SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Community Facilities Building Committee
August 3, 2022 at 7:15pm – Trumbull Library Community Room

Present Members:  Lori Hayes-O’Brien, Chairman
                   Mike Buswell
                   Ron Foligno
                   Dean Fabrizio
                   Gail Ritacco
                   Dave Galla
                   Tony Silber

Absent Members:   Dawn Cantafio, Vice Chairman
                  Ted Chase

Also Present:     Cynthia Katske, Chief Administrative Officer
                  George Estrada, Public Works Director
                  Rina Bakalar, Economic & Community Development Director
                  Dmitri Paris, Park Superintendent
                  Gia Mentillo, Committee Clerk – Via Conference Call

Residents:        Richard White, 169 Church Hill Road
                  Cynthia Penkoff, 101 Columbine Drive

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:21pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comment:

Chairman Hayes-O’Brien asked that members of the public introduce themselves before speaking and do their
best to keep comments succinct.

Richard White of 169 Church Hill Road referenced the site by site scoring done by town staff and the Committee
and questioned several elements of that process, noting that documentation associated with said process has
not been shared with the public. Mr. White asked that the Committee start over in their evaluation process as
most of the information they utilized is outdated and the scoring process should be refined. He went on to
provide an explanation of an independent study he conducted of the properties in question using GIS
techniques. (See Exhibit 1 attached.)

Cynthia Penkoff of 101 Columbine Drive voiced agreement with Richard White, and she asked that the
Committee table future discussion of this project and request that the Town Council revoke the Committee’s
charge. Ms. Penkoff also stated that the only need in town is for a new senior center, and the Parks and
Recreation Department should not be considered in the plans for a new facility.

Public comment closed at 7:31pm.

Acceptance of July 13, 2022 Meeting Minutes

The Chairman requested the minutes be amended to remove the word “Special” from the heading and
list Gia Mentillo as absent.
MOTION MADE (Fabrizio), seconded (Foligno) to amend the July 13, 2022 meeting minutes. The motion carried (7 -0).

MOTION MADE (Ritacco), seconded (Silber) to approve the July 13, 2022 meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried (7 – 0).

Site Evaluation Presentation:

The Chairman thanked George Estrada, Dmitri Paris, and Rina Bakalar for their work on re-evaluating the properties in question and for attending the meeting to present their findings.

George Estrada

Mr. Estrada thanked the Committee for having him attend their meeting. He stated his intention to be to put context to the pros and cons of each property, and he presented staff findings (See Exhibit 2 attached).

Mr. Buswell questioned why abutting properties seemed to be considered differently for the Hardy Lane, Huntington Turnpike, and Priscilla Place locations. Mr. Estrada clarified that the Hardy Lane development would be situated away from all neighboring properties other than the two at the end of Hardy Lane whereas on Priscilla Place, and other areas, neighboring properties were considered as being impacted because the development would be visible from their properties.

Mr. Galla questioned the topography and wetlands on the Priscilla Place property. Mr. Estrada clarified that a stream runs through the property and is currently subverted below the existing building, and topography is not an issue for said location.

Mr. Foligno asked whether moisture at the administration building is due to a stream similar to that of Priscilla Place. Mr. Estrada confirmed this to be true but informed that the new facility would be situated away from the stream on the property.

Mr. Silber asked whether a facility on Hardy Lane would encroach on the existing park area. Mr. Estrada stated that the facility would not at all impact the forested area beyond Hardy Lane.

Mr. Silber questioned why access was considered a con at the Indian Ledge property but not the Hardy Lane one. Mr. Estrada clarify that the Hardy Lane location is a much shorter distance to a main road way (Church Hill Road) and existing utilities than that of Indian Ledge.

Mr. Buswell asked if wetlands issues exist at the Hardy Lane location. Mr. Estrada stated there is no water issue at the Hardy Lane site that would impact plans for a facility.

Mr. Silber questioned how a facility on Hardy Lane would impact traffic to the area. Mr. Estrada stated that the removal of a pool significantly decreases the expected traffic flow to the facility, but, regardless of site selected by the Committee, a traffic study will ultimately be done.

Dmitri Paris made the distinction between a flood plain and wetlands.

Mr. Buswell asked if it would be necessary to purchase neighboring properties of the Hardy Lane location, and Mr. Estrada stated that to be unnecessary.

Rina Bakalar
Ms. Bakalar provided the Committee with background knowledge of current and upcoming grant opportunities that could be utilized for the proposed facility if the Committee were able to get the project to a “shovel ready” state. The minimum requirements for this include having a site selected, Town ownership of said site, approval from the Town Council for a specific use on that particular site, concept drawings (preferably construction drawings), and a detailed, realistic budget.

She voiced understanding for concerns regarding the current economic climate both locally and nationally but informed that this is also an unprecedented time as far as the number of funding opportunities and amount of funds available through federal bills as well as state programs. Ms. Bakalar stated that there are wide spanning opportunities to address improvements to infrastructure, sidewalks, and public amenities (in and around the proposed facility), estimating that these circumstances will last about two years. She sited such funds as providing an opportunity to alleviate some of the financial concerns from tax payers and other stakeholders.

Ms. Ritacco asked if there is a date by which the Committee should get the project shovel ready, and Ms. Bakalar stated that the Town is actively missing opportunities to submit grant applications for this project because certain details have not been refined.

Mr. Silber asked how much money is available through grants at this time, and Ms. Bakalar stated anywhere from 500,000 to 10 million dollars are being offered per application.

Mr. Galla asked whether there is an ability to apply to multiple grant opportunities for funding one project, and Ms. Bakalar stated that it depends on the opportunities being offered and by whom.

Chairman Hayes-O’Brien asked whether Ms. Bakalar felt any sites in particular should be removed from consideration or appear to be better suited than others. Ms. Bakalar stated she felt the Hardy Lane and Church Hill Road sites to be the best sites available at the time, siting the fact that Trumbull is 98% developed and has limited developable space. She noted that facilities that are not on public transit routes have less options for grant funding and route schedules can be adjusted if there is a case to do so.

Dmitri Paris

Mr. Paris informed that, as Park Superintendent, he helps to manage the public facilities buildings. He informed that the current senior center is on its last legs operationally, siting major HVAC, boiler, and roof issues amongst others. Mr. Paris stated that funds and resources are being spent on a building beyond repair, and those costs will only increase with time.

Next Steps:

Mr. Silber asked whether the Committee was ready to begin eliminating locations from consideration. Chairman Hayes-O’Brien asked that the Committee take a week to contemplate the information shared by town staff and potentially decide on a location during the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting. Ms. Ritacco supported the Chairman’s comments, siting time constraints shared by Mr. Paris and Ms. Bakalar.

Mr. Fabrizio asked for confirmation that the Committee would not be expanding its list of properties to consider for the proposed facility. The Chairman stated that neither town staff nor the Committee is aware of any other properties that can be considered for the needs of this facility, though suggestions are still welcomed.

New Business:
The Chairman asked that George Estrada share his presentation so it may be included in the meeting minutes. She also asked that the Committee send any questions they may have for staff through her so that they do not receive redundant questions.

_Adjournment:_

The July 13, 2022 Regular Meeting of the Trumbull Community Facilities Building Committee adjourned at 8:43pm with unanimous consent.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gia Mentillo, Committee Clerk
I. Available Data

Months ago, I reached out to multiple people for access to the site-by-site scoring as only the total summary and Hardy Lane site had been presented by this committee. I had two in-person meetings where I requested this information and after the final meeting gained access to the full set of scoring. I do not believe that the complete set of documents is available on the Town website or has been made available prior to this meeting as required by our Town Charter.

I entered each site, scoring item and factor, and scores into a spreadsheet and created my own final summary. I understand that other sites, not on the summary, were also considered and I would like to see any scoring that was developed for those sites as well.

I would like to ask this committee to start over, most of what you are going to see tonight is over six years old. Make certain that you fully understand the intent of each item, the range of scores applied, the factor applied and question if these very important inputs to your process still make sense. Add new items, remove unnecessary items, adjust the factors, and recscore each site. Own this process as a committee and don’t outsource to staff, out-of-town architects, or others that don’t have your level of knowledge about Trumbull.

II. Site Selection

A. Maximum Impact Items (5)

1. Central Location

Binary with some variance between +25 points to -25 points. The few measurements that are not at the extremes aren’t consistent. For example, Wagner Tree Farm is -10 points, but nearby Tashua Knolls is -25 points.

I have completed two centrality studies of Trumbull using current drivetime models, the centroid of each residential property and these twelve sites. There is much more nuance than a binary 25 or +25 points implies. Basically, any property that is near the northern or southern ends of Route 25 is more easily accessible than properties that are to the far east or far west of town.

Please create a sliding scale and actually measure centrality by drive time. I can share my results.
2. **Public Transportation**

Binary, either +25 points or -25 points. I have spoken about this multiple times; this item should either be removed, factored very low, and / or scored very low. The utility of public transportation to a Community Center / Senior Center is almost zero.

While there is a single bus route that serves three of these properties, it passes by 75 minutes prior to when our senior center currently opens and returns 15 minutes after our senior center currently closes.

For example, if I lived near Trumbull Center, I could take the bus in the morning 0.8 miles up Church Hill Road to Hardy Lane at 6:45 AM and then wait over an hour for the Senior Center to open. I could hang out all day and then take the bus home at 4:15 PM.

3. **Site Size**

Binary, either +25 points or -25 points. Total acreage is listed along with buildable acres which is used to determine if the site is large enough. My main concern is that Site Size is not mutually exclusive with some of the other items on the list such as wetlands, flooding, topography, or existing use.

For example, Twin Brooks Park is 300 acres with over three buildable acres. These are the three acres that don’t have wetlands, flooding, topography, or existing use restrictions.

The negatives in other items don’t actually impact the proposed site, yet they bring down the score.

4. **Sanitary Sewers**

Binary, either +25 points or -25 points. I have mapped our existing sanitary sewer mains and some of these sites are within one mile of existing sewer mains. I understand that this adds to the cost, however is there room for some nuance in the scoring? Instead of a binary -25 points, -10 points for a quarter-mile sewer extension?

Also, what is the current state of the septic at some of the non Sanitary Sewer sites? Is the septic at Indian Ledge end-of-life and in need of replacement? Might this be an opportunity? Was the septic at Tashua Knolls recently updated and can handle the additional volume?

Please do not tell a neighborhood that the traffic and impact will be minimal AND that we need way more toilets.

5. **Existing Parks**

Binary, either zero points or -25 points with the odd exception of Hardy Lane which gains +5 points for “REALLY not being in a park”.

Similar to our Board of Education not wanting a competitive and teaching pool on school grounds, our Parks and Recreation staff and Committee does not want a recreational facility in our parks.

Why are parks even being considered by this committee if every park on this list is immediately vetoed with a very high factor and a very negative score?
Bluntly, our Parks and Rec staff and Committee have a serious NIMBY problem and it is beyond the pale that the Parks staff will be getting space in a building that they don't actually want in a park.

B. Other Items

1. Neighborhood
Binary, either zero or +20 points for Old Church Hill Road and Hardy Lane. This item is not consistent with very high scores for two properties and zero for everything else.

Pricilla Place is in a neighborhood. Long Hill Admin is in a neighborhood, Indian Brook is in a neighborhood, but they have not been positively scored.

The neighborhood around Beech Memorial Pool did not want this facility, the neighborhood around Hardy Lane does not want this facility, and I imagine the neighborhood around Long Hill will not want this facility. Why are these scores positive? We need to look to our larger parks for a location.

2. Vehicles & Pedestrians
Binary, either zero or +10 points. This item is not consistent and should almost always have a negative value unless certain traffic control devices are in place. Promise of future traffic control devices is laughable.

For example, zero points for Wagner Tree Farm. There is a light nearby and almost everyone will leave the property and turn right with traffic.

Another example, zero points for Long Hill. There is a nearby crosswalk and sidewalks on both sides of the road and zero line-of-site issues. Shouldn't Long Hill score a bit more than Wagner Tree Farm?

Another example, +10 points for Hardy Lane. Zero crosswalk or sidewalk and a tight uphill curve that restricts line-of-site. Shouldn't Hardy Lane score a bit worse than Long Hill?

I guess technically, when you leave the Community Center Parking lot you are still on Hardy Lane and where there isn't a lot of actual traffic, yet.

3. P&Z, Traffic, and Residences
We talk a lot about our historic P&Z visions for the town, our Plan of Conservation and Development being a guide, and our award-winning Conservation Commission. We applaud our past fights against unwanted development such as the Cell Tower at the Police Station, Fuel Cell in Nichols, and the Jewish Home for the Elderly at Hardy Lane. We lament and try to improve past mistakes that have increased traffic at Chips, CVS, and along Main Street.

Why are the scores for P&Z, Traffic and Pedestrians, and Residential in this study so very low, with factors labeled “Minimum”?

If town development doesn’t do better than the most brash commercial developer, what chance do we have to control future development in Trumbull?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Label</th>
<th>01 Wagner Tree Farm</th>
<th>02 Long Hill Admin Building</th>
<th>03 Church Hill Road</th>
<th>04 Indian Ledge Park</th>
<th>05 Pritchilla Place</th>
<th>06 1445 Huntington Turnpike</th>
<th>07 Island Brook Park</th>
<th>08 Unity Park</th>
<th>09 Twin Brooks Park</th>
<th>10 Old Mine Park</th>
<th>11 Tasha Knolls Recreation Area</th>
<th>12 Hardy Lane</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Site Size (5)</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Town Owned (5)</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Central Location (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Public Transit (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Existing Park (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Public Utilities (4)</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Wetlands (4)</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Existing Uses (Rclo) (4)</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Topography (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Neighborhood (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 0.2% AFR (3)</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Contaminated (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Adjacent Recreation (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Adjoining Residential (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Vehicles &amp; Peds (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Zoning Regs (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Financial or Demo (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>-25</strong></td>
<td><strong>-65</strong></td>
<td><strong>-10</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senior / Community Center Site Considerations
### Site Selection Considering Town Owned Properties 2017

#### Site Analysis Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wagner Tree Farm</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Long Hill Administrative Building</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Church Hill Road</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indian Ledge Park</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Priscilla Place / Existing Senior Center</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1445 Huntington Turnpike</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Island Brook Park</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unity Park</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Twin Brooks Park</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Old Mine Park</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tashua Knolls Recreation Area</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town-Owned Properties

Wagner Tree Farm
Long Hill Administrative Building
Church Hill Road
Indian Ledge Park
Priscilla Place/Senior Center
1445 Huntington Tpke.
Indian Ledge Park
Island Brook Park
Unity Park
Twin Brooks Park
Old Mine Park
Tashua Knolls Rec Area

Site Selection Process
**CONS**

- Wetlands – Limited Developable Area
- Acreage may not be sufficient (3 acres)
- Location not convenient to many residents
- Busy road may be difficult for some residents to navigate
- Relocation TNAC
**PROS**

✓ Centrally located
✓ Public utilities
✓ Sewers
✓ Sufficient acreage

**CONS**

✓ Relocation of BOE/logistics, expense
✓ Loss of playing field
✓ 16 adjoining property owners
✓ Demolition cost
✓ Busy road may be difficult for some residents to navigate
Indian Ledge Park

**PROS**
- Sufficient acreage

**CONS**
- Not Centrally Located
- No Public Sewers
- No Public Transportation
- One Point of Access
- High Elevation - Challenging Winter Conditions
Pros

- Recognized location
- Public utilities
- Sewers

Cons

- Location Not Central
- 12 Adjoining Properties
- Limited Parking
- Narrow road
- Busy road may be difficult for some residents to navigate
- Acquisition cost to expand
- Flooding
PROS

✓ Public utilities
✓ Sufficient acreage

CONS

✓ Remote Location
✓ Wetlands
✓ Limited Access Point (Easement)
✓ No public sewers
✓ Acquisition cost to improve access
✓ Relocation cost – Park Ranger Station and Park Maintenance storage
Twin Brooks Park

**PROS**
- Convenient location
- Sufficient acreage

**CONS**
- Flood zone
- Encroachment of public park
- No public utilities
- Busy road, may be difficult for some residents to navigate
**Old Mine Park**

**Legend**

- Green: Parking
- Blue: Blue Trail (0.81 mi.)
- Orange: Orange Trail (0.40 mi.)
- Red: Pequonnock River Trail

**PROS**

- ✓ Sufficient acreage

**CONS**

- ✓ Old Mine Road – flood zone
- ✓ Quartz Lane - remote
- ✓ No public utilities
- ✓ Busy road, may be difficult for some residents to navigate (RT 111)
- ✓ Encroachment of public park
Tashua Knolls Recreation Area

CONS
✓ Extreme distance
✓ Displaced usage
✓ No sewers
PROS

✓ Sufficient acreage
✓ Central location
✓ Sewers
✓ Public utilities
✓ Previously developed site
✓ Only two adjacent properties
✓ Direct access to Pequaonnock River Trail

CONS

✓ Demolition of houses
✓ Busy road may be difficult for some residents to navigate
Flood Zones