

**Route 10 Steering Committee Meeting #4
Simsbury Town Hall, Main Meeting Room
Minutes of March 3, 2011 – 7:00 PM**

ATTENDEES:

Name Company*

Mary Glassman First Selectman – SC
Ed Pabich SC
Rick Wagner Representing local business in corridor – SC
Tom Evans Resident
Mike Fish Representing local business in corridor – SC
Kirsten Griebel Resident – SC
Emil Dahlquist Design Review Board – SC
Eileen Fielding Farmington River Association
Nancy Haase BOS
Margery Winters CC IW
Emily Moos CRCOG – PT
Jennifer Carrier CRCOG – PT
Anita Mielert Resident – Historical Society President
Julie Mackay Resident
Duncan McKay Resident
Judy Rabinowitz Resident
Mark Orenstein Resident
Harold Bender Resident
Marlene Jung Resident
Bob Durbois Resident
Hiram Peck Town – PT
Ted DeSantos F&O – PT
Patrick Baxter F&O - PT
Wade Walker F&O – PT (phone)

* SC = Steering Committee
PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

Mary Glassman opened the meeting, by welcoming everyone. The objective of this meeting is to take a step back and review what came out of the charrette process.

A brief overview of February's Charrette was given by CRCOG and Fuss & O'Neill. The meeting was then open to the public for input.

Public Comment

1. Anita Mielert - Letter from 2-11 regarding NOD Road/East Weatogue:
 - Opposed to relocation of Nod Rd. for many reasons:
 - In conflict of POCD.



- Moves traffic off highway to residential street
 - Designated Local Historic District – 1987
 - Federal National Historic District – 1990
 - Requires Federal review if impacted by Federal Funded project
 - Municipal designation – Scenic Road
 - Posted “No Thru Traffic” with 10k weight limit
 - Option was previously studied in 1998 study and not chosen as a preferred alternative
2. Bob Patricelli – owner Folly Farm on Rte 185
- Would have liked better notification of process
 - Preserve rural gateway as you cross mountain over 185
 - Relocation of Nod Rd. across his property would:
 - Disturb very important environmental parcel: “horseshoe cove” full of natural resources
 - Cause loss of farmland
 - Scenic designation of Farmington River
 - If town continues with this recommendation to build a new road across his property they will face very determined opposition from him. He is in favor of keeping Nod Rd as it is
3. Eileen Fielding – Executive Director of Farmington River Association
- Concerned with impacts of new connections in southern gateway and Weatogue area
 - Concerned about impacts to Farmington River
 - Increased impervious surface
 - Polluted runoff
 - River may be designated as “Wild & Scenic” by NPS
 - Migration route for wildlife
 - Proximity of road to riverbank – risk to road from Erosion.
 - Endangered species of mussel near proposed bridge
 - NPS review of bridge – aesthetics
 - Low impact public access point
 - Don’t build unless / until clearly needed
 - Prefer existing Route 185 access
 - Would like to see increased public access to river.
 - Study should consider Farmington Valley Biodiversity Project
 - Submitted letter to be included in public comment record
4. Duncan McKay – resident across Hopmeadow Street from Abigail’s
- Maintain Historic Character – small town
 - There are no traffic “problems”; the traffic is not so bad. At most 10 – 15 minutes period of time when there is some back up, at 185/Rte 10 intersection twice a day
 - No need for traffic improvements at existing Route 10/185 gateway but not opposed to
 - beautification initiatives, i.e. plantings
5. Julie MacKay – resident
- Not opposed to Weatogue near connection to Stratton Brook if no environmental



impact and if property owners agree

6. Sue Benardczyk - Simsbury resident

- Concern with river, floodplain, homeowners
- Not looking at what to preserve/protect and how we want to grow
- Does not want Route 10 Four-Lane Highway – with PAD Rte 10 can become four lane rd even with improvements
- Keep two-lane road
- Need to do a land use charrette

6. Marlene Jung Weatogue resident – lives adjacent to Route 10/185 Gateway

- Likes new West Street intersection
- Traffic calming and capacity improvements
- Wants improved pedestrian facilities
- Sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals
- Monument/beautification for Route 10/185 and able to cross the street safely at the intersection

Adoption of Minutes from February 3, 2011 Meeting

Mary Glassman called for adoption of the February 3rd Meeting Minutes, Mike Fish made a motion which Kirsten Griebel seconded to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Corridor Alternatives Review & Discussion Part I (F&O Team)

Ted DeSantos and Emily Moos explained that the purpose of the presentation slides is to review one by one each of the new connections in the plan and present the pros and cons as heard through the charrette process. Additionally, public comments received to date on each connection have been highlighted. Emily Moos explained that after the slides relating to each connection, slides have been placed into the presentation to capture the committee's discussion and thoughts regarding each connection. The purpose of this presentation is to allow the committee to better understand and discuss the plan that came out of the charrette and also to have the committee give direction to the project team on prioritizing recommendations for further study and modeling.

Several Questions were asked throughout the first few slides of the presentation:

Question – Ed Pabich; can you project future capacity with improvements?

Modeling not yet complete – to be provided.

Question – Kirsten Griebel; Will you use the POCD as model for projections for traffic capacity?

Ted deSantos; Stakeholder groups informed the project about plans and Simsbury's economic development goals

Comment - Input from The Hartford important

Question – Can developers - through development process - widen RT 10?
Need to plan for projected increase in traffic. If not, it will be easier for new development – if development is approved by boards and commissions in the future - to require capacity changes to RT 10.

Question – Emil Dahlquist – Do these new alternatives create induced traffic?
Plan allows for better planned improvements
Roadways not built in hopes of development

Question – Rick Wagner – How do we decide priority? CRCOG model will be updated for new roadway connections

Question – Rick Wagner – what is the Steering Committee's role this evening?
This evening and our next meeting are designed to walk through all connections and improvements – committee's role is to provide comments to guide the project team with plan refinement

Question – Emil Dahlquist – Will there be a chance to evaluate economic benefits of alternatives?
The project team is moving in the direction of creating a matrix of improvements and a way to “rate” or weigh the costs and benefit of each alternative

Question – Mass Transit

In 20 years, could it be possible that the population is moving more towards transit as the primary means of transportation? If so, capacity improvements would be lower priority. Should we be encouraging more transit use over single occupant vehicle?

Discussion of Southern Gateway:

Comment - Kirsten Griebel; Most concerned with extending E/W connection of Latimer Lane extension. It will increase traffic on a road that has an elementary school and has children walking and biking across the road. Safety concerns – we should not be encouraging traffic on that road

Comment – Margery Winters; Terrible site for a road (Latimer Lane extension) and bridge. Very environmentally sensitive site across existing wetlands. If you have to build it move it north across field

Question – Latimer Lane Bridge only getting people half way, not all the way across mountain – not a regional improvement – what is cost?
Provides important alternate route across river to relieve the existing 2 lane bridge on Hartford Road and reduce traffic on Route 10.

Comment – Kirsten Griebel; We heard overwhelmingly from people that there is no traffic problem

Next Steps:

- Committee to vote separately on bike lanes with paving project



- Next meeting 3-23 or 3-24 for Part II Discussion
- Continue conversation on improvements at next meeting