

Route 10 Steering Committee Meeting #5
Simsbury Town Hall, Main Meeting Room
Minutes of March 24, 2011 – 7:00 PM

ATTENDEES:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company*</u>
	Margery Winters	CC IW – SC
	Emil Dahlquist	Design Review Board – SC
	Julie Gray Mackay	Resident, Stakeholder – Alt. for K.Griebel
	Mary Glassman	First Selectman – SC
	Rick Wagner	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	Mark Deming	Economic Development Comm. – SC
	Alan Needham	Planning Comm. – SC
	Ed Pabich	Zoning Comm. – SC
	Tom Evans	Resident
	Harald Bender	Resident
	Anita Mielert	Resident – Historical Society President
	Anna Bergeron	CT DOT
	Melanie Zimyeski	CT DOT
	Hiram Peck	Town – PT
	Emily Moos	CRCOG – PT
	Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG – PT

* SC = Steering Committee
PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

Mary Glassman opened the meeting at 7PM and stated that the purpose of this meeting is to have an overview of the corridor study process from CRCOG.

Public Comment

1. Anita Mielert, Resident – Historical Society President –
 - Ms. Mielert referred to the letter that she had presented at the March 3, 2011 meeting regarding Nod Road/East Weatogue Street stating that although the comments she provided were listed in the March 3rd consultant/CRCOG presentation as “cons” that they are to be taken in a more serious manner as they indicate that East Weatogue Historic District is a Designated Local Historic District as of 1987 and a Federally recognized National Historic District as of 1990. The road itself holds a Scenic road Designation. Ms. Mielert stated that the previous RT 10 Corridor Study looked at this same recommendation and discarded it. Ms. Mielert further stated that implementation of the improvements noted on the Draft Corridor Master Plan would have an impact that would violate these official designations as well as intentions of the POCD and that

MEETING NOTES**March 24, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5****PAGE 2 OF 6**

the Committee should take these things into serious consideration when reviewing the draft plan.

Adoption of Minutes from March 3, 2011 Meeting

Mary Glassman called for adoption of the March 3rd Meeting Minutes. Julie MacKay, sitting in as an alternate for Kirsten Griebel, stated that Ms. Griebel asks the committee to waive adoption of the March 3rd Minutes until the next Steering Committee Meeting as she has some changes to include.

Ms. MacKay also stated that she had minor changes that she would submit to CRCOG now.

The committee agreed to waive adoption of the March 3rd Minutes until the next Steering Committee Meeting.

Corridor Study Process Overview (CRCOG)

Emily Moos and Jennifer Carrier led an overview of the Corridor Study Process.

Mary Glassman asked if CRCOG could begin with a description of all documents in the handout packet for this meeting.

Ms. Moos gave a description of each handout. In the packet there were seven handouts and a handout cover sheet. In order these handouts were:

- 1) Agenda – March 24th, 2011
- 2) Draft Meeting Minutes – March 3rd, 2011
- 3) CRCOG Transportation Studies Examples Packet
- 4) Draft Trip Generation Analysis Table and Map
- 5) Draft Route 10 Corridor Future Alternatives Matrix
- 6) RT 10 Study Review & Endorsement Process Working Schedule
- 7) RT 10 Study Public Comment Summary

Jennifer Carrier presented the CRCOG Transportation Studies Examples Packet. The first example in the packet was the RT 305 Study Alternative Analysis Anticipated Change in Daily Traffic Volume A1. This example shows the analysis of introducing an interchange alternative at I 91 and the resulting daily traffic volume change at key locations in the road network.

Mary Glassman asked for clarification on how many of the draft alternatives can be modeled for the RT 10 Study.

MEETING NOTES**March 24, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5****PAGE 3 OF 6**

Jennifer Carrier confirmed that CRCOG will take input from the Steering Committee on which alternatives to run in the model and that a few of the alternatives can be examined through the modeling process.

Emil Dahlquist asked how the RT 305 Study is different from the RT 10 Study.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the RT 305 study was a larger study involving two towns – Windsor and Bloomfield – and that the RT 10 study is classified as a smaller, special study with a smaller scope. The RT 305 study was conducted over 18 months, following the traditional study format, whereas the RT 10 study was structured as a charrette-type study.

Rick Wagner asked how much modeling and traffic simulation can be accomplished in a smaller study with a limited scope.

Jennifer Carrier explained the difference between the CRCOG modeling process and the Synchro software which simulates traffic conditions. The CRCOG model generates numbers that are input into the Synchro model which can be an effective tool for visualizing current and future traffic patterns.

The second example document showed a section of the RT 305 Report Appendix on alternative concepts. Jennifer Carrier stated that this section explains the alternatives that were reviewed as a part of the study, but not included in the final plan.

Hiram Peck stated that this approach allows for a community to re-examine alternatives possibly even 20 years down the road if necessary.

Mary Glassman stated that this approach to setting up the final report means that the endorsement process is not an “all or nothing” process. This review process will help enable the town to compete for funding in the future for improvement projects as needed. If a plan is not in place, the town will not be as ready to compete for the future funding.

Jennifer Carrier stated that some towns have also gone through their legislators to seek funding for projects and that the study process is an important one. When CRCOG solicits municipalities for transportation projects needing funding, projects are assigned points based on pre-established rating criteria developed by CRCOG’s Transportation Committee.

Jennifer explained the final few example documents which were the RT 305 Improvement Concept Comparison Matrix which is similar to the draft matrix for RT 10 which was presented at the last Steering Committee Meeting. The final three examples are the Executive Summaries of the RT 305, RT 190 and Bradley Area Transportation Study.

Rick Wagner asked if CRCOG could summarize the point system and criteria used by the transportation committee for assigning funding to projects.

MEETING NOTES**March 24, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5****PAGE 4 OF 6**

Mary Glassman and Jennifer Carrier explained some of the CROG Transportation Committee's criteria for approving funding for projects which include cost, structural components, bike & pedestrian considerations, traffic data, etc. Ms. Glassman stated that projects need town support to move forward on seeking funding.

Jennifer Carrier stated that as a result of the RT 190 Study (Executive Summary provided in packet) the Town of Somers is still trying to advance some of the projects recommended in the study, while the Town of Enfield has advanced one project, securing funding under the local road accident reduction program.

Mary Glassman clarified that, the Town of Simsbury could, for example, seek funding for the bike and pedestrian improvements in this study as a separate project.

Jennifer Carrier stated that a project advancing through design, from the Bradley Area Transportation Study in Windsor Locks, is laying the groundwork to establish a parallel road system near the airport.

Emil Dahlquist asked how successful the transit components of these projects are.

Jennifer Carrier stated that in all CROG transportation studies, transit is addressed and that concepts being developed under this study, in the Westogue area, may be very feasible and funding could be tangible with what we've been seeing out of Washington. Ms. Carrier stated that Connecticut Transit and Rideshare have been stakeholders in this study.

Alan Needham noted that at a recent Planning Commission meeting, the commission spoke favorably of the bike lane elements and restriping elements discussed as a part of this study. Mr. Needham asked whether it is possible for the Steering Committee to vote on those shorter term improvements separately.

Emily Moos stated that a separate committee endorsement of shorter term improvements could be voted on at a future meeting.

Emily Moos presented the Draft Trip Generation Analysis Table and Map stating that the charrette had been a new component to the corridor study process and that it may not have allowed for the best incorporation of the land use elements of the scope. Ms. Moos stated that the team will utilize this table which calculates available land area and applies an absorption rate and assumptions based upon the current POCD and zoning for those areas to calculate future trips. Ms. Moos described the map stating that these calculations would be done for each of the four general corridor areas that had been discussed as a part of the charrette process.

Mary Glassman stated that what the steering committee will see through this process is a comparison of existing conditions to future conditions based upon buildout of the POCD and zoning assumptions which have already been adopted by the town.

Julie MacKay asked about the flexibility of the new PAD zone.

MEETING NOTES**March 24, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5****PAGE 5 OF 6**

Mary Glassman stated that this analysis will take into account what is currently allowed under Simsbury's zoning regulations.

Ed Pabich stated that this approach moves us a step forward. It will give a Frame of reference for future Zoning Commission decisions.

Rick Wagner asked whether this study will look at projects that might impact RT 10 which are beyond town borders.

Emily Moos stated that CRCOG will work with the town to examine and list developments outside of the corridor within town boundaries which will be generally addressed in this analysis. Ms. Moos explained that while it is not in this project's scope to examine developments outside of town boundaries that may have an impact, the CRCOG model takes into account the future growth of the entire regional network which even reaches beyond state borders into Massachusetts.

Emil Dahlquist referred to the RT 10 CRCOG Consultant Agreement and scope of work where it states that the team will "develop a table summary of 8-10 key redevelopment properties to tabulate buildout potential under desirable zoning" and questioned the use of the phrase "desirable zoning."

Hiram Peck stated that the POCD will be relied upon to make assumptions when utilizing the trip generation table for analysis.

Jennifer Carrier stated that a similar scope of work is utilized for many of our studies and that the language of the scope is generally taken from CRCOG standard template.

Ms. Moos presented the Draft RT 10 Corridor Future Alternatives Matrix stating that the consultant would begin filling in the contents soon to bring for a May or June Steering Committee Meeting.

Emil Dahlquist asked whether CRCOG and the consultant would be rating the alternatives.

Emily Moos responded that while the consultant will fill in information to help the committee compare the alternatives, the committee will be asked to give input on the overall rating of alternatives.

Rick Wagner commented that filling in this table will require lots of work and asked whether the product could be somewhere in between the comparison matrix for the RT 305 study (Table 4.2) and what the draft looks like now?

Emily Moos stated that this matrix is a work in progress and that these categories would require different types of answers. Ms. Moos stated that the Committee is welcome to offer input on which columns might be of more or less use to the committee before the consultant begins to fill it in.

MEETING NOTES**March 24, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #5****PAGE 6 OF 6**

Jennifer Carrier presented the RT 10 Corridor Study Review & Endorsement Process Working Schedule. Ms. Carrier stated that the schedule reflects that CRCOG staff aims to make themselves available to meet with the Committee twice a month until endorsement. To stay within scope and within budget, the consultant will only be able to come to a limited number of future meetings.

Alan Needham asked whether meeting the second week in April on localized improvements gave the committee enough time to coordinate those recommendations with the summer paving project.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the ConnDOT will likely go through a change order process and that this meeting timing would work.

Julie MacKay noted that the summer is a tough time for public comment period and that it would be better to move it up as much as possible.

Public Comments Received to Date (CRCOG)

Emily Moos presented the Draft Public Comment Summary stating that this record includes all emails and letters received at CRCOG to date and that this log will continue to be updated as future comments come in. At the request of Rick Wagner, Ms. Moos pointed to three additions made to the summary since the committee received the document earlier in the week.

Next Steps:

- CRCOG will schedule the next meeting date and notice the meeting for the Committee and Interested Parties.
- To the greatest extent possible, CRCOG will forward advance copies of meeting materials to the Steering Committee.