TOWN OF TRUMBULL
CONNECTICUT

Town Hall
5866 Main Street
Trumbull, Connecticut 06611

Trumbull Community Center Study and Building Committee
Thursday, July 28, 2016
7:00 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 and David Preusch

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

Absent: Committee Member Joseph Costa

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mr. Marconi followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Past Minutes
Motion was made by Mrs. Stauder to approve the minutes of June 27, 2016 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Cantafio and approved with one abstention from Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien.

Public Comment
No public comment.

Update on Architectural Selection and Public Input Discussion
Mr. Marconi noted the Town Council has approved the Committee's selection of Quisenberry Arcari as the architects for the Community/Senior Center. Mr. Bova stated he is still waiting for a final scope of work to begin negotiations. Mrs. Arnow noted the town is waiting for some input from the architects on the Committee as to language in the scope that everyone is comfortable with. It is hoped the scope of work will be finalized next week and then negotiations can begin. Mr. Bova, Ms. Bakalar and Mr. Marsillio are working on this part of the project. Once the scope of work is finalized, the Committee will be given a copy for review.

Mr. Marconi reviewed the reasons why this firm was selected noting they had extensive experience in building community centers, senior centers and combination centers. They also acted in a consulting capacity on projects. They made an excellent presentation at the meeting. Mr. Arcari made a point he would like to reach out to the community to get input using various methods which would give a more rounded opinion. It is not part of the scope for the firm to decide if the town wants or needs this building. Mr. Pifko noted the method of communication can be varied but not all individuals will provide input. By reaching out to various groups, it is hoped more information will be gathered that will be helpful. The firms will be determining through input what should be included in the building that would fulfill the needs of the community. The option for a pool will be included in discussions. At this time there is nothing on paper but they need information in order to make decisions.

Mr. Pifko stated that the funding for the project for Trumbull would be a one-time expenditure. This project can vary in price depending on what is finally decided. It was noted the community reacts differently to various projects in town and we need to have the input to make informed decisions for the community center project.

Discussion was held regarding public input and gathering information from outside groups who may be impacted by this center. The town now needs to move forward with the architectural firm to set up meetings. Contact with the residents would need to be done through the town for the architect. Mrs. Arnow stated the architect has experience in the building of these centers and he would be able to tell the town what a good response would be and what would be adequate for getting information. It is the duty of the public to respond and comment. The architect knows this is a concern of the town and has avenues to get information.

Discussion was held regarding the input received through prior efforts such as public hearings and the two surveys. These should not be discredited as people in the community have taken the time to share their ideas and comment. Mr. Pifko would like to have future meetings to include a focus group. Once we know what the architects approach is, we can see if there are any gaps and make adjustments.

Mr. Seaman asked what the next step would be. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien was requested to make a list of how to get information out to the public. It was noted that the more responses received does not necessarily change the data and we would rely on the architect for his input. The Committee felt that a mail option or a robo call would be appropriate. The information could also be reinforced in the paper. Mr. Marconi noted the original surveys were done at the very beginning and the Committee was just starting to collect data. The Committee has evolved from building a senior center to making it a community center/intergenerational center. A lot of work has been done right. We need to do all the legwork because the building will be here for many years and we need to build something that is complimentary to the town. References were checked on other projects of the firm and each one said their participation rates skyrocketed after the new building was completed.

Mr. Preusch summarized that we are at the pre-design/feasibility study stage. It is important to not get ahead of ourselves or the community. Everyone has to work together. We are looking for the architect

to provide a conceptual recommendation as to what, where, cost and design. The $175,000 is seed money and it is not based on anything. The architect is in the information gathering stage. We are here because there is a feeling the town is not providing for the needs of the residents. A community center would help to fill this need. The surveys done previously noted different needs of the community. Firms interviewed were asked what makes a successful project. Everyone comment it is listening to the needs of the community.

Mr. Preusch noted as far as site selection, all areas should be on the table so a selection can be made based on the needs. Needs and site selection all relate to the cost. The cost is based on hard quantitative analysis. At the present time, there is no basis for discussion of cost.

Mr. Preusch felt one possible way to gather information was to hold a workshop type session. This is a brainstorming meeting with different groups of people who would have one spokesperson that would speak to their conclusions.

We are not hiring the architect to design a building. He is going out to listen. We want Trumbull to feel the facility is what they need and that is in the best location. In the end of this phase, we will have a concept to work with.

Next Meeting
Tentative next meeting date is Thursday, August 18, 2016 at 7:00 pm.

Adjournment
There being no further business, motion was made by Mr. Seaman, seconded by Mrs. Stauder to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall
Clerk