

# Meeting Minutes

**Project:** Feasibility Study  
Greenwich High School Natatorium  
10 Hillside Road, Greenwich, CT 06830

**Job No.:** 25012

**Author:** Lisa Yates, AIA

**E-mail:** lyates@antinozzi.com

**Meeting No.:** FS-13 (Feasibility Committee)

**Meeting Date:** 10/8/25

**Meeting Time:** 3:00pm

**Location:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83989466962?pwd=KcPIhEw65X8MCxYpkQdl5TQVh7CRmT.I>

**Overview:**

Natorium Feasibility Committee Kick-Off meeting. The goal of the Committee is to work with an architect to develop and deliver Educational Specifications to the Board of Education for consideration and approval.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83989466962?pwd=KcPIhEw65X8MCxYpkQdl5TQVh7CRmT.I>

Meeting ID: 839 8946 6962  
Passcode: 364280

**Attendees:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toni Jones, Superintendent, Feasibility Committee Chair (GPS) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harry Fisher (BET Chair)                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Branyan, CFAO (GPS)                                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sophie Koven (BOE)                                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Watson, Director of Facilities (GPS)                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Waters (RTM Budget Overview Committee Chair) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Julian Delarosa, Facilities (GPS)  | <input type="checkbox"/> Kara Mendelsohn (Community)                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ralph Mayo, Principal, (GHS)                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Fortuna, TLB Architects, Aquatics Specialist (TLBA)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peter Georgiou, Athletic Director (GHS)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Jesus Yzquierdo, TLBA   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Liv DiLascia, Girls Diving Coach (GHS)                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Fran DeFiore, Educational Consultant (CSG)                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Brendan Heller, Girls Swim Team Coach (GHS)                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Lisi, Antinozzi Associates (AA)               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Terry Lowe, Boys Swim Team Coach (GHS)                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Yates, Antinozzi Associates (AA)              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Ramaley, Boys Water Polo Coach (GHS)                    |  |

**PROGRESS & DEVELOPMENT**

Item	Origin	Description	Action by
2.1	FS-01	<p>CURRENT WORK TO DATE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review and discuss variant of Option 4.1 (4.1a) without spectator seating level.</li> <li>▪ For pricing and comparison purposes, consider variant of Option 5 that expands the pool from 35 to 50 meters. This is very similar to Option 3, but lets us rely more heavily on Option 5 for comparison. This option has not been drawn; consider a cost 20% more than Option 5.</li> <li>▪ Other considerations:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Temporary pool facility does not have a site, a diving area, or the ability to hold events with spectators in person.</li> <li>○ Tennis court relocation off-site may be possible.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes: Refer to item 2.3; options were discussed in the context of narrative and scorecard matrices.</i></p>	

2.3	FS-01	<p><b>NARRATIVE AND SCORECARD MATRICES</b></p> <p>The narrative matrix been updated and focused to help determine a direction between Options 4.1, 4.1a, 5 and 5.1 (similar to Option 5 but with an Olympic size long-course 50M pool instead of a 30M short-course stretch pool). Review narrative and scoring.</p> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes:</i></p> <p><i>Option 5.1 (New Long-Course Pool @ tennis courts): The group feels comfortable eliminating this option due to cost and the fact that the high school does not have an Olympic training club. Even those who love the idea of a big pool agree, understanding that the only long-course pool in the area is at the Greenwich YMCA.</i></p> <p><i>Option 4.1a (New Short-Course Pool @ existing location). The group feels comfortable eliminating this option. The order-of-magnitude cost difference is not enough to justify losing upper tier seating. Development of this option was valuable because it revealed the importance of separate seating above the pool deck; it should be seen as a basic amenity. A recent meet last weekend had an overflow crowd and the athletic staff had to police the situation. There were senior citizens present and the water at deck level caused slippery conditions; this is an unsafe combination. Facilities corrected drainage issues related to ponding on the pool deck, so issue is completely due to seating spectators on the pool deck.</i></p> <p><i>The recommendation is therefore narrowed down to Options 4.1 and 5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Impact of construction on school operations: The school has successfully remained in operation during previous construction projects on site. Option 4.1 is inherently more disruptive than Option 5 due to proximity. Phasing for Option 4.1 is more of a concern. Also, if rock excavation is needed for Option 4.1 (as it was for the first pool excavation) there could be significant noise.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Option 5 is a stronger candidate for private donations because it keeps the swim program in operation. Working through potential private donations with the BOE was discussed. Dr. Jones suggested that a regulation could be drafted to manage a capital campaign. Per Sophie Koven, there is an existing gift policy which would underpin this new regulation. This path informs the BOE without requiring approval. Private donation potential is a selection factor.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>The biggest drawback of Option 4.1 is the need for temporary accommodation of the aquatics program; a temporary pool facility has been ruled out as an option due to throwaway cost and lack of site. The biggest drawback of Option 5 is the need to relocate the tennis courts.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Per Ben Brayan’s research, Building Committees (BC) are required when project require an MI (Municipal Improvement Review). Since a BC is required, it makes sense to have a single committee take care of the natatorium and driveway as a single project. These projects are complementary and require tight coordination.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>If Option 5 is selected, the Ed Specs should include language covering the driveway.</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Should tennis court relocation also be part of Option 5? Ideally, tennis courts elsewhere could happen more quickly than the pool – but if tennis courts require an MI they’d have to be under a committee as well. Scope includes eight, all at the same location, possibly Western MS.</i></li> </ul>
-----	-------	--

2.5	FS-01	<p><b>FOCUS GROUPS</b></p> <p>Review timing for upcoming meetings; likely to be scheduled after a direction has been agreed upon within the committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>AHJ Meeting:</b> Planned for normal working hours, this meeting will include representatives from P&amp;Z, Public Works, Parks &amp; Rec., Building Department, Fire Marshal, Tree Warden and any other Town entities with interest in the project.</li> <li>▪ <b>Meeting with Neighbors:</b> This meeting will likely occur in the early evening to make it easier for neighbors to attend. There is a neighborhood point person we will contact to coordinate with the neighbors.</li> </ul> <p>Consider focus group with tennis community.</p> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes: No new minutes.</i></p>
-----	-------	---

## SCHEDULE AND HOUSEKEEPING

Item	Origin	Description	Action by
3.1	FS-02	<p><b>APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES – 9/24/25</b></p> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes: James Waters moved to approve the minutes from 9/24/25, seconded by Harry Fisher. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.</i></p>	
3.2	FS-01	<p><b>SCHEDULE – Upcoming Meetings and Milestones:</b></p> <p>Reviewing current progress with the Board of Ed is the next major milestone.</p> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes: The next full Business BOE meeting is on 11/20. Antinozzi will present full draft Educational Specifications at the next committee meeting on Thursday 10/30, and follow up on Thursday 11/6 with a committee meeting to which BOE members are invited (no more than 3 or 4 BOE Members; consider it a focus group). Both meetings will be at 3pm. Next steps:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Thursday 10/30/25, 3pm: Committee Meeting – Review Draft Ed Specs, option selection</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Thursday 11/6/25, 3pm: Committee Meeting / BOE Focus Group for discussion</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Thursday 11/20/25, 7pm, Havemeyer: Introduction of Educational Specifications at BOE Business Meeting</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Thursday 12/11/25, 7pm, CMS: BOE Business Meeting, target date for BOE approval of Educational Specifications.</i></li> </ul>	
3.3	FS-01	<p><b>ADJOURN</b></p> <p><i>10/8/25 Minutes: Meeting was adjourned at 4:36pm.</i></p>	

The above represents our interpretation of the discussions that took place at the meeting. Please notify the undersigned in writing within five (5) days of receipt with clarifications, additions and/or supplemental information, or it will be assumed that these minutes have been accepted by all attendees as a correct understanding of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



ANTINOZZI ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
XC: FILE, INVITEES/ATTENDEES