

Greenwich Board of Education Minutes of the GHS Front Entry Committee Meeting

DATE: October 6, 2022

LOCATION: Virtual via Google Meet

TIME: 8:00 am

Committee Members Present:

Stephen Walko - Chairman

Jake Allen- Vice Chairman

Maureen Bonanno-Secretary

Ashley Cole

Louis Contadino

Stephanie Cowie

Christina Downey (BOE)

Leslie Moriarty (BET)

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Craig Amundson (RTM)

Ralph Mayo (GHS Principal)

Tom Bobkowski (BOE - Central Office)

Dan Watson (BOE- Central Office)

Will Schwartz (DPW)

Dennis Yeskey (P&Z)

Others Present:

David Stein (Silver Petrucelli)

Bob Banning (Silver Petrucelli)

Matt Gallerani (Silver Petrucelli)

Chris Cykley (CSG)

Not Present:

Megan Galleta

Lauren Rabin (Board of Selectmen)

Steven Swidler (BOE Staff)

- **Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order by Mr. Walko at 8:01 a.m.
- **Project Review:**
 - Mr. Walko stated that the BOE had directed the committee to go back to Silver Petrucelli for a redesign of the project that is within budget.
 - Mr. Walko noted that he sent to the committee 3 new design concepts from Silver Petrucelli, which will be discussed today.
 - Mr. Walko reviewed the original budget which originally included \$250,000 for soft costs or A&E money and \$2,750,000 for construction costs. He added that

the \$250,000 was already used for the previous design, so future soft costs will come from the construction costs, which should also include a 10% contingency.

- Ms. Moriarty stated that the cost of the project will also depend on the add-alternates that the committee chooses to include; those previously discussed included radiant flooring and the ballistic glass in the corridor. She also noted that there may be some expenses not part of the GC contract such as the security equipment and cameras which were not in the RFP scope but may need to come from our budget. She also noted that there is still some question as to how much landscaping will be included in our budget. Ms. Moriarty suggested that the budget could be as low as \$1,800,000 available for a GC contract, noting that she was conservative on her assumptions and this amount included funds for an owner's rep.
- Mr. Walko noted that we have not factored into the revenue side the PTA funds or any other potential sources.
- Ms. Downey stated that although we want to stay on budget, everyone wants to get this project done, and if we end up being just short of funds, there may be some appetite from the BOE side to go for interim funding. She noted that safety and security is even more of a priority now than when the project started.
- Mr. Walko noted that we are not voting on dollar amounts or the add-alternates at this point.

- **Silver Petrucelli Design Presentation:**

- Mr. Stein stated that they downsized the original design to fit within a framework of the budget and although they are being conservative in approach, the intent was not to lose the mission of a security project and a well designed entry.
- Mr. Stein stated that they developed 3 schemes, different in look but similar in functionality, with one scheme to fall within the budget. He added that the \$1.8MM was the number that they also estimated for the cost of the project.
- Mr. Stein stated that the original design was just over 2,000 sq. feet and in order to meet the budget, square footage would need to be reduced along with some different material choices. Mr. Stein noted that the 2 bidders on the original project provided a detailed breakdown of their individual divisions, including the glazing, the roofing, the steel, the concrete etc and from this breakdown, Silver Petrucelli determined that the cost of security glazing was double than what it was originally budgeted for and what it historically was, so the overall square footage of glazing would need to be reduced.
- Mr. Stein noted that all 3 designs reflect a 1st sketch, intended to give a sense of scale and material and the landscape design is identical to what was proposed in the original design. He added, the mechanical systems need to be designed as before and noted there should be some downsizing savings there, but not a significant amount.

- **Design 1**

- The smallest of the designs, square footage is reduced by half.
 - Meets egress requirements.

- The security desk is located on the right side but still provides good visibility.
- A ramp for ADA leading to the office.
- The width of the building is reduced.
- Work to the office is minimized, utilizing technology instead of reconfiguring.
- White panels shown in drawings were in response to ARC's suggestion to use existing materials throughout the building. The white panels are used in MISA.
- Covered canopy for students.
- Height matches the existing entryway.

■ Design 2

- Slightly larger, same depth for a total of 1,425 sq feet.
- Security desk location similar to original design.
- The office work is interchangeable in any scheme.
- Similar elements to Design 1.
- Not required to have security glazing on the upper level/could have traditional glazing or lesser ballistic level which would help to reduce cost given the estimates for ballistic glazing came in at \$700 sq foot vs. \$350.
- Solid face on the side to reduce glazing.

■ Design 3

- Architecturally closer to the original scheme.
- Angled entryway totalling 1,130 sq feet
- Overhang is slightly deeper.
- The most ambitious and hardest to get to the budget but there are strategies to get closer including: only doors could have ballistic grade upper level does not, Wood paneled screen vs. brick, and simplification of interior including the lighting.

● Discussion on Silver Petrucelli Proposals

- Ms. Cowie stated that she does not like Design 1, from an ADA perspective, it would be tight, Design 2 is a possibility but prefers Design 3.
- Mr. Contadino stated that from a circulation perspective, Design 1 does not work given the security desk is on the opposite side of the office but he thought that it encompasses the current entry way of the building in a logical way. Mr. Contadino noted that the other 2 designs do not extend to the end leaving a disconnect to the existing building. He added that he likes the introduction of wood in Design 3 but noted his disappointment over the loss of the columns and asked why the architects started from scratch regarding the materiality.
- Ms. Cole agreed with Mr. Contadino and she expressed her disappointment over losing the original design. She stated that Design 3 could be a possibility.
- Ms. Downey noted there were visibility issues with Design 1 and Design 2. She noted that by not having glass, it creates security issues. She also stated that she likes the angle of Design 3 and thinks that Design 1 looks just like a box

thrown on the front of the building and does not enhance it and Design 2 is slightly better, but thought that we originally rejected an earlier version of this design. She suggested that we focus on Design 3 and work to get it within budget.

- Ms. Moriarty stated that the panels used in MISA were chosen for cost only and they are typically used on warehouse type structures. She added that they are thin metal and easily damaged. She noted that getting the right material in the design would be important given it is a high use area.
- Mr. Walko asked the committee if they wanted to see a further expansion of Design 1 and the committee agreed not to move forward with Design 1.
- Mr. Walko stated that from a functionality reason, putting the security desk on the opposite side doesn't work as well.
- Mr. Walko stated that, based on the comments, the majority of the committee prefers Design 3 from an aesthetic perspective, however from a cost perspective, Design 2 would be less expensive.
- Ms. Downey stated that in terms of cost savings, we should consider minimizing the work involving the main office.
- Mr. Walko asked if we can get a more comprehensive estimation of cost for the 2 designs to show side by side comparison along with anything that would change mechanically.
- Mr. Stein recommended that S&P come back to the next meeting with side by side estimates of the 2 designs along with anything that would change mechanically or electrically and he believes there could be savings in minimizing the work inside the building.
- Mr. Walko asked Mr. Stein for the next presentation to include the location of the mechanicals.
- Ms. Moriarty suggested that Mr. Mayo and his administration weigh in on the work to the main office. Mr. Walko added that the fire chief and police chief also should review the design to get their input.
- Ms. Bonanno asked if the signage gets lost when the height is reduced and Mr. Stein responded that in Design 1, it definitely goes away but on the other designs, they need to take a closer look.
- Mr. Walko asked if the next presentation can include current knowledge of the cost of the add alternates.

- **Going Forward/Next Meeting:**

- Mr. Walko stated that the next committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 19th to compare the 2 designs and review the budget for each.
- Mr. Stein stated that he will refine the designs further.
- Ms. Downey reminded the committee that the design still needs to be approved by the BOE and will add it to the BOE agenda when the committee approves. She added that the next regular BOE meetings are October 20th and November 16th, with a budget meeting in between. Mr. Walko asked if this could be taken up at the budget meeting and Ms. Downey responded that she did not think it

could be taken up at a budget meeting, but they could potentially add a special meeting.

- Ms. Moriarty asked about the Owner's Rep bids that were sent out and Mr. Walko responded that they expired and we will need to go out to bid again.
- Mr. Yeskey suggested that we do a pre-app to avoid potential ARC complications and Mr. Walko responded that we would first need BOE approval.
- Ms. Cowie stated that a letter went out to the neighborhood through the PTA and gave a brief overview of the project status and suggested that we get the neighborhood involved again.

- **Approval of Minutes:**

Motion was made by Stephanie Cowie and seconded by Leslie Moriarty to approve the minutes of the September 7th, 2022 meeting. The motion was approved.

The Motion Passed 8-0-0

- **Adjourn:**

- The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Walko at 8:56am.

Submitted by Maureen Bonanno on October 17th, 2022