

Route 10 Steering Committee Meeting #8
Simsbury Town Hall, Main Meeting Room
Minutes of May 11, 2011 – 7:00 PM

ATTENDEES:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company*</u>
	Margery Winters	CC IW – SC
	Emil Dahlquist	Design Review Board – SC
	Rick Wagner	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	John Hampton	Deputy First Selectman - SC
	Alan Needham	Planning Comm. – SC
	Nancy Haase	Resident - SC
	Julie Mackay (For Kirsten Griebel)	Resident, Stakeholder - Weatogue
	Hiram Peck	Town of Simsbury – PT
	Emily Moos	CRCOG – PT
	Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG – PT

* SC = Steering Committee

PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

Mary Glassman welcomed everyone to the meeting. She stated that attendance by Steering Committee members is critical and that if people could RSVP prior to meetings and send a representative if they cannot make it that would be helpful.

Rick Wagner asked whether the Steering Committee could get a sense of where the study is headed and what is required of the committee with regard to the final product of the study.

Mary Glassman stated that the committee will be required to vote to endorse the final plan to the Board of Selectmen for adoption by the town. She asked whether CRCOG could send an e-mail to committee about meetings, attendance and what is required of the committee.

Rick Wagner stated that he is concerned about coming to consensus on the final plan. He stated that it's important that all committee members understand the recommendations of the plan.

Emily Moos went through the schedule for the study stating that the final draft of the study report is likely to be posted to the public in mid June and that the committee would be asked to make a vote to endorse the final plan to the Board of Selectmen in mid July after a 30-day public comment period on the plan.

Mary Glassman stated that the public is interested in when this study will move the next step. She asked whether it's ok that the committee has not come to a vote yet.

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 2 OF 8**

Ms. Moos stated that the study team has wanted to give the committee and the public as much time and information necessary to digest and understand the results of the charrette. She stated that the next meeting will bring the consultant team back to discuss the draft improvement matrix which has been filled in and which can be another tool to help the committee and the public understand the impacts of the recommended improvements.

Emil Dahlquist reiterated Rick's comments and stated that he'd like to have the opportunity during Steering Committee Meetings to have more discussion amongst committee members.

Ms. Moos stated that there will be plenty of opportunity for discussion at the next few meetings where the draft improvement matrix and draft elements of the final report will be available.

Rick Wagner asked whether the matrix could be sent to the committee ahead of time for review.

Ms. Moos stated that with the tight meeting schedule, the team would do the best they could to send materials ahead of time. She pointed the committee's attention to the blank sample matrix that had been shown to the committee at prior meetings and commented on how that sample will be modified for the next meeting.

Margery Winters asked whether the CRCOG model will be re-run based upon which recommendations are endorse and which are not.

Jennifer Carrier stated the difference between the model and the matrix and stated that the discussion about model outputs will help inform the matrix.

John Hampton asked about getting the RT 10 meetings posted on the Simsbury meeting calendar on-line.

Emily Moos stated that she would work to further facilitate this on CRCOG's end. She also stated that there is another SCTV appearance scheduled when the draft final report comes out for public comment.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Adoption of Minutes

Without a quorum, the Adoption of Minutes was tabled for the next meeting.

MEETING NOTES

May 11, 2011

ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6

PAGE 3 OF 8

Traffic Variations and Regional Connections Discussion

Emily Moos presented each of the regional connections stating that this presentation had been updated with any public comments that came through since the last time that the committee saw this presentation.

Ms. Moos went through the pros, cons and comments associated with each concept from South to North in the corridor which can be found in the meeting presentation. Committee members made comments and asked questions which were answered by the project team.

Concept 1A: A North south parallel connection between Blue Ridge drive and the new east west Road at Latimer Lane.

Julie MacKay asked for clarification on whether this improvement assuming a new road and if so, does it go between commercial properties?

Emily Moos stated that a new road is proposed with this improvement which does traverse existing commercial properties.

Mary Glassman asked whether this improvement includes a new bridge?

Emily Moos stated that the new bridge is associated with 1B, not 1A.

Emil Dahlquist, representing the Design Review Committee relayed comments from that committee:

- 1) Questioning the efficacy of this parallel road – if the extension of Latimer Lane and new bridge is not also build, does this connection work?
- 2) There are multiple greenway crossings of the this new road which may not be desirable
- 3) Detrimental environmental impacts associated with this improvement

Mary Glassman indicated that this might be a good connection to quantify with the model. Ms. Moos stated that this could be run as a connection in the model.

Rick Wagner asked how much buy-in would be need from private property owners for this roadway and wanted to get a sense of how this project could be addressed with the private owners.

Jennifer Carrier stated that in some studies have approached private owners during the course of the study as stakeholders. Hiram Peck stated that he had spoken with property owners in this area, but that development of roadways here will really depend upon the situation at the time of development if this area is developed.

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 4 OF 8**

Emil asked whether it is important to draw distinctions between main line congestion and intersection congestion and what does this concept accomplish?

Jennifer Carrier stated that this concept is meant to address both.

Concept 1B: East West Connection between RT 10 and Nod Road opposite Latimer Lane.

Hiram Peck stated that this alternative would have the same con as the previous alternative regarding multiple private property ownership.

Mary Glassman stated that she did not see a lot of support for this concept.

Concept 2A: Relocation of Not Road easterly to connect with East Weatogue Street.

Mary Glassman stated that this alternative does not have a lot of support. She stated that 2A may have more support, but that it could encounter issues associated with flooding.

Rick Wagner asked whether there is a possibility of a "2C" option to tweak the existing configuration.

Jennifer Carrier stated that ConnDOT had made improvements to this intersection previously and that the team could look at another solution to tweak what has been set forth in this study already.

Hiram Peck stated that an improvement is going to have to stay on the south side of the intersection so as not to affect the historic tree to the north.

Concept 3: New Regional Connection extending from RT 185 to intersect with Stratton Brook – One Way.

Julie MacKay asked for clarification on why the road is one way only.

Hiram Peck stated that a two-way would create another problematic intersection on RT 10 turning onto RT 185 if the road were two way.

Rick Wagner stated that there had been a public comment regarding allowing traffic to go one way in the AM and the other way in the PM. He stated that this is of concern for safety reasons.

Mary Glassman stated that the comments on this alternative should reflect that one property owner in this area is interested in this option

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 5 OF 8**

Margery Winters asked for clarification on the location and relocation of the commuter lot stating that the lot would need a lot of remediation as it is close to the river.

Hiram Peck stated that this commuter lot is the most heavily used. He stated that the comments from this process indication the lot could be expanded and relocated to provide for better access to the potential multi-modal hub.

Rick Wagner asked about the environmental permitting as a roadblock in this process.

Emily Moos stated that perhaps - given positive comments received by the public and the committee on this alternative in the charrette process - this may be an example where the benefits to community place-making are worth the permitting issues and costs and that the matrix for next week's meeting will help the committee with that discussion.

Jennifer Carrier stated that CRCOG can run through model to see traffic implications of this connection and that this information can go into the matrix for evaluation.

Emil Dahlquist stated that this option addresses several issues at once as it creates a sense of place and organizes Weatogue well placing parking behind future buildings. He stated that it will be important to separate parking from the Riverview lot so as not to have a sea of asphalt.

Hiram Peck stated that this option creates potential for other opportunities in this area, especially if some of the adjacent properties are ever redeveloped.

Alan Needham stated that this alternative does something positive for Weatogue. He asked whether there will be a problem at the intersection where RT 10 where the new connection meets? He also had one concern about leaving Abigail's on an "island" of land if the new connection were introduced.

Jennifer Carrier stated that this new road will be less likely to create a back-up at the intersection of RT 10 and Stratton Brook because people will have a choice and because it will act more like a relief valve for those coming off of the RT 185 mountain.

Emil Dahlquist asked if the study team could take a comparative look at what this roadway system would look like with and without the alternative implemented.

Julie MacKay also asked if the team would look at making improvements but not adding the new road?

It was concluded that CRCOG would run this concept in the transportation model to look at the impacts to the RT 10 system.

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 6 OF 8**

Concept 4: Extension of Iron Horse Boulevard southerly to connect with RT 10 Pine Hill Drive.

Mary Glassman – Do want to go back to Ensign Bickford with this concept to get input

Emil Dahlquist raised the idea that this concept would also face floodplain permitting issues

Rick Wagner stated that there are people who work in this area and wanted not to make assumptions with this study that this business and those jobs would not be there in the near future.

Mary Glassman stated that this may be a long term suggestion and that the town could come back and look at this solution in the future. The report should make a point in the plan that the intent is not to disrupt properties or jobs in the short term, but rather if this property becomes available in the future.

Nancy Haase stated that she wouldn't want to see this alternative leave the plan because it is an opportunity if this property does get redeveloped.

Julie MacKay stated that it will be important to point out in the report that this alternative does not impact the existing properties in the plan

Margery Winters stated that it is a concern to see more parking in this area as there is already so much parking nearby.

Hiram Peck stated that the commuter lots north of Drake Hill would be relocated south of Drake Hill somewhere.

Emil Dahlquist asked about the localized improvement in this area connecting Iron Horse to West Street around the current bank property.

Emily Moos explained the modeling results for this improvement run in the 2030 baseline model. This connection will alleviate some of the additional traffic on RT 10 as it handles about 800-900 vehicles. There is a negligible impact on Drake Hill Road.

Rick Wagner asked about Level of Service results. Ms. Moos explained that LOS grades would require a more detailed analysis. Jennifer Carrier stated that this study would generally cover traffic variations analysis.

It was determined that CRCOG would place percent change in average daily traffic on these model results so as to make the significance of reductions or additions to average daily traffic more understandable.

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 7 OF 8**

Jennifer Carrier made the distinction between the baseline traffic analysis and the model results based upon the use of the land use and transportation tool presented at the previous meeting.

Concept 5A & 5B: New regional connection extending from Hoskins and County Road intersection to join with Wolcott Road at RT 10 and a parallel Connection from new regional connection to intersect with Hoskins Rd.

Emil Dahlquist stated that 5A is a recommendation that had been expressed in the 2007 POCD and should be listed as a pro.

Rick Wagner stated that Rich Sawitzke had stated that changing the designation of RT 315 would be a costly endeavor and that the committee needs to keep that point in mind. He questioned the LOS F at Tariffville Road.

Ms. Moos stated that CRCOG would get back to the committee on this intersection.

Emil Dahlquist asked about LOS as a measure for traffic improvement as it analyzes the peak hours of the day and questioned whether that prompts overbuilding for all of the other hours of the day.

Nancy Haase stated that Hoskins and County already dangerous. Wondered whether there is something at this intersection could be improved and whether intersecting 5A would make this intersection more dangerous.

Jennifer Carrier stated that based upon committee discussions, this 5A alternative may be a good candidate for running in the traffic model to see what level of traffic the new connection could serve. The committee agreed with this statement. Jennifer also stated that CRCOG would look at the POCD recommendation on this to become aware of the details of that vision.

Concept 6: New regional connection linking RT 167 with County Road.

Mary suggested to revisit this alternative if the ownership or use of the golf course changes. There is a ground lease on this property by a company that maintains a long range plan, so it is possible that uses may change at some point in the future.

Alan Needham questioned whether, with the comments that have been made to date, the improvements that will end up being endorse as a part of the plan will really address the traffic issues into the future.

MEETING NOTES**May 11, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 8 OF 8**

Jennifer Carrier stated that as the improvement matrix gets rolled out, this would be part of the discussion.

Hiram Peck stated that it is important to take the long view with these improvements.

Several committee members cited changes that could potentially happen over time which will warrant another look at the recommendations made in this plan such as changes to technology, changes in the natural environment, changes in land ownership, etc. as well as stating that his process has been important in terms of thinking about the impacts of future corridor traffic patterns.

Emil Dahlquist stated that the study has provided the town with opportunities for discussion and tools to help make future decisions about the corridor.

Ms. Moos shared the improvement matrix again and let committee members know that this would be the topic of discussion for the next meeting. She stated that the matrix has undergone some changes, but overall would include similar categories to what have been shown to the committee.

Nancy Haase stated that it would be helpful to add a column relating to how improvements impact or introduce transit opportunities.

Nancy Haase asked about historic buildout percentages and whether those could be used in the effort to examine the land use and transportation analysis tool.

Ms. Moos stated that the CRCOG model does use some historic development trends to make traffic predictions.

Mary Glassman stated that town staff would get back to CRCOG regarding any historic data that could be used.

Next Steps

- Sub-Committee will meet on May 17, 2011
- Steering Committee will meet on May 19, 2011