TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

Senior/Community Center and Library Study Building Committee
Wednesday, April 6, 2016
7:00 pm
Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Present: Co-Chairmen Joseph Pifko and Daniel Marconi; Committee Members Joseph Costa, Jeannine Stauder, Richard Seaman and Dawn Cantafio

Also Present: Lynn Arnow, Chief of Staff and Dawn Savo, Assistant Finance Director

Absent: Lori Hayes-O'Brien and Rachel Yahwak

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chairman Pifko at 5:07 pm followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment
No public comment.

Past Minutes
Motion was made by Mrs. Stauder to approve the minutes of March 31, 2016 as written. Seconded by Mr. Seaman and approved unanimously.

Discussion of RFQ and RFP
Mr. Pifko noted he requested Mr. Costa to review the proposal in his professional capacity and some suggestions were made. There was a conference call with the Purchasing Director. Mr. Costa noted the idea is to solicit interest in the project. We want to broadcast that this is a great project and a good size project and would like to gather information from a number of firms interested in pursuing this project. His suggestion through the Chair was to do an RFQ for qualifications, asking for experience, number of people, etc. From that information, the committee would form a short list of four potential firms and issue an RFP for services associated with a feasibility study leading to a project if approved by the Town Council (funded). This is the typical sequence when asking for services. One of the key components right now is that we do not have a hard

site picked out, a project or a schedule. The feasibility study would narrow down the site which is most feasible and practical by looking at criteria such as location, cost, etc. This information would then be presented to the Committee for evaluation and as a motion from the body, would move forward to other town leadership such as the First Selectman or the Town Council. This two-step approach would narrow down the scope and give the committee a comparative analysis between sites or there may be a different approaches to be considered.

Mr. Pifko noted this is a more cautious approach by having a short list of firms rather than asking multiple firms to do a large amount of work and then narrow the field. He proposed the formation of a subcommittee that, in Executive Session, would narrow the field down to four potential firms. This is cleaner, although it adds another step in the process.

Ms. Savo reviewed how the bid is awarded. She noted initially the bids will come in from the RFQ and the Purchasing Director will review them initially to make sure they have included everything that is required. If they didn't, they would be dismissed. Then the subcommittee would review them and hold meetings with the firms, if deemed necessary, to determine the four to be presented to the full committee. An RFP would be presented to those firms to come back with information for the project. Normally this process is done in-house but a sub-committee would be able to make the recommendation.

Mrs. Arnow noted the RFQ distributed at the meeting has been amended from the draft sent previously to the Committee from the Purchasing Director. Ms. Savo reviewed the changes made. She noted that because of the forensic audit done on other projects and the recommendations presented, town staff is coming to the meetings because the town is required to stay active in the project. Even though there will be a subcommittee, town staff (Purchasing, Finance, Facilities) may be attending the meetings as resources. Town Charter and State laws will be followed for the project as public funding will be used. These resources will need to be a part of the process.

Mrs. Cantafio noted additional pages have also been added with regard to affirmative action.

Motion was made by Mr. Costa to move forward with this RFQ. Seconded by Mr. Marconi and approved unanimously.

Mrs. Cantafio noted that she has received comments from the community about the scope of the committee. She questioned if this could be clarified. Does the Committee need a legal opinion about the name of the Committee so that we are transparent. She is still getting emails from residents asking exactly what the scope and name of the Committee is and she does not want all the hard work done by the Committee to be questioned. Mrs. Arnow asked if there were any questions regarding the minutes of the Town Council or any actions taken. Mrs. Cantafio stated it was the name of the Committee – is it a building committee or a study committee. A statement to clarify this would be beneficial. It was agreed that Mr. Massaro will be contacted and a review of the minutes will be done. If need be, a motion will be made by the Town Council.

Mrs. Cantafio noted she met with Mr. Bova who was very helpful in answering her questions regarding the RFQ. Mrs. Stauder noted the same interaction with her questions through email.

Mr. Pifko stated that not all email sent to the town email address listed for the Committee was delivered. It was sent into a spam folder. The IT Department also found the answered emails came back to Mr. Pifko's personal email box as a sent document when it was not sent to the addressee. The town address is only incoming not outgoing. When responses were made, it showed it was sent but the system was unable to send it. That is the reason why residents have commented he didn't respond to them. It was stuck in this loop.

Mr. Costa asked how the RFQ was being advertised. Ms. Savo noted it would be in a daily paper such as the CT Post. Dates may need to be adjusted so it is posted for the required amount of time. This will also be on the town website under Purchasing. Awards are posted, as well as those attending the opening, on the website also.

Motion was made by Mr. Costa to amend the prior motion to change the date on the RFQ to whatever is legally required to meet the obligations of the posting. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder and approved unanimously.

Appointment of Subcommittee

Discussion was held regarding a subcommittee to evaluate the responses. With regard to discussion of the bids, if all Committee members are present it becomes a public meeting. The subcommittee would review the respondents and report back a short list to the Committee. This subcommittee can have a maximum of four members. Discussion and selection of the firm would then take place in Executive Session by the entire Committee.

Motion was made by Mrs. Stauder to nominate Mr. Costa, Mr. Pifko, Mr. Marconi and Mrs. Cantafio as members of the subcommittee. Seconded by Mr. Seaman and approved unanimously.

Site Selection

Mr. Pifko noted Mr. Marsillio has encouraged the Committee to re-evaluate the Middlebrooks Avenue site. The ledge would not be problematic. The site is bordered on three sides by town property which provides a significant buffer for the neighbors. He encouraged the Committee members to walk the property. The Board of Education property was also discussed. Options for the sites would be explored in the feasibility study.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on May 12, 2016 at 7:00 pm in the Long Hill Conference Room. This will give the subcommittee time to review the bids received and make recommendations.

Adjournment

There being no further business, motion was made by Mrs. Cantafio to adjourn the meeting at 5:40 pm. Seconded by Mr. Seaman and approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall
Clerk

These minutes are considered a draft until approved at the next meeting of the Senior/Community Center Library Study Building Committee.