is situated on the sight of the power plant.

Option 1 will provide the students and faculty with the proper educational setting, both inside and out. Please strongly consider Option 1 and let's move forward with providing the students and faculty the proper educational environment.

Sincerely,  
Christine [Marullo]

Email 9

11/17/2015

Hi Stephen-

Thank you for taking the time to listen to all sides of the debate over New Lebanon! While we listen to a variety of opinions on the matter, it is important we differentiate facts from fiction, and truth from hyperbole.

For example, Alex Popp criticized Option 1 claiming the noisy cafeteria is at the center of the design. I have heard numerous people including NLBC members echo this sentiment, even though it is wrong. The sky lit media center is the central focus of the design at the entrance level of the building, while the cafeteria is on the lower level closer to the field. I imagine that Popp was so quick to dismiss Option 1, that he failed to read the drawings correctly, rather than intentionally mislead anyone. But all the same, this misinformation is out there and needs to be corrected.

Similarly, you explained that you have heard complaints that Option 1 is at the bottom of a hole. That is fair if that is someone's interpretation, but it is not fair to echo this sentiment as fact. It is not a hole, it is not even a ravine, and Option 1 is not at the bottom of it. If Option 1 is selected, I hope that you will help explain this so that the community can build support for the design and the NLBC's decision, rather than malign it with misinformation.

Conversely, if Plan D is selected, I hope that you will be able to explain this decision and unify the community behind it. My understanding of the appeal of Plan D is that it attempts to maintain the status quo by literally building in the same footprint as the existing school, but we cannot fit a square peg in a round hole, and the result fails to accomplish this goal of maintaining the status quo, which must be disappointing for supporters of Plan D.

Most of the questions last nite tried to identify tangible reasons for choosing one design over the other: which design will have the least noise pollution, air pollution, maintenance cost, heating cost, etc.. These are all

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC039

important issues to understand moving forward, but none of them are compelling arguments for one design over the other. Option 1 would be the most fuel efficient with the most concise building envelope at approximately ~65,000 sq/ft compared to ~100,000 sq/ft. This cost efficiency may be a nice selling point, but it is hardly a compelling deciding factor.

The important deciding factors should be which design will produce the best learning experience for our students and the most beautiful campus for our community. These subjective factors are difficult to quantify, rank with numbers, or describe in a chart. But a careful reading of the drawings and models should lead us to the same conclusion as Tai Soo Kim, that Option 1 is the best way forward.

Thanks again for your careful consideration of this important decision.  
Your time and thoughtfulness is greatly appreciated.

-Eric Maurer

Email 10  
11/17/2015 Subject: New Lebanon parent option 1

Hi my name is jackeline barriga i has two daughter un The New Lebanon school please The óption "1" is The Best for The children and The community thank you .  
[Jackeline Barriga]

Email 11  
11/17/2015 Subject: OPTION 1

Hello all,

Please take into consideration and vote with what is right for our children and vote for option 1 when it comes to New Lebanon's new school scheme. None of the parents want to have their children displaced. It's going to be hard enough to have to move them all to Western in 2017. Let's give them a break and not uproot their lives and take them away from what they know and love. Please think well and hard as if it were your children that were being affected. What would you want for them? I'm sure it would be for them NOT to be dispersed into different schools, taken away from their friends and ultimately dividing up our community. We have worked so hard to make our community what it is today. Please vote with us, not against us and keep our community together.

Option 1 seems to be the best plan for us.

Thank you for your time.

Erin Senft

Email 12  
11/17/2015 Subject: Option 1

Please please listen to the people who love Option 1  
I am a nursery school teacher and feel close to The Rodriguez family. I love Dana and Oscar's interest and dedication to New Lebanon so I want to support their wish. I like this idea too. It is simpler too.  
Thank you  
Anne Martine Cook

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC040

Email 13

11/17/2015 Subject: New Leb – Option 1A

Steve:

Thank you for allowing the public the continued ability for commenting on the new school building process. I was interested in Patricia Baiardi's concept stated at last night's Building Committee meeting of moving the Option 1 building to the west placing it on the hillside. For your consideration on the attached conceptual sketch (called "Option #1A"), I moved the Option 1 building even further to the west to the existing school site. On the Option 1A sketch, the new building would sit about 10-14' lower than the existing school building which results in a larger developable area. This option would require blasting of the rock but would provide the following:

1. The new building is out of the depression and would require no bridges for access.
2. Would appear consistent with Selectmen's approval.
3. Is 175% further from highway.
4. Provides improved light into classrooms.
5. Provides improved air circulation.
6. Saves more of the woodland which buffers the school from the highway.

I also like that in Option 1A the bus loop area could be closed off during the day so student can have safe access to the ballfield.

Matt.

Matthew J. Popp

Landscape Architect / Professional Wetland Scientist

Environmental Land Solutions, LLC

--- Response to this email by TSKP sent to NLBC ---

Stephen,

*I have reviewed the sketch of Option 1A with our team. We are concerned about the extent to which existing grade would need to be lowered, as referenced in Summary note #1. It appears to us that the upper site on which the existing building (elev. 61') sits has been lowered by 10-14' in this sketch. Re-grading by 14' would allow the lower level of the building to exit directly to the parking lot, drop off, and play area as shown on the West side of the building. It's a big area that would need to be re-graded to achieve this. The upper site is roughly 100,000 sqft in area. Lowering this area by 14' would require excavation in the range of 900K - 1.4 million cubic feet. Much of the material impacted appears to be rock. Our rough estimate for the removal of 1 million cubic feet of rock is \$2.2M. This number does not include exporting the material. Also, rock removal on this scale would mean significantly more blasting and may be an issue for the neighbors. For comparison, our option D has the most amount of excavation, which we've estimated at 70K cuft.*

*While we really appreciate the concept behind this sketch, we are concerned that revising to the topography on a grand scale may not be feasible given the project budget and community impact.*

Thanks,

Jesse Saylor, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architect

Tai Soo Kim Partners Architects • www.tskp.com

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC041

Email 14

11/17/2015 Subject: Choose Option 1 for New Lebanon School!

Dear New Lebanon Building Committee, Board of Education & Board of Selectmen,

I've attended various meetings and public forums for the past two years, listening to the community toss around many possibilities in regards to the new New Lebanon School building. Initially, I took comfort in the fact that a building committee consisting of professional in the field would be formed and they, along with planning & zoning, would be charged with making the final decision. Two years into this process, I realize that elected officials and some community members seem to think they are the experts in the real estate field or perhaps have an agenda of their own. It has been surprising, to say the least, to hear a few community members push back so hard at the various options when in fact there wasn't an actual design - only possibilities. Now, we are finally at the point where we have actual designs in front of us.

On Wednesday, November 11, as I sat and listened to Tai Soo Kim present the different options, **it is clear that the best design for the town and the students is Option 1. Option 1 not only meets the educational specs for our school community but causes the LEAST disruption to our students, offers the most functional design and layout and will integrate well with the Byram community.**

**There were several "handicaps" mentioned by Mr. Kim with Option D such as the service vehicles access to the building due to the steep hill, and putting a 3-story building on the footprint of where a two-story building fits. These handicaps should be enough reason NOT to choose Option D.**

**The main use of the building is for the students. In Option D there will be many students who will have to climb two levels of stairs to get to common spaces. On a daily basis the amount of travel time that would be equal to wasted non-instructional time is significant. The differential between Option 1 and Option D means students have lost hundreds of hours of instructional time traveling from their classrooms to the common spaces over six years of elementary education. By choosing Option D you are essentially condoning this loss of learning, which is significant in a school that has an achievement gap to overcome. Everyday, the New Lebanon School administration, parents and teachers are working extremely hard to bridge this achievement gap. Don't create more obstacles for the school community by choosing Option D.**

**As a parent of a current third grader and incoming kindergartener for 2016-2017, I urge you to NOT make this about politics, but to truly keep an open mind and make your choice based on what is best for the students educationally and for the Byram community for the next 50 plus years.**

**Thank you for your consideration.**

**Dana Rodriguez  
New Lebanon School PTA Executive Board Member**



Email 16  
11/17/2015 Subject: New Lebanon: Option 1

Dear Steve,

Regarding option 1, I hope the New Lebanon School building committee considers the following:

1. The 2018 Summer Workload is unrealistic. Over the course of two months, teachers will have to pack up, the building be completely razed, the parking lot graded and asphalted, two bridges built, and the occupancy certificate approved. This time frame is logistically tight and problematic. If missed, students would have to be schooled off site while this work is completed.

2. The William Street field/village green will be fenced off for years. The plan calls for this location to be used as a staging area. This is detrimental to maintaining a sense of community in our neighborhood. And it leads me to wonder where the students will have PE classes, and where would the neighbor kids play?

3. Housing our children in close proximity to a major construction site jeopardizes their safety. I recognize the construction site will be fenced off, but unforeseen accidents happen all the time. Just this week a perimeter fence around the Greenwich Reform Synagogue construction site fell. CMS students had to walk into oncoming traffic to proceed to school. And in May, an industrial air conditioner being hoisted by a crane to the top of a midtown New York building plummeted 30 stories after a cable snapped, and 10 people were injured by falling debris.

In closing, I recognize the committee comprises of individuals with specific expertise, yet I am puzzled by the lack of questions raised by appointed members.

Sincerely,

Alex Popp  
New Lebanon Parent  
Class of 2017 and 2020

Email 17  
11/17/2015 Subject: New Lebanon school

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the New Lebanon students and families. After reviewing the proposals and hearing the information presented I am strongly convinced that proposal 1 is the best choice. Having a second grader at New Lebanon one of my greatest concerns is the possible disruption to a secure familiar learning environment and having an option that keeps the New Lebanon family together is important. This proposal goes beyond that as well, providing space for years to come and keeping the continuity of our neighborhood.

I hope you will consider the wishes of those most intimately involved with New Lebanon and be diligent in seeking the best solution for those who depend so heavily on your decision.

Sincerely,

Kelly Johnson

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC043

Email 18

11/17/2015 Subject: Support for Option 1

Dear Building Committee Members,

I am writing to express my support for Option 1 as a New Lebanon parent and hope for your support of the New Leb families who wish to see this design become a reality. The plans for Option 1 as presented last week were beyond anything I could have envisioned for our school. The flow and layout of the school are so much more functional than anything we could have imagined for our children. And the modern design & central location of the medial center with skylights was perfect for a space that has so much focus in our childrens studies today. The Byram community finally has an opportunity to have a beautifully designed school that will attract students from other Greenwich communities as well as make this side of town a more attractive option for young professional families looking to move to a more affordable part of town.

In closing, please consider the opinions of those of us with children in the school for Option 1 and not those of a small group that have their own agenda with no vision for Byram's future. Let's move from the status quo and create a learning space for the younger generation who will also be proud to bring their own kids to the New Lebanon school in the years to come.

Kindest Regards,  
Dana Sanchez

Email 19

11/17/2015 Subject Vote for Option 1!!!

Dear New Lebanon Building Committee, Board of Education & Board of Selectmen,

I would like to take a moment to express **my support of Option 1 for the new New Lebanon School**. I attended Monday night's meeting and listened intently to all of the responses to the questions submitted and additional questions raised by the New Lebanon Building Committee members. The highlight of the evening for me was the discussion specific to Option D. Some committee members asked about modifications to Option D in reference to building height and location among other things. For example, "can we get around building a 3-story structure for Option D," to which Mr. Kim replied "no." They've never built a 3-story building, because it's not efficient and clearly the least favorable option in their opinion. Based on the architect's responses to the Option D questions raised, it is clear from their professional opinion that **Option D is the least desirable of all**.

The students and Byram community need and deserve the best option presented by Tai Soo Kim, and that is Option 1. This is your opportunity to make the right decision that will provide the best long-term investment that will benefit the New Lebanon Students and the Byram Community for years to come.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this most important matter.

Regards,

Oscar Rodriguez  
New Lebanon Parent & Byram Resident

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC044

Email 20  
11/17/2015 Subject: Voting for option 1

To whom it may concern:

Hello my name is Alberto H. Figueroa and I only want it to write you that I vote for option # 1 on the construction for my daughter school new building!

My address is: [redacted]

If any questions, please don't hesitate to reach me at 904-608-6962.

Thank you!  
[Alberto H. Figueroa]

Email 21  
11/18/2015 Subject: Option 1

Dear NLBC members,

I want to thank you for all the work, effort and time that all of you had dedicated to New Lebanon School.

Voting for a new building is not only understanding and listening to the professionals who you hired to guide you to the best solution but also thinking of the future of the Byram children and the future generations.

In my opinion, Option 1 is the best solution and provides the architects to be creative instead of forcing them to fit a solution in a limited and not ideal location. Our children will also be benefiting by having closer proximity to the center of their enrichment activities and enhance their learning experience.

Once again, I want to thank you for all the effort and please think about the New Lebanon children and future generations when you vote.

Best Regards,

Diego Sanchez  
New Lebanon PTA Co-President  
Parent of two children at New Lebanon

Email 22  
11/18/2015 Subject: Fwd: some concerns

When do you plan on meeting with the Byram Community to explain your vote to recommend Option 1, instead of going forward with Plan D, or revised Plan D, as decided by the Selectmen after a year of deliberation with the community?

Mary-Ann Zalman

Email 23  
11/23/2015 Subject: New Lebanon Architects' Presentation

Dear all:  
NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC045

My concerns re: New Lebanon School Construction Plans:

Safety – Construction with children on site is dangerous. Children must be relocated.

I have personally experienced a near tragedy on our own major house renovation and witnessed the death of a nine-year old playing on a construction site where we all played as children. Just today the specter of a huge crane at the side of I-95 was frightening and brought to mind all possible construction accidents. Would the children be required to wear hard hats?

Tai Soo Kim and Partners are apparently very talented architects but they have ignored the mandate to build on the current site and stay away from the ravine. One of the reasons that there were so few comments prepared for the NL Building committee meeting on November 16 is that community members were shocked and dismayed that the architects' preferred proposal flew in the face of the community and their Selectmen and was sited in the ravine. The group of listeners was literally speechless following the presentation.

It seems that Tai Soo Kim architects are trying to appeal to the town to save \$2.1 million by claiming they can build a new structure alongside the current New Lebanon School (in the wooded ravine) and keep our children in their classrooms during construction. Upon completion of the new structure, they propose to demolish the old school and then add a huge traffic infrastructure and two small play areas. One can bet that the \$33 million budget will already have been spent on building the new structure and that demolition and the massive traffic configuration will come in as cost add-ons. Had child safety ever been their concern? Our wise selectmen have repeatedly stated that the children will not be on the construction site. Do New Lebanon parents really want to put their children in danger?

So Tai Soo Kim Partners exhibited a model of a school to be built in an arsenic polluted ravine abutting I-95 with its noise and carbon dioxide and monoxide pollution (terrible conditions for asthmatics and migraine sufferers). They would destroy the tree buffer that the school and neighborhood enjoys. They gave short shrift to Plan D or Option D revised while clearly promoting their Option 1 as having a "Wow" factor.

Option 1 is a solid block albeit with curves inside and out. "Where is the "Wow" factor? The building seems bloated. The school entrances comprise 2 bridges. Are these two separate entrances? Wouldn't children enjoy entering school along with everyone: their friends, brothers and sisters and neighbors? Is bridging the proper use of the topography? Unless there is a stream to traverse, bridges look like compensation for improper siting of the building. There is a massive traffic pattern in front of the school which detracts from the school's visual impact. Take a look at the confusing traffic pattern, entrance and parking lot at Glenville School for example. Couldn't this mess be avoided at New Lebanon?

A "Wow" factor can be created on any design by creating a beautiful façade and having sumptuous, functional interiors.

What I hope to see is the main part of the school built on the original high, dry and bright location. The gym and media center can enter the ravine if necessary. I think this is a reasonable compromise.

Alternatively, Option 1 could be moved west and north, but it's a bit too massive. I prefer an L-shaped configuration. I have confidence that our newly constituted NL Building Committee can achieve the best for Byram for the long term.

Sincerely,

Susanne Wahba

NLBC 12-3-2015 update

NLBC046



## **E. NL FIELD OPTIMIZATION**

11/19/2015

Subject NL field optimization

Hi Steve,

The New Leb students have never used their athletic field as they deserve. We now have the opportunity to build an excellent athletic field which they can use. Excellence will also attract the magnet students, a key objective.

An optimized field is shown in the attached drawing. (This is from page 40 of the supplemental materials to the BOE June 4 meeting. Apart from the field layout, the other elements of this sketch are out of date and unimportant, obviously.)

This optimized, artificial turf, baseball-and-soccer field will be the best among Greenwich's elementary schools. It may require that the school footprint be shifted south slightly. This is relevant to TSK's current work. This opportunity for excellence of the student experience must not be missed.

Please provide this to TSK and the Committee.

Thanks,  
Sincerely,  
Bill

Member, Board of Estimate and Taxation  
Chairman, Investment Advisory Committee  
Vice Chairman, New Lebanon School Building Committee

11/19/2015 attachment to Bill Drake's "NL field optimization" email

**EXHIBIT E: Part I: Proposed Site Option A**

