

# Meeting Agenda

**Project:** Greenwich Public Schools  
Riverside School Study  
90 Hendrie Avenue  
Riverside, CT 06878  
State Project No.

**Meeting No.:** (FS-06)

**Meeting Date:** 12/3/2024

**Job No.:** 24051

**Meeting Time:** 4:00 PM

**Author:** Lisa Yates, AIA, LEED AP

**Location:** Riverside School

**E-mail:** [lyates@antinozzi.com](mailto:lyates@antinozzi.com)

**Overview:**

A project kick-off meeting was held to initiate the Feasibility Study for the Greenwich Riverside Project

**Attendees:**

- Dr. Toni Jones, Superintendent of Schools, Greenwich Public Schools (GPS) [toni\\_jones@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:toni_jones@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Ben Branyan, Chief Financial & Admin. Officer, (GPS) [ben\\_branyan@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:ben_branyan@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Sophie Koven, BOE (GPS) [sophie\\_koven@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:sophie_koven@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Jason Martin, Principal, Riverside School (RS) [jason\\_martin@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:jason_martin@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Mary Dean Collette, Assistant Principal (RS)
- Dan Watson, Facilities Director (GPS) [daniel\\_watson@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:daniel_watson@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Lucia Jansen [luca.jansen.bet@greenwichct.gov](mailto:luca.jansen.bet@greenwichct.gov)
- Pam Kelly, Kindergarten Teacher (RS) [pam\\_kelly@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:pam_kelly@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Kiesha Neitzell, 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher (RS) [keisha\\_neitzell@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:keisha_neitzell@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Alex Popp, 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher (RS) [alex\\_popp@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:alex_popp@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Jessica Punchatz, Music Teacher (RS) [jessica\\_punchatz@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:jessica_punchatz@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Jessica Rosa [jessica\\_rosa@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:jessica_rosa@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Jessica Wahlers [jessica\\_wahlers@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:jessica_wahlers@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Lynn Sterner, Literacy Specialist (RS) [lynn\\_sterner@greenwich.k12.ct.us](mailto:lynn_sterner@greenwich.k12.ct.us)
- Betsy McIntyre, PTA (GPS-PTA) [betsy.s.mcintyre@gmail.com](mailto:betsy.s.mcintyre@gmail.com)
- Virginia Lockhart, PTA (GPS-PTA) [virginia.b.lockhart@gmail.com](mailto:virginia.b.lockhart@gmail.com)
- Carey Bisbee, PTA (GPS-PTA) [carey.starno@gmail.com](mailto:carey.starno@gmail.com)
- Fran DiFiore, Construction Solutions Group (CSG)
- Jim Giuliano (CSG) [jimg@csgroup-llc.com](mailto:jimg@csgroup-llc.com)
- Paul Lisi, Antinozzi Associates (AA) [plisi@antinozzi.com](mailto:plisi@antinozzi.com)
- Michael LoSasso, Antinozzi Associates (AA) [mlosasso@antinozzi.com](mailto:mlosasso@antinozzi.com)
- Lisa Yates, Antinozzi Associates (AA) [lyates@antinozzi.com](mailto:lyates@antinozzi.com)
- Patti McKeon, Antinozzi Associates (AA) [pmckeon@antinozzi.com](mailto:pmckeon@antinozzi.com)

**STUDY PROCESS**

Item	Origin	Description	Action by
2.1	FS-01	<p>GENERAL – GPS STUDY PROCESS</p> <p><i>10/15/2024 Minutes: The purpose of the study was reviewed again. Dr. Jones reiterated that we are early in the process. What is the committee’s role? Per Dr. Jones, the committee’s role is advisory.</i></p> <p><i>The Educational Specifications and program to be provided will be subject to detailed review and updating by the BOE, which votes on the Ed Spec. The BOE spends a lot of time reviewing the Ed Spec and programming. Goes through the Board of Estimate &amp; Taxation (BET) and the Representative Town Meeting (RTM). There will be hours of upcoming public</i></p>	

		<p><i>meetings; per Joe Kelly there were 200 meetings for the middle school. Committee members are encouraged to attend BOE meetings if they would like to speak.</i></p> <p><i>The process will us an outside estimator, in addition to the Design Team’s estimating consultant.</i></p> <p><i>Per Dr. Jones, the study sometimes transforms when design progresses. For New Lebanon, the initial concept placed the building on the field. Building was placed in a different spot.</i></p>	
2.5	FS-06	<p><b>CONCEPTUAL PLAN AND ADJUSTMENTS TO TARGET AREAS:</b>            In order to emerge from the upcoming BOE/BET/RTM review process with a viable project basis, Dr. Jones advised that we look at more modest expectations for space sizes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We have developed conceptual plans which keep the total square footage at or below the 70,217 eligible for State reimbursement, holding the total size of all additions at or below 12,507 square feet. While Greenwich may not pursue reimbursement, keeping the size down will reduce the cost outlay.</li> <li>○ We have added columns to the Space Program for proposed areas. In general, the “Ideal” areas are the largest, the “Existing” areas are smaller, and the “Proposed” areas are somewhere in between, or match existing in cases where we are retaining spaces like the Gym and some classrooms. It should be noted that the existing building also limits the size of some of the secondary instructional space; when we increase classroom sizes within the building, we come up with secondary spaces that are a little smaller than a normal classroom.</li> <li>○ We are expecting to classify the building as “Expansion/Alteration” in terms of potential State reimbursement, so we will not rehabilitate all spaces to the extent required for “Renovate as New.”</li> </ul> <p><i>12/3/2024 Minutes:</i></p>	
2.4	FS-02	<p><b>EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS:</b> Review items to adjust; note any new feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We will add language to the Ed Spec “Rationale for the Project” describing the age of the building, need for an elevator and ADA upgrades, and will note some of the main areas in need of improvement, like the Cafeteria.</li> <li>○ We will include a copy of the ADA report prepared by Silver Petrucelli. We will include it as an Appendix and note that we intend to address all priority 1 and 2 items.</li> <li>○ There has been some discussion regarding identification of elements that are “legally required” for the project. In terms of construction, Greenwich is not “legally required” to perform any upgrades unless the school is in danger of losing its accreditation, or unless the Fire Marshal requires immediate action, and neither of these appear to be immediate issues. There are, however, legal triggers which are pulled once work is performed. For instance, sprinklers will be required throughout for any unseparated building addition. When renovating the building, the code requires that primary function areas be made accessible provide the cost of ADA upgrades does not exceed 20% of the total renovation cost. Code compliance is another general requirement which can get very detailed depending on the scope of work.</li> <li>○ Upon acceptance of the conceptual plans, proposed areas will be integrated into throughout the document, possibly noting the ideal areas that served as a starting point.</li> </ul> <p><i>12/3/2024 Minutes:</i></p>	

		<p><i>11/19/2024 Minutes:</i></p> <p><i>Site feedback:</i>  <i>Maintenance of current number of parking spaces, minimum is critical. Separate bus loop is probably not needed.</i>  <i>There is only one bus, and it parks on Hendrie. Students within one mile are not offered bus service, and the majority of students are within one mile.</i>  <i>The area at the southwest corner, and near the gym is tight.</i>  <i>Trees desired near play areas. The former large oak tree south of the playground near the school fell onto the playground (A Hopp)</i></p> <p><i>Lucia Jansen:</i>  <i>Wants to develop a table to describe all legal mandates for the building upgrades</i>  <i>What specific features are new and required for ADA compliance</i>  <i>Wants all the estimated costs</i>  <i>What is the total impact to the local sewer system (?)</i>  <i>Description of all the mechanicals</i>  <i>Land use approvals - What kind of PNZ approvals are necessary</i>  <i>Wants all the teaching spaces listed in a one-page chart</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

## WORK TO DATE

Item	Origin	Description	Action by
7.4	FS-04	<p><b>NEXT STEPS</b>                      With a draft Educational Specification and associated Building Program complete for review, the Design Team can now generate “test fits” of one or more layout options for the study.</p>	
7.5	FS-05	<p><b>SPACE STANDARD</b>                      For an enrollment of 442, assuming the school retains the 52,780sf constructed prior to 1959, the State considers a total area of 66,425sf eligible for reimbursement. The existing school is 57,709sf, resulting in an eligible addition size of 8,716sf. <b>With addition of 30 PK students, the maximum eligible total area goes up to 70,217, which is a 12,507 sf addition.</b></p> <p><i>12/3/2024 Minutes:</i></p>	

## SCHEDULE

Item	Origin	Description	Action by
6.1	FS-01	<p><b>SCHEDULE:</b> Regarding deliverables for presentation to the BOE, Dr. Jones advised us that in addition to the Educational Specifications, a professional cost estimate based on conceptual plans will be required. The interviews for the Ed Specs were conducted four weeks later than originally anticipated, which pushed out the Ed Specs, so we are just now reviewing the associated conceptual plan. We do not have time to get the plans reviewed and estimated prior to the 12/12/24 BOE meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dr. Jones advised that the next opportunity to present to BOE is January 16th, 2025. We are targeting this date.</li> <li>○ Upon review and acceptance of the conceptual plan, we will transmit the package to our cost estimator. Assuming we transmit our package to the estimator on or around 12/18/24, he should be able to get us a draft for Design Team review around a week before the BOE Meeting.</li> </ul>	AA

	<p>SCHEDULE UPDATE &amp; REMAINING POTENTIAL MEETINGS:</p> <p><b>December 3rd-</b> Meet to review conceptual plan defining scope for cost estimation. <b>December 10<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup></b> - follow-up meetings are possible if needed but due to evening obligations Design Team must be virtual. <b>December 18<sup>th</sup></b> – Package sent to Cost Estimator (Tom Hardin, PACs, Inc.) <b>January 9<sup>th</sup></b> – Draft Cost Estimate may be available for review by Design Team <b>January 14<sup>th</sup></b> – Possible final meeting date <b>January 16<sup>th</sup></b> - Present Educational Specification to the Board of Education, 7:00 pm</p> <p><i>12/3/2024 Minutes:</i></p> <p><i>11/19/2024 Minutes: Set next meeting for 12/3. In person desired (L Jansen)</i></p>	
--	---	--