

**TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT**

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611



Senior/Community Center and Library Study Building Committee
Monday May 16, 2016
5:00 pm
Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Present: Co-Chairmen Joseph Pifko and Daniel Marconi; Committee Members Jeannine Stauder, Richard Seaman, Dawn Cantafio, Lori Hayes-O'Brien, Joseph Costa (entered at 5:07 pm)

Also Present: Lynn Arnow, Chief of Staff and Kevin Bova, Purchasing Director

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm by Mr. Pifko followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He welcomed Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien back to the meetings after a brief absence and noted Mrs. Rachel Yahwak had resigned from the Committee for personal reasons. The Town Council will be appointing a new member to the committee to replace Mrs. Yahwak.

Mr. Pifko noted in public session, he would report on the work of the sub-committee and how the work was accomplished. Questions will be answered. When discussion becomes specific to the four contractors who will receive an RFP, this would be done in Executive Session because the RFP has not been published. It will be discussed at this time why the four were chosen. There were twelve proposals in total to review and he thanked the sub-committee for reviewing the proposals. Mr. Pifko detailed the selection process. He noted they used the matrix agreed upon by the committee.

Past Minutes

Mr. Marconi moved to accept the minutes of April 6, 2016 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder and approved with one abstention by Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien.

Mr. Costa entered the meeting at 5:07 pm.

Mr. Pifko continued to explain the scoring process used by the sub-committee. Committee members were asked to score each contractor 1-10. Each committee member presented their top five choices in order of preference. The committee members came up with the same names. Total scores were determined and the top six were reviewed. Then they were narrowed down to the top four. Now an RFP will be sent to those four and a vote will be taken to accept these as the four contractors to be interviewed. The interviews will be done in public but until

the RFP is made public, the contractor names cannot be disclosed. Discussion of the four contractors will be done in Executive Session.

Review of Sites

1. Mr. Pifko noted that he, First Selectman Herbst, Mr. Marsilio and Mrs. Arnow conducted a site visit to Glastonbury. Glastonbury is similar in size to Trumbull and they built a beautiful community center. He noted it was basically Shelton's community center with a waterfront. This is used as a community center and also as a senior center in the early parts of the day. It is high quality construction with a very large dining area to accommodate 200-300 people. It is also rented to groups for events which provided income. Cost of the facility in 2006 was \$6.5. The way it was built, they had enough land for expansion to add a pool in the future. They had an exercise room but no gym.
2. Mrs. Stauder visited Westport. Very different type of building. Done elegantly and efficiently. Included many rooms, a cafeteria with 11 tables, small fitness room, library and computer classroom. Many activities planned. It is free to anyone but they do charge for some of the activities. This is more a senior center than a community center. Room to expand. Not as efficient as the committee would like Trumbull's to be.

Mr. Bova noted the selection process has been followed from the Town Charter procedures. He commended the committee on how well the process has been done. RFQ for this project means requesting qualifications to find certified, experienced architects who have done senior center/community centers. An RFP will be given to the four chosen architects for proposals/quote which will be opened after the interviews. Mr. Pifko noted they are going through this process without looking at numbers but totally from a qualification standpoint at this time. The contractors who submitted proposals did an enormous amount of work which was individually prepared with Trumbull in mind.

Mrs. Hayes O'Brien requested clarification of a couple of questions posed to her by members of the public.

1. Why did the sub-committee go into Executive Session? Mr. Pifko noted they were talking about individual contracts so there are legal ramifications. The town checked with the Freedom of Information Office in Hartford and they told them the discussion had to be in Executive Session. If not done in this manner, it opens up the town for liability and as well as each member of the committee.
2. Is there an update to the Town Council at their meeting on June 10? Yes.
3. Will there be a clarification of the title of the committee since there is confusion about whether it is a study or building committee? The name does not help the committee describe what they are doing. She commented Mr. Pifko had noted at an earlier committee meeting that there was a proposal before the Town Council to rename the committee and was looking for clarification. She questioned if there should be a conversation about this or should it be put on an agenda for discussion? Mr. Pifko stated the committee was requested to design a building, pick a site and develop a budget for a community/senior center. The title states exactly what the committee is at this point. The Town Council may decide to change the name on June 10. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien felt it would be best to clarify these questions. She feels the public has mixed feelings about what a community center would be. The recreational side is still being discussed as well as what the community really wants. The public has a lot of questions that need to be clarified.

Mr. Herbst entered the meeting briefly noting there are a lot of comments being made on social media regarding this project. He discussed the current senior center and the need for meeting space for the community. He plans to spend money on a community center that will maximize the town's return on investment. This center would be

used fully at all hours of the day every day and constructed in such a way as to provide for expansion in the future. Mr. Herbst discussed the use of the terms senior center and community center which has invited unnecessary problems between constituencies. This will be a community facility that will service the entire community. We will address the needs of multiple constituencies, space issues and special needs as well as plan for the future. This has been discussed since 1999 and a senior center and community center were number 1 and number 2 in the recently updated POCD.

Executive Session

Motion was made by Mr. Marconi to enter into Executive Session at 5:30 pm to discuss the proposals. Seconded by Mrs. Stauder and approved unanimously. Members in the session are Mr. Pifko, Mr. Marconi, Mr. Seaman, Mrs. Cantafio, Mrs. Stauder, Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien, Mr. Costa, Mrs. Arnow and Mr. Bova. Also included were Mark Block and Lisa Valenti from the Town Council. Prior to entering into Executive Session, Mr. Pifko took Public Comment.

Public Comment

Vanessa Eiseman, 11 Canterbury Lane – She is involved because the site proposed is in her back yard in Middlebrook Woods. She felt there is a growing disconnect with the community buy in and is confused about the data being used. She cited the survey numbers. With the 35,000 people in town, she did not feel there was credibility of data and questioned why survey monkey was used. She stated it was an exciting opportunity for the community but it is a huge expense.

Tony D'Aquila, 29 Valley View Road – Questioned whether the sites will be discussed before or after the Executive Session as indicated on the agenda. Sites will be dealt with at the end of the Executive Session.

Cindy Katske, 129 Meadowview Drive – Read from previous minutes of the Committee meetings which gave examples of where some of the confusion is coming from. February 4 minutes read “Mrs. Cantafio questioned if the Committee is considering expansion when determining a site. It was agreed that would be part of the criteria as the project will start out as a senior center. If the town decides to have more of a community center aspect, they would have room for expansion. January 7 minutes read “Mrs. Stauder stated the committee agreed to start with a senior enter and have an area that could be expanded for a community center. The seniors have been looking for a new place for years so it was felt to start with the senior center and move forward.” She felt these were examples of where the confusion is coming from and that there is a need to clarify it. Perhaps the June Town Council meeting would be a good place to clarify this.

Executive Session was entered at 5:36 pm after Public Comment with the attendees noted above. Motion was made by Mr. Marconi, seconded by Mrs. Stauder, to exit Executive Session at 6:31 pm. Approved unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Seaman, seconded by Mr. Marconi to accept the four architectural firms and request that a letter be sent to notify them that they have been selected for an interview and that they will be given an RFP once the scope of work has been written. Approved unanimously.

Site Review

Mrs. Stauder motioned to table the discussion of the site review due to the time constraints at this meeting. Seconded by Mr. Costa and approved unanimously.

Next Meeting

May 24, 2016 at 7:00 pm in the Long Hill Conference Room.

Adjournment

Motion was made by Mr. Marconi, seconded by Mr. Seaman, to adjourn the meeting at 6:36 pm. 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.