

Date Prepared	5/26/2015	
Project Name	<b>Stamford Interdistrict IB Magnate Extension; K-5 Phases I and II</b> <b>OSF No. 135-0277 / MAG / PF / EA</b>	
Project Number	61860.00	
Subject	Project Building Committee Meeting No. 1	
Meeting Location	Engineering Bureau Conference Room, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Government Center 888 Washington Blvd., Stamford, CT	
Meeting Date	5/20/2015	
Meeting Time	11:00 am	
Prepared By	Tina Greco, AIA, Project Manager	t.greco@perkinseastman.com
	T: 203 251 7419	F: -
Participants	<p>Louis Casolo, City Engineer, City of Stamford  Domenic Tramontozzi, Senior Construction Manager, City of Stamford  Winnie Hamilton, Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education  Mary Savage, Board of Reps  Jackie Heftman, Board of Education  Rich Lyons, Board of Education Facilities  Cindy Grafstein, Mayor's Office  Anne Downey, Resident and Retired Principal  Al Barbarotta, Board of Education Facilities  Tamu Lucero, Assistant Superintendent Elementary, Stamford Public Schools  Joe Coppola, Board of Representatives  Ernie Orgera, Operations, City of Stamford  Geof Alswanger, Board of Education  Richard Freeman, Board of Finance</p> <p>Joe Costa, Principal, Perkins Eastman  Mark McCarthy, Principal, Perkins Eastman  Tina Greco, Associate, Project Manager, Perkins Eastman</p>	

Meeting was called to order at 11:10 am

Motion was made to accept the April 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting minutes. The Committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes.

The Perkins Eastman Team introduced themselves and expressed their excitement and gratitude for having the opportunity to work on the New Inter-District Elementary IB Magnet School Extension to Rogers.

Joe Costa, Principal, Perkins Eastman, briefly described Perkins Eastman's experience with schools and some of the work the office has done in Stamford.

Mark McCarthy, Design Principal, Perkins Eastman, described the approach to the full 4-phased project that was presented during the interview process. The concept design was based on the requirements outlined in the RFQ. The general concept is a flexible approach that will allow for full development and design; it is an

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

approach that will work aesthetically and programmatically; the addition is a simple attachment to the existing building, which simplifies the complexities of construction and aligns with the project phasing and schedule. NOTE: the concept design did NOT include an area for an auditorium and was based on the Ed Spec areas that were part of the RFQ. Barn discussion as a multi-purpose space, difficult as a sloped floor auditorium

Tina Greco, Project Manager, Perkins Eastman, talked about the overall project schedule using the schedule slide as an aide. She emphasized that the first date that the team needs to work towards is getting the existing building ready to take **grades K-1** starting in **August 2016**.

Tina also outlined the goals for the meeting which had a focus on the Phase II work.

#### A. Approach to Phase II

- PE led discussion on approach to Phase II
  - Framework:
    - Meet the Schedule (children start to attend school in **August 2016**)
    - Minimize work that would have to be redone or removed out in Phases III or IV (which results in a loss of funds, the work will NOT be eligible in Phases III and IV if it is work that is done twice)
  - Schedule:  
K-1 Children occupy the building in August 2016; August 2017 includes 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade
  - Temporary:  
2 academic years of operation, while new wing is built
  - Approach:  
Create a safe building and site with **LIGHT** renovations. The Phase II **LIGHT** renovations approach will help to ensure that the schedule is met and it will minimize funds/reimbursement spent during this phase. Generally includes:
    - New paint through out
    - New VCT on all floors, abate existing floor materials as required
    - Reuse existing ceilings and lighting (replacing tiles and fixtures only where required).
    - Reuse existing walls as much as possible
    - Reuse doors, replacing only the hardware
    - Repair existing roof (possibly replace during Phase II, tbd)
    - No work to the fields, repair existing fencing
    - **Please see slide show presentation for additional detail on approach**
  - Discussion on Approach
    - Air Conditioning  
The Committee expressed the importance for including air-conditioning in the classroom building: upper floors will become hot in the warmer/hot months, this generation of children is accustomed to conditioned spaces, issue of asthma, etc.
    - Phase II temporary  
Phase II will not be a 'like new' renovation, it is temporary. Need to be sure that it is appealing for the two year temporary period. Renderings of 'what is to come' in Phases II and IV will be made easily available and visible.

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

- Field Visit

It was strongly suggested that the Committee make a field visit to the existing building to understand what is there. Phase II work will leave the building to a close to 'as is' condition. It was also suggested that classroom furniture be set-up in a classroom so that the Committee could get an understanding of the scale of each room. The Committee will make arrangements, for a visit.

- Phase II Program

It was understood that the Committee had selected Option 1 (the Silver Petrucelli Plan / appendix in the RFQ). PE met with the Fire Marshal and Building Inspector's office earlier in the week (Monday, May 18<sup>th</sup>) based on those discussions and knowledge that the Building Committee wanted to keep classrooms out of the basement (which is considered the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor), PE developed a sketch of the 4 levels that were presented.

The revised proposed plan allows for a cleaner approach to some of the Code concerns and puts the Kindergarten closer to grade (ground) level. The plan / layout shows:

- Gym Building

- Kindergarten in the lower / grade level of the gym wing (with new shared bathrooms, NOT in the classrooms; bathrooms are accessed from the corridor – located in area of existing shower / locker room).
- cafeteria and gym space will be shared, requires that scheduling will need to be worked out

- Classroom Building

- First Grade is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Level (entry level)
- Second Grade is on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Level
- Specials are generally on the 4<sup>th</sup>
- Administration is mostly on the 1<sup>st</sup> Level.
- Security / check-in desk at the front hall area of the 'main entry' to the Classroom Building. *PE needs instruction and direction from the Committee on whether this desk should remain, what kind of technology would be at this desk, etc.*

PE noted that the classroom sizes are for Phase II are adequate, but smaller than the Ed Specification requirements and smaller than what would typically be used for a 20 student classroom for this age level. Drawings (enlargement) showing 20 students with furniture presented.

PE noted that Code details are still being worked out. *Mods* (Code Modifications) will need to be sought for Phase II mostly as it relates to Exiting and Accessibility. The work for Phase II will include accessibility upgrades, however, because the project is temporary. Further investigation into this matter is required as it relates to what level of accommodations will be required, etc.

Proposed Revised Plan Discussion

- Perhaps Specials is shifted to the 1<sup>st</sup> Level or the 3<sup>rd</sup> Level. If Specials are shifted to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Level, Second Grade will be on the 4<sup>th</sup> Level. *The Committee will give direction to PE on this matter.*

## **B. Needed Information**

### Phase II

To maintain the schedule Perkins Eastman will need the first round of information (list provided on slide in presentation) by Wednesday, May 27<sup>th</sup>.

Please see slide show for list of needed information.

Tamu Lucero has formed a sub-committee to be able to respond to the educational program questions.

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Phase III and IV

To maintain the schedule for Phases III and IV Perkins Eastman will need clarification on the Program by July 1, 2015. The clarifications include a final Education Specification with the following resolved:

- o Final sf (Ed Spec Area exceeds State Standards)
- o K-5 vs K-8
- o Barn
- o auditorium

DiscussionK-5 vs K-8

- o Committee expressed concern on whether resolution on K-8 would be determined by July 1<sup>st</sup>.
- o Committee also would like additional information to be able to make a decision.
- o Perkins Eastman was asked if they could take a look at the positives and negatives of going to a K-8 program on the site.
- o Matter of possibly needing structured underground parking was mentioned.

Final sf (Ed Spec Area exceeds State Standards)

Comparison (based on current program information provided)

- Ed Spec total area: +/- **117,000 gsf** (without the barn and an auditorium)
- State Standards for Reimbursable area: +/- **97,000 gsf**
- Therefore, there is a 20,000 gsf delta, which would NOT be eligible for reimbursement

There was a thought that a waiver could be sought so that the reimbursed area could be increased (possibly for the auditorium, etc.).

Perkins Eastman has taken a look at the Rogers International IB Magnate plan and compared the program and was able to 'shave' off some area of the Ed Spec bringing the building more in line with the Rogers program (but without an auditorium) Perkins Eastman can assist the Committee in comparing the program to the existing Rogers School program and in looking at other possible alternative ways for looking to reducing the area.

Currently the State EDO49 Grant project total and the City project total do not match, the EDO49 shows \$77 million (\$10 million for land), the City has approved a \$55 million project expenditure (\$45 project).

**C. Next Meeting**

- o Wednesday, June 10, 2015 at 11am

**D. Meeting Handouts:**

- From Perkins Eastman
  - o Draft – Phase I and II Approach (included overall schedule, list of information needed), dated May 20, 2015. This was used as a slide presentation (PDF was forwarded to City)
  - o Meeting Agenda
- From City of Stamford
  - o Meeting Agenda
  - o Meeting April 7<sup>th</sup> Building Committee Meeting Minutes

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.

Next Meeting: 6/10/2015

cc:

Attachments: None

This Meeting Record is our understanding of the items as they were discussed. Please report any discrepancies to Perkins Eastman. If no discrepancies are reported in five working days, this Meeting Record will stand as published.