

**TOWN OF TRUMBULL  
CONNECTICUT**



Trumbull Conservation Commission  
Community Facilities Building Committee  
Joint Meeting  
Wednesday, November 30, 2022  
7:00 pm  
Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Conservation Commission Members Present: Chairman, Mary Ellen Lemay, Tim Coughlin, Richard Post, Sara Sterling, John Massari, Matthew Sulzicki, Pam Roman

Community Facilities Building Committee Members Present: Chairman, Lori Hayes-O'Brien, Dave Galla, Dawn Cantafio, Ron Foligno, Michael Buswell

Also Present: Tom Arcari and Rocco Petito from QA&M, Cindy Katske, Chief Administrative Officer, Richard White, Janet Epstein

Mrs. Lemay called the joint meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**Past Minutes**

Motion was made by Mr. Post to approve the minutes of October 26, 2022 as written. Seconded by Mr. Coughlin and approved unanimously.

**Guest Presentation**

Mr. Arcari and Mr. Petito presented to the group the current concept design for a Senior Center. The design has gone through several iterations since 2016 with a rigorous site selection process. In the most recent iteration of the feasibility study, the Building Committee is looking at the parcel on Hardy Lane for exploration to develop a new Senior Center. The concern on this site is how the proposed development effects the natural habitat, wetlands and eco space. It was felt a meeting with the Conservation Commission would be beneficial in addressing those areas.

A power point presentation was reviewed and the following was noted:

1. Town-owned sites were studied for the project and evaluated considering key factors such size, infrastructure currently on the property, the types of natural elements that would be impacted, location, etc. The Hardy Lane site is central to the community and on a primary corridor for vehicular transportation.
2. The site is 25 acres purchased two years ago. It is adjacent to a preserved conservation area.

The proposal for the Center would impact .65 acres of the total space. Three residential parcels were purchased by the Town and the remainder of the space is undeveloped.

3. The process from the first iteration through the current design plan was shown.
4. Property topography was discussed. It was noted there has been some urban fill placed on the site over the years. This would indicate a necessity for a Phase II Environmental Study as the project moves forward to gather additional information on the material.
5. Wetlands were identified on the site. Although the proposal did not encroach on the wetlands, it was felt it was too close during earlier discussions.
6. Through the process, the aquatic facility was removed from the scope of the project and will be explored separately. This made an impact on the footprint of the facility. In addition, the footprint was reduced by placing the gymnasium component in the basement of the building. This moved the building up on the site.
7. The last iteration of the proposal was discussed. It will give the flexibility to provide the Center with greater access and give the ability to clean up the area, clean up the unsuitable soils that may be found and use the parking areas as a barrier for rain water runoff. This plan also could address the return of the unused property to the conservation area as it cannot be developed. They will continue to develop the design after further discussion.
8. Parking on the property was discussed, including paving materials being considered. Area of disturbance would be considerably lessened. The proposed center sits on the former residential properties with little impact on the undeveloped areas.
9. Concept designs are being worked on. Various areas within the building were discussed. Many areas would have a direct view of the conservation area.
10. Proposed building is 32,000 sq feet. (13,500 and 18,500)
11. The process continues to evolve and the Committee is glad to gather information from the Conservation Commission and use it to make the Center a viable addition to the community.
12. Environmental testing on the site will be conducted soon as well as a full traffic study on the impact of Hardy Lane and State Route 127. Environmental assessments and conservation assessments are the biggest concerns with the project.

Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted this was a summary of many conversations and is a constantly evolving project. They have worked hard to make the project as efficient as possible but also to serve a purpose. This has been a tough process with the availability of suitable sites. Testing could change the direction of the project at any time. Mrs. Jakab, the Senior Center Director, has provided great input.

Several topics were addressed by the Conservation Commission members with Mr. Arcari including:

1. **Mr. Post - Phase I study.** Mr. Arcari noted this was conducted and indicated there was fill on the site but the materials were unknown. There was a small area of concern that was evaluated in the location of an underground tank at one of the residential properties. Phase I was conducted before the purchase of the properties.
2. **Mr. Post - Ground Water sampling.** Mr. Arcari noted this will be done in Phase II, if they get to ground water. Concern was for run off of water with the slope of the property. It is planned to contain the water, treat it and release after treatment or create a natural treatment area such as a rain garden. Concern is for pollutants being re-introduced into the water. Erosion control is also a concern.
3. **Mrs. Roman – excavation for over flow parking area in the rear of the building.** Mr. Arcari noted there would be excavation to accommodate the basement of the building in that area. Various types of pavement were discussed. Pervious pavement is hard to maintain and is costly. Options can be considered for the various parking areas depending on decisions made with

regard to water retention.

4. **Mrs. Lemay – interested in the percentages for imperious pavement areas and slope on the site.** Mr. Arcari did not have these specific numbers but felt the slope was about 8% at the back of the property. He did note the building will be one story from the front and two stories from the rear which faces the wooded area.
5. **Mr. Massari – concern about a 25 foot drop off and being able to contain the run off.** Mr. Arcari noted the concept is to have underground retention beneath the parking area in the rear. The Committee is not close to those types of decisions yet. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted this is very preliminary work. The Committee is charged with developing a concept design, obtaining numbers and presenting to the Town Council for approval before the project moves forward.
6. **Mr. Massari – suggestion of returning the unused land as part of the conservation area.** It was noted the Committee can only recommend this action as it is not within their scope.
7. Trail access was discussed. This may not be achievable with the topography of the land. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted access to the outside was important for recreation purposes.
8. **Mrs. Sterling – interested in LID considerations in the plan.** Mr. Arcari noted the building would be very energy efficient and LID would be included.
9. Trumbull resident, Mr. Richard White, requested QA&M provide the town with geo-referencing information for the Town GIS system. Mr. Arcari noted that would not be a problem as all information gathered belongs to the Town.
10. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted the next Community Facilities Building Committee meeting is on December 14 and is open to the public.

At 8:04 pm, the Community Facilities Building Committee members adjourned their Committee meeting by unanimous consent and left the meeting. The Conservation Commission continued with the remainder of their meeting agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall  
Conservation Commission Clerk

**TOWN OF TRUMBULL  
CONNECTICUT**



Trumbull Conservation Commission  
Community Facilities Building Committee  
Joint Meeting

Wednesday, November 30, 2022

7:00 pm

Long Hill Conference Room, Trumbull Town Hall

Conservation Commission Members Present: Chairman, Mary Ellen Lemay, Tim Coughlin, Richard Post, Sara Sterling, John Massari, Matthew Sulzicki, Pam Roman

Community Facilities Building Committee Members Present: Chairman, Lori Hayes-O'Brien, Dave Galla, Dawn Cantafio, Ron Foligno, Michael Buswell

Also Present: Tom Arcari and Rocco Petito from QA&M, Cindy Katske, Chief Administrative Officer, Richard White, Janet Epstein

Mrs. Lemay called the joint meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**Past Minutes**

Motion was made by Mr. Post to approve the minutes of October 26, 2022 as written. Seconded by Mr. Coughlin and approved unanimously.

**Guest Presentation**

Mr. Arcari and Mr. Petito presented to the group the current concept design for a Senior Center. The design has gone through several iterations since 2016 with a rigorous site selection process. In the most recent iteration of the feasibility study, the Building Committee is looking at the parcel on Hardy Lane for exploration to develop a new Senior Center. The concern on this site is how the proposed development effects the natural habitat, wetlands and eco space. It was felt a meeting with the Conservation Commission would be beneficial in addressing those areas.

A power point presentation was reviewed and the following was noted:

1. Town-owned sites were studied for the project and evaluated considering key factors such size, infrastructure currently on the property, the types of natural elements that would be impacted, location, etc. The Hardy Lane site is central to the community and on a primary corridor for vehicular transportation.
2. The site is 25 acres purchased two years ago. It is adjacent to a preserved conservation area.

The proposal for the Center would impact .65 acres of the total space. Three residential parcels were purchased by the Town and the remainder of the space is undeveloped.

3. The process from the first iteration through the current design plan was shown.
4. Property topography was discussed. It was noted there has been some urban fill placed on the site over the years. This would indicate a necessity for a Phase II Environmental Study as the project moves forward to gather additional information on the material.
5. Wetlands were identified on the site. Although the proposal did not encroach on the wetlands, it was felt it was too close during earlier discussions.
6. Through the process, the aquatic facility was removed from the scope of the project and will be explored separately. This made an impact on the footprint of the facility. In addition, the footprint was reduced by placing the gymnasium component in the basement of the building. This moved the building up on the site.
7. The last iteration of the proposal was discussed. It will give the flexibility to provide the Center with greater access and give the ability to clean up the area, clean up the unsuitable soils that may be found and use the parking areas as a barrier for rain water runoff. This plan also could address the return of the unused property to the conservation area as it cannot be developed. They will continue to develop the design after further discussion.
8. Parking on the property was discussed, including paving materials being considered. Area of disturbance would be considerably lessened. The proposed center sits on the former residential properties with little impact on the undeveloped areas.
9. Concept designs are being worked on. Various areas within the building were discussed. Many areas would have a direct view of the conservation area.
10. Proposed building is 32,000 sq feet. (13,500 and 18,500)
11. The process continues to evolve and the Committee is glad to gather information from the Conservation Commission and use it to make the Center a viable addition to the community.
12. Environmental testing on the site will be conducted soon as well as a full traffic study on the impact of Hardy Lane and State Route 127. Environmental assessments and conservation assessments are the biggest concerns with the project.

Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted this was a summary of many conversations and is a constantly evolving project. They have worked hard to make the project as efficient as possible but also to serve a purpose. This has been a tough process with the availability of suitable sites. Testing could change the direction of the project at any time. Mrs. Jakab, the Senior Center Director, has provided great input.

Several topics were addressed by the Conservation Commission members with Mr. Arcari including:

1. **Mr. Post - Phase I study.** Mr. Arcari noted this was conducted and indicated there was fill on the site but the materials were unknown. There was a small area of concern that was evaluated in the location of an underground tank at one of the residential properties. Phase I was conducted before the purchase of the properties.
2. **Mr. Post - Ground Water sampling.** Mr. Arcari noted this will be done in Phase II, if they get to ground water. Concern was for run off of water with the slope of the property. It is planned to contain the water, treat it and release after treatment or create a natural treatment area such as a rain garden. Concern is for pollutants being re-introduced into the water. Erosion control is also a concern.
3. **Mrs. Roman – excavation for over flow parking area in the rear of the building.** Mr. Arcari noted there would be excavation to accommodate the basement of the building in that area. Various types of pavement were discussed. Pervious pavement is hard to maintain and is costly. Options can be considered for the various parking areas depending on decisions made with

regard to water retention.

4. **Mrs. Lemay – interested in the percentages for imperious pavement areas and slope on the site.** Mr. Arcari did not have these specific numbers but felt the slope was about 8% at the back of the property. He did note the building will be one story from the front and two stories from the rear which faces the wooded area.
5. **Mr. Massari – concern about a 25 foot drop off and being able to contain the run off.** Mr. Arcari noted the concept is to have underground retention beneath the parking area in the rear. The Committee is not close to those types of decisions yet. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted this is very preliminary work. The Committee is charged with developing a concept design, obtaining numbers and presenting to the Town Council for approval before the project moves forward.
6. **Mr. Massari – suggestion of returning the unused land as part of the conservation area.** It was noted the Committee can only recommend this action as it is not within their scope.
7. Trail access was discussed. This may not be achievable with the topography of the land. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted access to the outside was important for recreation purposes.
8. **Mrs. Sterling – interested in LID considerations in the plan.** Mr. Arcari noted the building would be very energy efficient and LID would be included.
9. Trumbull resident, Mr. Richard White, requested QA&M provide the town with geo-referencing information for the Town GIS system. Mr. Arcari noted that would not be a problem as all information gathered belongs to the Town.
10. Mrs. Hayes-O'Brien noted the next Community Facilities Building Committee meeting is on December 14 and is open to the public.

At 8:04 pm, the Community Facilities Building Committee members adjourned their Committee meeting by unanimous consent and left the meeting. The Conservation Commission continued with the remainder of their meeting agenda.

#### **New Business**

1. Request for Information Session on Twin Brooks Park Project – Mrs. Lemay noted she received a notification from the CT DEP for a tentative determination to approve the activities at Twin Brooks Park waiving a public hearing unless there is a petition of 25 or more people by the end of December. She reviewed the project description with the Commissioners. A discussion was held with Bill Maurer, who is the contact with DEP, and an information session was requested for the project to update the Commission. Mr. Maurer will be invited to the February meeting.
2. 2022 Review of Accomplishments, Plans for 2023 – Mrs. Lemay is working on the 2022 Review. She noted the Commission should be prioritizing projects for 2023 with the Thousand Trees for Trumbull number one with all the associated facets including public education.
  - a. The Long Hill Green area and the proposed Veterans Center will provide an opportunity for plantings. The Commission has been requested to prepare a planting plan for the new Veterans Center at Kaatz Pond. Mrs. Lemay and Mrs. Roman have reviewed the location and are looking forward to making recommendations so the project can move forward with additional grants and donations. This would be a great demonstration site. Mrs. Lemay discussed a Riparian Buffer Planting Plan brochure that has several examples of types of buffers, planting plans and associated costs. The landscape project around the pond could fall into this type of plan. A budget has not been determined.
  - b. The Long Hill Market area was discussed with regard to an update to the landscape plan. Mrs. Roman developed a plan for one rain garden and they are considering extending the plan to cover the second rain garden on the property. This would remove invasives and include more native plants in the area. No pesticides would be allowed. Mr.

Coughlin noted the areas need to be maintained for the first three to five years so that invasives do not fill in again.

- c. The Long Hill Green could be part of the tree initiative and a demonstration site.

Mrs. Lemay noted the Commission has assisted with some of the landscape plans on submitted applications. Commissioners were requested to send the Chairman their project priorities for 2023. Mrs. Roman suggested two important projects should be tree education and invasive plant remediation, including dissemination of information to the public and recruitment to assist in projects.

### **Old Business**

1. Status of P&Z Regulation Upgrades and Applications
  - a. Steep Slope Change – Mrs. Lemay spoke with the Town Attorney and was informed they needed more time to review and discuss. Discussion was held regarding penalties if the regulation is not followed. This needs to be addressed. It was noted other towns have fines and requirements for replanting if the regulations are not followed.
  - b. Buffer Enhancement – Mrs. Lemay noted she will be attending a meeting with Metro COG and CTAC looking for terminology to be included in the regulation.
2. A Thousand Trees for Trumbull – Mr. Coughlin noted he attended a meeting with Mr. Estrada, Mr. Paris, Mrs. Isaac and Mrs. Roman regarding this program and now has a better idea of how to move forward. He suggested a walk through to help him with the costs. Twin Brooks is a target area and, according to Mr. Paris, should be ready for planting in the spring when the reconstruction project is completed. Once all the systems are in place for the trees, it will be easy moving forward. At this time, there will be no trees planted on private property.
3. Updates on IWWC Applications – West Mischa Road applications were rejected. It is expected they will be appealed in some manner.
4. Pollinator Pathway Updates – this will be expanded to the Long Hill Green area.
5. Town Properties Updates – No update at this time.
6. “You Can’s Unchop a Tree” Flyer – the Greenwich flyer requires updating with Trumbull information. Mrs. Sterling noted there is a movement in Redding regarding removal of trees and she will look into it and provide feedback.

Boards and Commissions Dinner will be held on December 1 at Tashua Knolls.

### **Resident Comments**

1. Richard White discussed several concerns regarding the proposed Senior Center on Hardy Lane including the fact the Town is removed from P&Z regulation review, impervious pavement surfaces are greater than reported, size of facility is around 2 acres, DEP has not been invited by the Town to review the project.
2. Ms. Epstein discussed the Thousand Tree project and asked what the five year plan would be. She also felt the tree ordinance should be finalized in some form.

### **Next Meeting and 2023 Meeting Dates**

The next Commission meeting will be held on February 1, 2023. Meeting dates were approved for 2023.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, motion was made by Mr. Coughlin to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 pm. Seconded by Mr. Post and approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crandall  
Clerk