

Route 10 Steering Committee Meeting #6
Simsbury Town Hall, Main Meeting Room
Minutes of April 13, 2011 – 7:00 PM

ATTENDEES:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company*</u>
	Margery Winters	CC IW – SC
	Emil Dahlquist	Design Review Board – SC
	John Hampton	Deputy First Selectman - SC
	Kirsten Griebel	Resident - SC
	Rick Wagner	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	Alan Needham	Planning Comm. – SC
	Ed Pabich	Zoning Comm. – SC
	Tom Evans	Resident
	Harald Bender	Resident
	Sue Benardczyk	Resident
	Bob Dugay	Resident
	Anita Mielert	Resident – Historical Society President
	Julie Mackay	Resident, Stakeholder - Weatogue
	David Head	CT DOT - PT
	Tom Roy	Town of Simsbury - PT
	Rich Sawitzke	Town of Simsbury - PT
	Hiram Peck	Town of Simsbury – PT
	Emily Moos	CRCOG – PT
	Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG – PT

* SC = Steering Committee

PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

John Hampton opened the meeting at 7:05 PM and stated that he would be chairing this meeting in Mary Glassman's absence.

Public Comment

John Hampton opened the meeting to public comment.

- 1) Anita Mielert stated that she had two comments to make regarding the draft improvement realignment of Nod Road connecting to East Weatogue Street. First that the project team should run the draft improvement by the planners at DOT who worked on the Avon Mountain improvement because this suggested realignment would replicate the intersection problem as was created at the base of Avon Mountain. Ms. Mielert stated that the planners would want to move Nod Road away from the base of 185, not toward it. She stated that one of the flaws of the work done in 1998 on the previous RT 10 Corridor Study was that the planners did not make use of topographical maps. She stated that everyone who might use this new intersection is going to have to stop at the base of RT 185.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 2 OF 16**

Second, Ms. Mielert stated that not only does Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act have serious implications for this improvement, but also Section 4F of the National Transportation Act should be reviewed. Section 4F states that planning studies should look at all reasonable alternatives before suggesting improvements that would affect historic resources. Ms. Mielert stated this East Weatogue/Nod Road realignment improvement purposefully affects historic resources.

John Hampton asked for clarification on where the historic district boundaries are. Ms. Mielert stated that the boundaries stretch south of RT 185 and encompass the area proposed for the potential realignment.

Ms. Mielert stated that the RT 10 Steering Committee and CROG would be receiving a letter from an archeologist who lives in Simsbury which states that there are important archeological resources on the land. This improvement would need to go into a Level I and likely Level II environmental review and there would need to be archeological remediation if the improvement were to be built.

Ms. Mielert read from Section 4F of the Department of Transportation Act Declaration of Purpose Section 4(f):

“It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.

The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States, in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of lands crossed by transportation activities or facilities.

The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project (other than any project for a park road or parkway under section 204 of title 23) [of the United States Code, “Federal Lands Highways Program”] requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if— (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.”

John Hampton asked whether this type of issue has been successfully challenged in other areas.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 3 OF 16**

Ms. Mielert stated that there are hundreds of Section 106 reviews in Connecticut every year. She stated that many of them never take action past review because the sites in question do not contain any historic resources. Ms. Mielert stated that President George W. Bush challenged Section 4F and that his proposal had been turned down by congress.

Kirsten Griebel asked Ms. Mielert to define the boundaries of the district.

Ms. Mielert stated that there is a Local Historic District and a National Historic District and they have different boundaries and she pointed out where the boundaries are on the RT 10 Corridor Map.

Ms. Griebel asked for clarification on whether the boundaries fall west of the river. Ms. Mielert stated that they do not - they are all east of the river.

Ms. Mielert also pointed out the Terry's Plain National Register District which includes a field that had once been the subject of planning for soccer fields. Ms. Mielert said that she had objected to the soccer field plans citing Section 106 because that area is the old militia grounds and the town attorney agreed that developing the fields would have a detrimental effect on a National Register Facility.

- 2) Sue Benardczyk stated that there had been an archeological study done during the update of the Plan of Conservation and Development which should be referenced before this corridor study plan is completed.

Ms. Benardczyk also stated that she wanted to repeat her concerns about future development of the RT 10 Corridor and what impact that development will have on the 2-lane nature of the roadway into the future. She stated that the study process needs to address what impact how much development can be accommodated by two lanes on RT 10. Ms. Benardczyk stated that a two lane Route 10 will not happen unless you limit the amount of development that the corridor can have. She stated that Simsbury recently adopted a Town Center Code and with it is an area that states that developers can use a PAD which if laid across every piece of open, developable land in the corridor, will result in RT 10 having 4 lanes. Ms. Benardczyk reiterated that she would like to see this study have a conversation about the corridor as a whole that includes land uses on the corridor and the future impact of development on RT 10 having 2 lanes.

Kirsten Griebel asked whether the archeological study that Sue referred to was referenced in the recent Simsbury POCD.

Ms. Benardczyk stated yes, but that the study is much larger than what is in the POCD.

MEETING NOTES

April 13, 2011

ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6

PAGE 4 OF 16

John Hampton asked whether CRCOG had seen the larger study. Emily Moos stated that CRCOG had not seen it, but that they would ask for a copy of the study.

Kirsten Griebel stated that a reference to the archeological study should be added to the guiding principles of the study. She also asked Anita Mielert if the maps of the historic districts were included in the POCD. Ms. Mielert stated that the maps are included in the POCD.

- 3) Bob Dugay, a Simsbury resident stated his desire for the Town of Simsbury to maintain its small-town character and that he is not in support of a 4-lane RT 10. Mr. Dugay stated that he had not been supportive of the recent River Oaks development because of the amount of parking it proposed. He stated his desire for RT 10 to remain 2-lanes and for the town to keep its special character – for example, he referenced his regret for the time that the bridge over RT 185 gained more lanes as there was a certain politeness to having to stop to let an oncoming car pass. He reiterated his concern that allowing indiscriminate development would result in a 4-lane roadway.

Adoption of Minutes from March 3, 2011 Meeting and March 24, 2011 Meeting

John Hampton stated that there are two sets of minutes to be adopted, March 3rd and March 24th. He asked for a motion to approve March 3rd Minutes. Ed Pabich made a motion and Rick Wagner seconded. John Hampton called for edits or corrections.

Kirsten Griebel stated that she did have quite a few changes, additions and questions including Tom Evans being incorrectly listed as a member of the Steering Committee, the “Weatogue Resident” in public comment #5 as having been Marlene Jung and Bob Patricelli’s comment needing more detail regarding his reference to the Nod Road relocation which did not come across in the minutes. Ms. Griebel stated that she would send them to CRCOG to adapt and redistribute.

She also stated a broad request to get more details into the meeting minutes – especially in the public comment section. She stated that some people had handed in written statements that supplement the minutes, but for those who do not supplement their comments with written statements, it is important that all details be captured.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the team would do the best it could and that the focus of the minutes is on the action items which are what we are required to record.

John Hampton stated that tonight’s meeting was not posted on the town website. Mr. Hampton stated that he asked Tom Cook to look into this issue. He also asked whether written comments would be posted.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 5 OF 16**

Emily Moos stated that all notices of upcoming meeting dates are sent to the town clerk and posted on the CRCOG RT 10 Corridor webpage. Notices and a link to the CROCG RT 10 page are also sent to the Steering Committee and RT 10 Interested Parties list prior to each meeting. Ms. Moos also stated that all comments that have come to CRCOG by email and written letter have been posted on the RT 10 Corridor webpage.

John Hampton asked for any further edits to the minutes. Ed Pabich withdrew his previous motion and the March 3rd minutes were tabled.

John Hampton asked for a motion on the March 24th meeting minutes.

Allen Needham made a motion and Margery Winters seconded the motion to adopt the minutes of March 24th, 2011. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

Kirsten Griebel asked whether someone would be taking Gerry Post's place on the RT 10 Steering Committee.

John Hampton stated that Nancy Haase would take the place of Gerry Post on the Steering Committee.

Localized Improvement Discussion (CRCOG)

John Hampton introduced the CRCOG presentation on localized improvements.

Emily Moos described the definition of localized improvements within the RT 10 Study. Localized improvements are not only bike, pedestrian and streetscape improvements, but also intersection improvements that will help traffic operations within town. In contrast, at the March 3rd meeting, the committee had begun to discuss regional improvements which are considered to be the new roadway infrastructure that will make connections that will have a regional impact on traffic. Ms. Moos stated that we will be coming back to the regional improvements.

Ms. Moos began by showing the corridor wide bike and pedestrian improvement plan and explaining the new bike suitability system created for and by ConnDOT. This is a system by which roads in Connecticut are designated more suitable to less suitable for biking based upon their average daily traffic and shoulder width. Ms. Moos stated that RT 10 sees on average 14-15,000 cars per day and has shoulders that range in width from 2-4ft. This information categorizes the stretch of RT 10 analyzed by this corridor study as suitable for biking.

Emil Dahlquist asked whether speed had anything to do with these numbers.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 6 OF 16**

David Head from ConnDOT explained that because the speeds vary so much throughout even a short amount of roadway, speed as a factor would have caused a piecemeal analysis. The analysis that has resulted is a standard that has been used across the U.S. and allows for the individual to make a safety judgment for themselves, for their children, etc.

Emil Dahlquist asked whether what applies in town center would apply in the north end of town.

David Head stated that it is strictly a measurement of Average Daily Traffic and Shoulder width.

Ed Pabich asked whether suitability differed for adults and children.

David Head said that this system relies on the judgment of the individual to choose their feeling of safety for themselves and their children.

Emily Moos stated that even though greater bike accommodations might be placed on RT 10, the greenway trail still provides options for bicyclists who might not want to ride on the roadway.

Sue Benardczyk described a neighborhood on Riverside Road which had been striped for wider shoulders for bikes and they had been taken out and asked and asked if the shoulders are greater than the widths on the sustainability scale whether they could become an actual travel lane or whether there is a way to keep the lane a bike lane or trail.

David Head stated that the striping on the side of the road is considered to be a shoulder. He stated that it is up to these studies to designate what the town wants in terms of roadway improvements. He stated that ConnDOT looks to these studies to help inform future improvements.

Emily Moos began to move section by section through the corridor presentation to show the committee the draft improvements for bikes and pedestrian that came out of the RT 10 Corridor Charrette. Ms. Moos started with the southernmost portion of the corridor stating that the bike and pedestrian corridor plan recommends bike accommodations.

Jennifer Carrier stated that in conversations with ConnDOT regarding bike lanes, the ConnDOT is more comfortable with the concept of a 5' land which permits bicycling in the shoulder. She stated that the installation of bike symbols becomes a very large maintenance issue as well. She stated that if 11' lanes are striped with wider shoulders, safe biking will still be achievable along the RT 10 Corridor. Ms. Carrier stated that if the community strongly desires stamped bike symbols, it will need to engage in further conversations with the DOT and it will

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 7 OF 16**

not be feasible to stamp those symbols as a part of the summer repaving project due to increased costs and project timing.

Rick Wagner stated that the town has implemented sharrows at Old Farms Road and Country Road for a 14 miles route. He asked whether sharrows would be a bicycle symbol that would go in this lane as well.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the summer repaving project would only allow for the restriping of a solid white line.

David Head stated that sharrows are for two different uses. In shoulders bike lane signs would go in the lane. Sharrows are done in travel lane where you don't have a shoulder or a bike lane to signal to drivers that you might have a bicyclist in the lane. They are also to guide cyclists to where they should be in the lane, toward the right side.

Tom Roy said that sharrows are new and uses are evolving. In the bigger cities sharrows had been used next to parking lanes, but there were issues due to doors swinging open in the path of cyclists. Sharrows have also been painted in the center of the lane in urban areas where cyclists would be allowed to take the entire lane. The idea of a sharrow is to use it where you don't have enough width to stripe out a traditional bike lane and need to share the road between cyclists and traffic.

Alan Needham stated that without a symbol or signage there would be nothing to invite a cyclist to use the road, even with a wider lane.

David Head stated that a 5' lane is a traffic engineering standard for a lane wide enough to accommodate cyclist.

Rich Sawitzke stated that there will likely not be confusion amongst the cycling community that a 5' shoulder is more accommodating for cyclists – anyone familiar with the League of American Bicyclists would know how to use that shoulder. He pointed out that the commuting cyclists are the ones who will be using the road and the multi-use road.

Emily Moos pointed out the other bike and pedestrian improvements in the corridor including a realignment of the trail to the intersection of Old Canal Way and The Hartford driveway and concrete sidewalks connecting the neighborhoods to RT 10 and the office areas.

Ms. Moos continued by explaining the draft improvements in the Weatogue area including sidewalks to connect neighborhoods to the multi-modal hub and a continuation of the existing greenway trail as well as bike shoulders on the RT 10 roadway.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 8 OF 16**

Kirsten Griebel asked whether the arrows at the end of the yellow lines, indicating concrete sidewalks, were meant to indicate a continuation of the sidewalks.

Ms. Moos stated that this study is just presenting the concept of sidewalks, but the actual extent of implementation would need further review.

Margery Winters stated that concrete sidewalks will add to the impervious surface coverage of the RT 10 Corridor. She asked whether there is a way to change the language to indicate a desire for green infrastructure treatments.

There was a clarification by the steering committee that the bridge shown with sidewalks is actually the bridge at RT 185, not the new draft proposed bridge connecting with Latimer Lane.

Anita Mielert stated that the bridge at RT 185 does have sidewalks on it, but that there are no sidewalks leading up to or away from it.

Ms. Moos continued by moving into the mixed use and commercial and town center sections of the corridor which show the existing greenway trail, on road bike shoulders and sidewalks. The town center improvements are in harmony with the recommendations of the town center Charrette. Bike shoulders would run along Iron Horse Boulevard in the town center so as to avoid the swinging doors of parked cars.

Kirsten Griebel asked if the sidewalks shown on Iron Horse could be shown on both sides of the road. The town center charrette had recommended this.

Ms. Moos stated that in the green corridor and northern gateway the recommendations remain similar – greenway trail remains in place, on-road bike shoulders and sidewalks connecting neighborhoods.

Alan Needham stated a suggestion for a link to an existing neighborhood – on Quad Hill Road there is already an unofficial connection.

Rich Sawitzke explained that there is a right of way there, but the original developer of 1948 still owns this and changing it would bring up a question of definitive ownership.

Kirsten Griebel pointed out that there is a Latimer lane trail through Adams. She stated that the Safe Routes to School program would likely support this connection because it runs near the school.

Alan stated that in this area there is a dirt path that runs along and connects with a cinderblock trail.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 9 OF 16**

Jennifer Carrier began the presentation of localized roadway improvements. She stated that analyzing intersections involves looking at aspects like traffic volumes, lane geometry, signal timing in a software program that outputs a Level of Service grade A-F. The consultant had created a graphic on level of service for presentation at the Charrette which portrayed 2010 existing conditions LOS and 2030 future baseline projections LOS which will be the basis for discussion this evening. Ms. Carrier reviewed that in this analysis, morning peak hour showed LOS concerns at Latimer Lane, Tariffville Road, Hoskins Road, Ely Lane and in the evening, Canal Street joins group. She stated in the southern gateway stating that throughout the presentation, the steering committee is asked to give reactions on improvements.

Rick Wagner asked whether the new proposed roadway connecting to Old Meadow Plain Road is meant to be offset.

Jennifer Carrier stated that we would not likely suggest off-set intersections. Where possible, it is desirable to align roadways at intersections.

Emil Dahlquist raised a concern with a regional connection at Blue Ridge Drive about potential increased pass through traffic in a residential area and questioned whether this improvement would eventually require another signal along RT 10. Mr. Dahlquist stated that he brought the corridor plan to the Design Review Board which he is a part of and that questions were raised about what happens to the whole proposed system if pieces are taken out. He stated that if the study goes to go into design and detail of intersections that it should take a broader look at the whole corridor. He asked about the rationale for the proposed road behind the Talcott Acres condos and whether it was suggested to aid existing offices in that area. He questioned who would use this connection.

Kirsten Griebel stated that there is already a signal at Old Meadow Plain and one more going in at Latimer Lane.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the team would have to look at the numbers for the Blue Ridge Drive intersection and the guidelines on preference for signal spacing. Ms. Carrier also stated that it is important to look at the broader picture and that there are tools to understand the merit of connections and the team would evaluate. She reiterated that the purpose of this evening is to discuss tangible localized intersection improvements that are likely to get constructed in the near term.

Kirsten Griebel questioned where the Old Meadow Plain Road connection was intended to go. She asked if the only reason to add the extension would be if there is going to be a loop road in back of those properties or whether it would go in even if that loop road improvement were not made.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 10 OF 16**

Jennifer Carrier stated that if this improvement is endorsed in the plan and if the property owner were to come forward with a site plan that located the driveway elsewhere, the town and ConnDOT, with this plan in place, would be able to say that there is an endorsed plan behind aligning the driveway with Old Meadow Plain Road so as not to offset intersections.

Kirsten Griebel asked for clarification on whether this means that there is a reason that would justify looking at this anyway even if there was no other continuation of loop roads to the east.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the regional connections are longer term decisions and right now we are just looking at the intersection improvement.

Harald Bender asked if this area gets developed would it make sense to take the office driveway to Tower Office park and make one driveway to both developments.

Tom Evans stated that the attorney for a property owner in this area spoke during this process of a plan that has been developed for this area.

Sue Benardczyk stated that the POCD assumptions do not take into account the PAD zone which needs to be addressed.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the next meeting would focus on Land Use and Transportation connections.

Emil Dahlquist stated that there is already a great deal of traffic on Old Meadow Plain and asked whether there could be an opportunity to join the CL&P property with the existing driveway.

Jennifer Carrier stated that all of these suggestions would be noted and that we could go back and look at them with the consultant.

Emil Dahlquist stated that he is concerned with median strips, particularly the size proposed in this plan. He stated that maintenance is a big factor and if they are not maintained, they do not work. He stated that on Iron Horse they are much wider and they work better.

Kirsten Griebel asked how wide the medians are on Iron Horse Boulevard.

Rich Sawitzke stated that they are 18ft and go down to 4 feet at turn lanes. He stated that the biggest maintenance issue is initial irrigation.

Margery Winters stated that median strips don't always have to be built up, but that they could be built down as run-off control.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 11 OF 16**

Jennifer continued the discussion presenting the improvements at Old Canal Way and the Hartford Driveway. These include a relocation of greenway trail, improved pedestrian conditions and eliminating the channelized island in the future. Ms. Carrier Stated that we'll need to review bike boxes to see where they have been successful and also talk more about them with department of transportation as they add new complexity to the. The team will investigate where they have been done.

Harald Bender stated that bike boxes in this case are for cyclists that want to turn left. By putting in box they have first ten feet of roadway and can have a separate bike signal – they get traffic first and then the cars get it ten seconds later.

David Head stated that bike boxes do not exist on state roads in Connecticut but there is one proposed in New Haven that the DOT is watching closely.

Jennifer Carrier continued with the Latimer Lane intersection stating that it operates poorly in both the AM and PM peak hour and that we'll need to look at monitoring this location for the traffic signal warrants. She stated that turning volumes of 100 or 150 are often evaluated for potential implementation of exclusive turning lanes or intersection widening for a bypass. Ms. Carrier clarified that volume in morning is showed with a plain number and the afternoon volume is the number in parentheses.

Emil Dahlquist asked whether this intersection is operating at LOS F because of the turning traffic.

Jennifer Carrier stated it is possible that this issue is the un-signalized intersection and the heavy volume on RT 10 not allowing for gaps to enter the roadway. She stated that with 270 cars there not be sufficient room to turn and sometimes it is too tight for people to want to pass.

Kirsten Griebel asked why the LOS F remains when there are no accidents at this intersection and that the LOS F may be ok if safety is not a concern because the delay is not necessarily a bad thing.

Jennifer stated that the study may recommend monitoring to see if the volumes meet warrants for signals, but that it is important to remember that there is no capacity at this intersection – looking into the future, volumes will increase and something will need to be done.

Bob DuGay stated his concern that if the plan prepares for growth, it may end up inviting the growth and that if the town does not want a 4-lane road, future growth will need to be controlled.

John Hampton stated that the RT 10 study is in underway to get a jump start on planning to see how the corridor traffic will be impacted in the future.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 12 OF 16**

Emily Moos pointed out that the CRCOG traffic model takes into account a whole network that extends beyond Simsbury and even beyond Connecticut State borders and that even if no growth were added to the corridor, there would still be increased volumes from changes outside of town.

Julie MacKay stated that it is her understating that there will be a land use discussion that will look at the PAD and its impacts on the 2-lane nature of the roadway.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the next committee meeting will begin to get into future development and land use.

Emil Dahlquist and Tom Evans had questions regarding the traffic model – What is the model? What are the inputs? How do intersections arrive at LOS F? A resident asked if growth occurs down the road in Granby how will it affect RT 10 in Simsbury.

Jennifer – stated that a side conversation could explain the CRCOG model which is very complex, but that Synchro software is what used at the charrette which helped get to the LOS conclusions. The modeling that CRCOG is going to be doing is at a larger scale with regional connections.

Emily Moos stated that we can place any of the improvements that the steering committee endorses or wants to explore into the CRCOG model and see how it affects RT 10 traffic in the future.

Jennifer Carrier continued by discussing the intersection improvements for the Weatogue area beginning with RT 185 and RT 10 intersection which sees a heavy southbound left turn volume in the morning and a heavy west bound right turn lane volume in the afternoon. In 2030 LOS deteriorates at this intersection which is currently operating at C and D in the AM and PM respectively. Ms. Carrier explained the improvement suggested - providing a right turn slip roadway which is to be a one-way, one-lane road off of RT 185. Ms. Carrier stated that the charrette revealed this improvement may have merit, especially in helping to facilitate a multi-modal hub and village center for Weatogue.

Margery Winters asked who owns this property.

It was determined that the property owner may be amenable to this change and that part of the land shown in the area has just been sold to Abigail's restaurant.

Anita Mielert pointed out that the land that this road would traverse is floodplain land.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 13 OF 16**

Kirsten Griebel asked if the evaluation of this improvement would take into consideration the environmental impacts and flooding.

Ed Pabich questioned - without the transit hub - whether the improvement would make any sense.

Jennifer Carrier stated that the team will need to understand how this improvement affects the 10 and 185 intersection.

Anita Mielert raised a concern that the new slip road would affect business at Abigail's.

Julie MacKay asked whether the new proposed slip road would allow traffic off of Canal Street to go straight in the morning instead of turning left onto RT 10 to join RT 185. She stated that this would be a big benefit of this new slip road.

It was determined that the new slip road operates only one way heading off of RT 185 onto RT 10.

Harald Bender stated that the biggest benefit would be allowing vehicles to come off of RT 185 and go straight onto Canal Street rather than building up to turn left off of RT 10 onto Canal.

Emil Dahlquist stated that the solutions in the Weatogue area try to tackle multiple problems at once which is positive. He stated his concern over the amount of parking shown in the extended commuter lot and that the lot should be separated as much as possible the view of the area.

Hiram Peck stated that the existing commuter lot is the most heavily used of all of the commuter lots in town and that the new arrangement might have the opportunity of sharing parking with area businesses.

Emily Moos stated that there is a lot that can be done in terms of low impact development and green infrastructure solutions at parking lots and that the team would keep this in mind.

Bob Dugay asked whether the slip road could operate as one way in the morning and one way in the afternoon.

Jennifer Carrier reiterated that the study team needs to explore the operations at Canal Street are improvement by this alternative.

Rick Wagner asked whether ConnDOT is concerned about any improvements that are suggested that have significant flooding or are impacted adversely by floods.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 14 OF 16**

Jennifer Carrier stated that ConnDOT is mainly concerned with funding aspects and that environmental impacts can contribute to the cost of a project. She stated that any project with an environmental concern will also add significant time to the implementation process.

Hiram Peck stated that the roads would need to be constructed and designed so that they would not flood.

David Head stated that when using federal dollars the design and construction has to go through the NEPA and SEPA environmental processes which could ask about other alternatives. Mr. Head stated that there are other options here, so that's why ConnDOT might question the alternatives that deal with floodplain.

Margery Winters commented that to keep the road from flooding you'll need to add fill.

Jennifer Carrier moved on to discuss the town center area which shows a realignment of West Street with Drake Hill Road. Ms. Carrier stated that grades are very steep, so there is a need to confirm with consultant about the intention for this improvement.

Anita Mielert stated that the topography of this area is steep and the 1998 study eliminated this concept. She also stated that the West Street, RT 10 intersection just went through an improvement project.

Emil Dahlquist stated that this improvement is appealing because the historic building would now be more a part of town center and it provides a nicer gateway to town center and unifies building with town center.

Jennifer Carrier stated that CRCOG would work with consultant to understand the feasibility of this intersection and that it also may tie in nicely with the regional connection in this area with is the extension of Iron Horse Blvd. Ms. Carrier briefly touched upon the trail extension following the Farmington River east of Iron Horse Boulevard which FRWA was very supportive of. Ms. Carrier also spoke about the curb bump-outs which would buffer parking and reduce pedestrian crossing distance. Ms. Carrier stated that ConnDOT had been receptive to far-side bump-outs and that more engineering would need to be considered as the bump-outs introduce drainage complexities. Ms. Carrier also stated that it this study may consider whether the bump-outs can incorporate more green infrastructure - rain gardens, etc.

Rick Wagner asked for a definition of a far-side bump-out.

Jennifer Carrier stated that a far-side bump-out is one that is on the far-side of the intersection as you approach in the travel lane.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 15 OF 16**

Hiram Peck stated that as part of town center study, there will be a report on low impact development and light imprint study for drainage. The report will be developed over the next couple of months and may dovetail with the end of this study.

Jennifer Carrier proceeded to discuss the Northern Gateway improvements including relocating RT 315 to Wolcott Road. Ms. Carrier stated that at Wolcott Road the draft plan proposes center landscaped medians and aligning with a future new driveway opposite Wolcott Road. Ms. Carrier stated that an evaluation would need to be done on re-designating RT 315 to Wolcott Road as this could have an impact on funding.

Emil Dahlquist stated that in the northern gateway there are multiple areas with multiple problems and that improvements in this area should consider the entire system and build a place rather than streets or individual intersections. Mr. Dahlquist stated that the POCD tried to address working with existing development organize in a way that makes sense along common themes.

Hiram Peck stated that this is an area where there are two or three different possibilities for where a parallel road could be and that the property owners will need to agree on roadway infrastructure.

Kirsten Griebel asked whether information will be available on the decisions of the property owners before the final report of this plan wraps up.

Hiram stated that at this point the study can make recommendations from an engineering standpoint on the best solution even if the property owners' plans are not known at this time.

Harald Bender suggested making Hoskins Road and Ely Road one way and said that he would provide a drawing for the public record.

Kirsten Griebel stated that on both sides of northern gateway there are many curb cuts and asked how the implementation of limiting curb cuts is carried out.

Jennifer Carrier stated that access management will be a part of the study recommendations and that it is up to the individual property owners to collaborate.

Sue Benardczyk asked for future reference whether the public would have access to the traffic count numbers associated with the study.

Emily Moos stated that many of the numbers and analyses are already available online as data that was presented in the charrette presentations and that more of the diagrammatic depictions of intersection volumes – such as those shown in this evening's presentation - could likely be made available.

MEETING NOTES**April 13, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #6****PAGE 16 OF 16****Next Steps:**

Emily Moos stated that the next meeting of the RT 10 Steering Committee will take place on April 28, 2011 to discuss land use and trip generation in the corridor.

Kirsten Griebel stated that she had an interest in hearing from representatives of the different town boards for their input on the study findings thus far.

Alan Needham stated that the planning board discussed some of the localized improvements such as the bike lanes and town center pedestrian improvements and would be in support of taking a vote on those items as soon as possible should the opportunity come up.

Emily Moos stated that as part of the review process, the project team will be making a presentation to a group of the town boards and commissions.

John Hampton declared that the meeting was adjourned at 9PM.