

**Cardinal Stadium “Project Big Red” Committee Meeting Minutes  
GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**DATE:** 12-18-2019

**PLACE:** Havemeyer Building, 290 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830  
Professional Development Room

**ATTENDANCE:**

Stephanie Cowie, First Selectman’s Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities  
Laura Erickson, BET  
Tim Coughlin, Parks and Recreation  
Jim Michel, Department of Public Works  
Amy Siebert, Department of Public Works  
Susan Fahey, RTM  
Joe Klein

**BOE Member**

Joe Kelly

**BOE Administration:**

Toni Jones, Superintendent  
Sean O’Keefe, Chief Operations Officer  
Dan Watson, Director of Facilities  
Gus Lindine, Athletic Director  
Ralph Mayo, Headmaster

**Architect**

Russ Davidson, KG & D

**Other**

Rick Kral, Mike Jedlicka

Call to Order – 6:20 pm

**1. Meeting Opening**

Request from Joe Kelly for GAF members to present their plan as a comparison. GAF discussion will be Part A of the meeting and then follow up with more discussion after the presentation.

**2. GAF Presentation**

GAF shared that visitor side bleachers renderings were done with individuals who are very familiar with the GHS property. All knowledgeable with the history of the site and there is no ground water issue in that area. There are some surface water challenges.

Bleachers would be elevated instead of excavating into the bank to allow space underneath the visitor bleachers. Existing bleachers are wider than what is being proposed. The higher bleachers will lift higher for vertical height. Replacing the existing footprint is the path of least resistance from the

viewpoint of a builder.

There is a proposed set back of 11' between the visitor bleachers and the track. If the track should be renovated in the future to accommodate metric measurements, the distance is provided to do so. The center of the stadium shifts to the north in order to make eight lanes.

Propose to put ADA parking behind the home bleachers. GAF went back to consultants and engineers and discussed the concerns about the compacted space. Turn around space is allowable. There are 17 ADA spaces. To add ADA standards on the visitor side there would be a walkway that would be paved.

The space on the far end of the home stands would be for a practice area.

The restrooms and bathrooms can be accessed by the middle of the bleachers of the east side of the home bleachers. A courtyard on the east side is maintained.

28 x 86 is the proposed home side team room (approximately 2400 sf)  
1200 square feet is proposed for the visitor side.

#### *Committee Questions/Comments*

Concerns were raised that parking behind the home bleachers could mix students/children and cars. Also, the cars proximity to the home stadium bleachers.

The entrance behind the home bleachers is right in and right out. No proposed changes to the driveways or accesses in this plan.

Clarification of ticket booth and concession stand as GAF proposed:  
Includes a ticket booth with internet to accept e-tickets and host playoff type games. Concession stand is smaller and provides selling of t-shirts, bottled water, not a cooking space.

Food trucks would be on the east side. Water and hookups would be provided. The grade would be sloped to provide lawn space.

Visitor side ADA parking would be the overflow parking near the baseball field to get a total of 20 spaces.

Storage has five roll up doors on the visitor side bleachers for storage. Parks and Recreation agree the storage is greatly needed in the plan. Many items are currently stored.

Plumbing would connect from the visitor side to the manhole located close to the entrance.

### **3. KG & D Input**

The early plans were modeled from the GAF plan earlier iteration.

KG & D heard from the police that they did not want parking behind the home bleachers for safety purposes. Can it be done? Yes, however, perpendicular parking is not what is expected to be provided for ADA parking.

The original design is at 60% design in the way it was proposed. Changing would mean starting over. The visitor bleachers have always been proposed to be elevated. A building can go under the visitor side, but there is surface water challenges which could seep. The under the bleachers could be waterproofed, but it is not the best design.

Question...parking issue, could we have both?

KG & D believes that the spaces behind the home bleachers is going to be very restricted access. Access exiting from the rear of the vehicle could be difficult with compacting parking behind the bleachers. Behind the stadium could be problematic for exiting. If the parking lot is separate, the ADA vehicle exits and then has access to a sidewalk in front of the parking space area to stay out of the active drive.

Entering the team room on the home side, from KG & D perspective, is better to access from a sidewalk with bollards protecting the walkers than through a tunnel under the bleachers.

GAF would like to preserve the space for future fields where KG & D is proposing the parking driveway.

Last meeting: Field ability or field space, was Option 3 (committee comments)

KG & D heard from community and staff input that the team room openings should be visible. The GAF plan is under a tunnel and not as easy to access.

#### **4. Committee Discussion**

What is bothering GAF with the KG & D committee work design?

GAF Comment: Very close. The additional building may need to be revisited. The designs are close.

Road Project

Last meeting was a great deal of discussion about the road and bridge. Many variables as to where we could have the road or not. Many future questions to be answered. Discussion among the BOE is to continue two different projects as the stadium and the road.

If the project is phased it must be in one Municipal Improvement (MI) process. If it's separated we could consider two different MI projects.

There can be any number of MI's presented at one time. They do not need to be tied together if the committee recommends a first project.

KG & D- if the completion of one phase needs another phase to be operational then it is one MI. If the project is separated, a later project can move through a separate MI process.

The current 60% design is looking at a driveway for ADA, not a road in the first project stage.

It's always been a driveway because it is on our own property. If it's a road, it must meet all of the safety expectations for fire, police, wider road, and robust bridge for fire trucks and such.

The committee wanted a 24' wide road if it was a safety/emergency access road. Again, right now it's a driveway.

Could also go back for a site plan modification.

Committee comments...

Why couldn't Option 3 work? ...What the committee had been deciding on.

The GAF prefers the building under the visitor bleachers. Some committee want the separate building near the entrance in terms of the visitor bleachers. Regardless of type, the buildings are proposed to have heat and air.

Splitting the two projects up into the stadium and a future road project could assist in moving the project faster.

Future costs could escalate by separating because of escalation of 4-6% per year.

Some concerns are that the traffic study and community input would see this project as one.

The stadium focused scope would put team rooms back under the visitor side bleachers. Which is a discussion point for the BOE.

Reiterate that the emergency access is needed.

## **5. Final Comments**

Suggestion on under the bleachers... Go that route or the separate building?

KG & D- it is a new footprint because we are changing the size

Will we have another meeting?

Does the committee want to have a vote tonight?

The committee wanted to take a vote.

How many people took the survey to choose option 1, 2, 3 ?

There were nine who took the option survey and eight of nine wanted Option 3.

The committee voted for KG & D Option 3.

9-0 unanimously voted to move that option forward to the BOE.

## **6. Adjournment**

Meeting ended at 8:02 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Toni Jones

Approved 1/3/20