RIVERSIDE SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE

Organizational Meeting

Wednesday, February 4th, 2026 | 7:30 AM ET

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Attendee	Position	Present	Absent
Officers			
Stephan Pezdek	Chair	In Person	
Luigi Ghilardi	Vice-Chair	In Person	
Bryan Finkel	Secretary	Zoom	
Voting Members			
Paul Cappiali	BOE Member	Zoom	
Louis Contadino	Regular Member	In Person	
Doug Fenton	BET Member	In Person	
Christina Lyndon	Regular Member	In Person	
Ex-Officio / Non-Voting Members			
Veronica Chiavaroli	First Selectman's Advisory Advocacy Committee for People with Disabilities	Zoom	
Christina Downey	RTM Representative		Absent
Nicholas Macri	P&Z Representative	Zoom	
Jason Martin	Riverside School Principal		Absent
Lauren Rabin	BOS Representative	In Person	
Sheel Spina	DPW Representative		Absent
Guests			
Andy Duus		In Person	

GREENWICH CONNECTICUT

Riverside School

MEETING MINUTES

Item	Topic	Description
1.00	Call to Order	• Meeting called to order at 7:31 AM ET
2.00	Attendance	• As noted above

3.00	Housekeeping	• Mr. Pezdek requested that members who have not already provided email contacts to the group, including phone number and an email address specific for the project, do so as soon as possible
		• It was noted that the administration at Riverside School ("RVS") was not informed, prior to the meeting, that it was to take place at the school
		  ○ Mr. Cappiali noted that he had been in contact with RVS Principal Martin
		  ○ Ms. Chiavaroli noted that the school requires advance written notice
		  ○ Mr. Finkel offered to coordinate directly with the school on procedure
		• Mr. Pezdek noted that the committee will, after the next meeting (or the meeting thereafter) whether the current 7:30 AM Wednesday timeslot still works for the group
		• Committee members asked who the Superintendent Representative will be. It was noted that Principal Martin would serve in this capacity and that, while he was made aware of this meeting, he was not formally invited.
		  ○ Mr. Finkel was asked to ensure he receives an invitation to future meetings

4.00	Approval of Minutes	• Minutes from January 14th meeting were approved at 7:36 AM ET
5.00	EdSpecs	• Mr. Pezdek opened a discussion regarding the Educational Specifications ("EdSpecs") commissioned by the Riverside School Feasibility Committee and approved by the Board of Education on February 20th, 2025 • Mr. Pezdek noted that each of the committee members should take time ahead of the next meeting to review the document and determine level of comfort with its content and detail, noting that portions of it are very "high level" in nature • Mr. Pezdek noted that the key agenda item for the next meeting will be a comprehensive review of the EdSpecs by one or more members of the former Feasibility Committee • Mr. Duus noted that the EdSpecs were written at a moment in time and are now a year old—he asked whether it is possible or feasible to reopen the EdSpecs or if they are "locked" as-is. The committee agreed that an agenda item for the next meeting will be whether to move forward with the document in its current form or reopen it
6.00	Financial	• The committee reviewed the note sent by Dr. Jones to district parents making note of the RSBC project, specifically calling out the notice of $600,000 of funding for commencement of the project and to initiate municipal improvements, followed by an unlocking of an additional $1.4 million for design, development, and capital planning • The committee noted a need to better understand what is executable within the confines of the first $600,000. Members asked for clarity regarding the scope of the municipal process, in particular—namely what will be needed to scope for the architect and design team to commence that process. Mr. Macri volunteered to help articulate the municipal process • Members noted that it would be helpful, as the process unfolds, to have guidance on document distribution, copies, resource allocations, etc., and what are the necessary steps to have the necessary documentation/proof of purchases, as required.

		• Ms. Rabin noted that Board of Education resources should be made available to the committee as needed so that out-of-pocket expenses can be avoided. Ms. Rabin noted that the RSBC acts with the same authority as DPW, with the same access to town resources. Ms. Rabin furthermore offered to print and bring copies of EdSpecs to the next meeting. ○ Mr. Finkel noted that all relevant documents will be shared with committee members in digital form via Google Drive
7.00	Confidentiality	• Members asked, with respect to matters that are deemed privileged and confidential, how the committee is required to handle such information ○ Ms. Rabin noted that here is an ethics page on the town website (which includes a conflict disclosure form) and a FOIA training form so that everyone has it • Mr. Duus asks about usage of a separate email / town email. Mr. Pezdek noted that this matter was covered in the first RSBC meeting • Mr. Cappiali noted that he asked BOE for resources (google drive, BOE email address, etc.) and these requests were denied, despite Central Middle School's building committee being provisioned with similar resources
8.00	Procurement	• Members discussed procedures and processes are needed for the procurement effort, especially as the committee will have to onboard different design professionals • Ms. Rabin suggested that Eugene Watts from the Board of Education come to a meeting to walk the committee through the procurement process, as this is the purview of the BOE rather than the Town • Given the next meeting's focus on the review of the EdSpecs, it was agreed that Mr. Watts will be invited to the meeting tentatively scheduled for February 25th, 2026
9.00	New Business	• Mr. Fenton asked if there is a required subcommittee structure that needs to be followed. Are subcommittees including Finance, Communications, etc., required? ○ It was suggested, at least at the outset, to keep this less formally structured, otherwise specific meeting rules will need to be followed, minutes taken, etc. Instead, form "working groups" for each key matter • Key workstreams and responsibilities will need to be identified. For instance, who from the committee will attend OEC meetings? • Ms. Lyndon suggested that a roadmap from project start to completion should be developed, identifying critical path items so that the committee can work backwards from each major goal/deadline/funding request. Mr. Pezdek agreed, noting that he would like to develop a Gantt chart with these key milestones in mind. • Ms. Lyndon noted that key resources need to be identified, calling out specifically the need to understand who the committee's legal representation is. It was noted that Barbara Schellenberg, attorney for the Town of Greenwich, can serve in this function but that it is perhaps premature to make contact / begin to pre-identify legal issues at this stage. It was noted that the Central Middle School Building Committee ("CMSBC") has a regulatory subgroup to understand the mechanics of approval, fire code, etc. • Members noted that the new Fire Marshal was appointed a week prior to the meeting and, in his review of Old Greenwich School's plans, reopened some matters that had previously thought to have been closed. Members suggested contacting him early in the process • Mr. Contadino pointed out some persistent issues faced in the building processes at both CMS and OGS and stressed that transparency by the RSBC will be critical to avoid the spending issues faced in both of those projects. Mr. Contadino stressed the benefits

		of an "open door policy" and to be as communicative as possible around decisions being made along the way • Mr. Macri noted that the RSBC's "mission" is to build/renovate the building to the best possible condition for the next 75 years for the students, with responsibility to the students as "owners" of the building that will far outlive the committee. Decisions should be made to optimize the project. • Mr. Macri noted that he will help get the committee connected with anyone needed with respect to municipal review. Once the committee has a good schematic plan, it can be "shopped" to the constituents. As an example, a sprinkler system: can the existing building be torn apart to install one? • Mr. Contadino noted, if the committee selects an architect with experience and/or specialization in institutional educational buildings, that the architect can help modify the plan as needed. Mr. Macri noted that CSG, which was commissioned for the feasibility study, has such expertise and is currently working on the Julian Curtiss project. However, the firm cannot be pre-selected, as the project must be bid out. • Members asked who is responsible for authoring the RFP to be used? Mr. Rabin noted that there are generic RFPs which can be used as a basis and modified and suggested looking at the documents created for the Julian Curtiss and OGS projects as a starting point • Mr. Fenton asked what are best practices regarding timeline for RFP drafting, distribution, and response deadlines? Mr. Pezdek noted that he would like to have the RFP distributed to candidates by April with responses due within 30 days, 30 days for review and approval, and then interviews to commence as soon as June. Ms. Rabin noted a desire to have this portion of the project commenced before the end of the school year to use the summer to conduct required investigation of the building • Members then discussed the status of the OGS project, and the requirement for a special meeting for interim appropriations to discuss that project's cost overruns • Mr. Duus asked if the committee is required to accept the low bid in all instances. Members noted that the standard requires the committee accept the "lowest qualified bid" and that the determination of qualification is up to the committee members • Members noted the need to identify and hire owner's rep prior to hiring an architect • Mr. Macri volunteered to distribute municipal planning information to the broader committee. Mr. Macri suggested prioritizing getting P&Z a site plan, basic floor plans and elevations, etc. so that commission can understand the scope of the project, how it relates to the surrounding neighborhood, etc. • Ms. Rabin noted the requirement to firstly approach the BOS for approval and referral to P&Z and noted that the BOS review does not dive into as deep of detail as that of the BET, but that the BOS is required to conduct its own independent review. Ms. Rabin suggested, as an example, that the BOS may ask whether the committee evaluated renovation vs. teardown-and-rebuild, from the perspective of cost, student displacement, time to completion, etc.
10.00	Meeting Logistics	• Members noted the closure of schools during the week of February 9th and a likely inability to convene a quorum during that week. Accordingly, the next meeting date was suggested for Wednesday, February 18th
11.00	Adjournment	• Motion to adjourn approved at 8:29 AM