



General Library Item

Name May 22, 2017

Content

Scarsdale Board of Education Meeting Highlights May 22, 2017

Executive Session

At 6:30 p.m. the Board entered into Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining issues.

Business Meeting

At 7 p.m., Lee Maude, Board of Education President, convened the Business Meeting, noting that most of the meeting would be given over to a presentation by the District architects, BBS Architects & Engineers, detailing its analysis and recommendations concerning building site, envelope, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, technology, and space utilization components of all the buildings in the District. She noted that following the presentation, the Board would pose questions to BBS, and following that there would be a time for public comment. Ms. Maude announced that the District will hold two public forums on this topic on Tuesday, June 20, at 9 a.m. and 7 p.m., and will also conduct surveys and focus groups to gather school and community input.

Drew Patrick, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Leadership Development, gave a Personnel Report, in which he introduced 11 recently-hired probationary teachers and one leave replacement teacher, and announced two civil service retirements.

The Board approved items on the consent agenda, including the Personnel Report presented by Mr. Patrick.

Dr. Thomas Hagerman, Superintendent of Schools, and Stuart Matthey, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Facilities, then introduced four representatives of BBS to give the presentation.

In their introduction, Dr. Hagerman and Mr. Matthey said that this presentation is part of an effort to develop a facilities plan that addresses the needs of all our buildings for the next many years.

Dr. Hagerman noted that the plans to be presented are an extension of past work, but also represent a somewhat different approach, drawing a distinction between what is "good," an adjective that means suitable or agreeable, but is subjective, and what is "right," which moves us towards objectivity as it refers to conforming to facts.

Mr. Matthey reviewed the charge given to the architects and the process they have undertaken:

- In February the District hired BBS Architects after a very competitive RFP and interview process.
- The primary charge, as outlined in the RFP, was to provide architectural and engineering services for the planning, design, and construction phases for all upcoming capital projects, including a major renovation or replacement of an elementary school, and work toward the design and implementation of a comprehensive District-wide facility plan.
- Since their appointment, BBS undertook to gather as much information as possible regarding all District facilities, including in-depth review and study of the following:
 - Work and recommendations of past building and feasibility committees;

- Work and recommendations of past architects and engineers;
- Long range plans and recommendations for roofs and field spaces
- As an important part of their study, BBS architects and engineers completed a multitude of site visits to assess each building's structural health, infrastructure and operating systems and to better understand how each building functions on a day to day basis.

Mr. Matthey observed that the BBS team demonstrated a coordinated effort in their investigation of the overall integrity, sustainability, adequacy, and life expectancy of District buildings while at the same time diving deep into how these buildings may be presenting conflicts to the goals of our educational programs, and the student, teacher, and parent experience.

Dr. Hagerman noted that unlike some recent experiences, the District is very confident about the data and information underlying the proposals, and observed that the District believes this is the "right" approach at the "right" time.

The four BBS representatives making the presentation were:

Roger P. Smith A.I.A. LEED AP Principal/Architect
Fred Seeba P.E. LEED AP Senior Associate/Director of Engineering
Joseph Rettig A.I.A. LEED AP Director of Architecture
Kevin Walsh A.I.A. LEED AP Project Designer

In their presentation, the BBS representatives presented detailed evaluations of existing conditions in each building, and an evaluation of how educational program delivery is affected by existing buildings and spaces.

Their PowerPoint presentation may be viewed [here](#).

The architects presented priority definitions, and presented tables detailing architectural and engineering items with priority designations.

- Priority 1A - Required to assure health and safety; mandated by law, regulation, or code, with compliance required by District
- Priority 1B - Recommended to assure health and safety, or recommended to upgrade/remediate conditions that pre-exist current law, regulation, or code.
- Priority 2 - Restore progressive deterioration of structural and other major components or systems, reducing risk of injury and/or damage to facility.
- Priority 3 - Restore progressive deterioration of surfaces and non-structural components, greatly facilitating a basic program or service.
- Priority 4 - Restore deterioration of non-critical components, enhancing existing service or program.
- Priority 5 - Aesthetic improvement, minimal functional effect

The BBS representatives then presented their District-wide space utilization analysis, and detailed the issues, conflicts, and opportunities in each building, along with sketches of present room use and possible solutions. These sketches are part of the [PowerPoint presentation](#).

One feature of the sketches is what the architects called a "thematic correction," in which they proposed creating commons areas and kitchens in each elementary school. They noted that this reflects a cultural change in suburban communities over the last several decades, away from elementary students going home for lunch. Dr. Hagerman noted that this undertaking of establishing commons areas would mean that the District would start to provide a lunch program in all schools.

Following the BBS presentation, Board of Education members posed questions to the architects concerning a variety of issues, mostly concerning Greenacres, including air quality; renovation versus new construction; classroom sizes; the possibility of needing to mitigate lead paint or asbestos during renovation; skylights for the gym; length of time needed for renovation; and the likelihood of SED approvals for renovations. Other questions concerned air quality upgrades and air conditioning installation across the District; whether the scope of the capital projects would match debt service roll-off; whether some priorities might be addressed with District budgeting; boiler replacement prioritization; and how additional construction of a commons at Heathcote would affect present construction plans.

Following Board questions, community members were invited to address the Board and 18 did so:

- Mary Beth Evans, 16 Edgewood Road, suggested that bond project history going back to 2000 be included in considerations, questioned whether a Middle School commons would weaken the House structure, and asked about long-term costs of old buildings versus consideration of a new Greenacres school
- Jenny Robertson, 5 Dobbs Terrace, asked about objective standards for classroom size
- Ron Schulhof, 8 Springdale Road, asked that healthy, sustainable buildings be a consideration
- Claudine Gecel, 10 Kent Road, noted that Middle School students resist going outside after lunch and asked whether a commons would address that
- Tony Corrigio, 157 Brite Avenue, expressed disappointment that Greenacres alternatives were not presented, and suggested parents be able to hire an independent investigator who could shut down construction if there were evidence of danger to students
- Anna Karpman, 27 Aspen Road, asked about the feasibility of air conditioner window units in classrooms
- Mitch Kahn, 198 Brewster Road, urged that boiler replacement be given a high priority, and asked that operating costs of an old school be addressed
- Diane Greenwald, 2 Oak Lane, suggested that excellence and innovation was more important than consistency, asked that priorities identified by the 2014 Bond steering committee be considered, and urged preservation of the Middle School House system
- Harriet Sobol, 10 Claremont Road, asked that the survey be sent to "old people" as well as parents, and urged preservation of the A-School and Heathcote.
- Mark Lewis, 98 Brewster Road, requested that a presentation be made to the Greenacres community in Greenacres, and indicated his preference for a new school
- Lynne Clark, 13 Walworth Avenue, expressed disappointment that a new school for Greenacres was not in consideration
- Andrew Sereysky, 57 Walworth Avenue, as president of the Greenacres Neighborhood Association, urged the Board and architects to address the issue of renovation vs. replacement.
- David Schwartz, 17 Oakstwain Road, requested a cost benefit analysis of renovation vs. replacement for Greenacres
- Barbara Wenglin, 152 Brewster Road, said she was encouraged to hear Greenacres is well maintained and does not need to be torn down
- Michael Levine, 54 Walworth Avenue, requested further explanations of the recommendations for Greenacres in light of previous recommendations
- Kyle Schurle, 17 Donellen Road, urged a detailed financial analysis of the recommendations concerning Greenacres
- Michael Per, 11 Aspen Road, urged District-wide installation of air conditioning in classrooms
- Jon Krisbergh, 107 Greenacres Avenue, requested more information on Greenacres renovation costs in comparison to new construction.

The Board conducted a wrap-up of the meeting and announced a list of upcoming meeting dates, including Public Forums scheduled for Tuesday, June 20 at 9 a.m. and 7 p.m.

The Board then adjourned into Executive Session to discuss legal matters.

The Board meeting may be viewed in its entirety, with links to specific segments, [here](#).