

# Capitol Region Council of Governments

241 Main St., Hartford, CT 06106

Final endorsed by  
Committee on 1/14/2009

**Route 305 Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Council Chambers, Windsor Town Hall**  
**Wednesday, December 3, 2008**  
**7:00 PM**

## Committee Members

Tom Lenehan  
Michael O'Brien  
Jim Martin  
Peter Souza  
Eric Barz

## Organization

Town of Windsor Town Engineer  
Windsor Planning & Zoning  
Windsor Economic Development  
Town of Windsor Town Manager  
Town of Windsor Town Planner

## Others

Grayson Wright  
Melanie Zimyeski  
Jim Burke  
Sam Hinckley

ConnDOT – Planning  
ConnDOT – Planning  
Windsor Economic Development  
Windsor Land Trust

## Project Team

Jennifer Carrier  
Tom Maziarz  
Lia Huang  
Rod Bascom  
Jeff Parker  
Dave Sousa

CRCOG  
CRCOG  
CRCOG  
CHA  
CHA  
CHA

## Public Attendees

Fred Hesketh

Windsor Journal

**Meeting Purpose:** Route 305 Corridor Study – Local Advisory Committee meeting to follow up on last meeting, discuss potential future improvement alternatives, and discuss the next public informational meeting.

## 1. Welcome and Progress Update

Jennifer Carrier led introductions and updated the committee on progress since the October 7, 2008 Advisory Committee meeting. The following summarizes Ms. Carrier's update:

- A Bloomfield Advisory Committee meeting was held to discuss grade-separated and at-grade rail crossing alternatives and short term improvements in Bloomfield.
- The Project Team met with the rail division of ConnDOT to discuss rail crossing alternatives.
- A meeting was held with the traffic, project development, and planning divisions of ConnDOT to discuss the overall project and preliminary alternatives.
- Comments from the last Windsor Advisory Committee meeting, particularly as they related to the model, were addressed.
- Began preparation for the upcoming public informational meeting.

## 2. Adoption of Minutes (Meeting October 7, 2008)

Jim Martin asked if there were any changes to the October 7, 2008 meeting minutes and none were identified. All committee members were in favor of accepting the minutes of the October 7, 2008 meeting as written.

### **3. Updated Alternative Analysis Findings and Discussion**

Jennifer Carrier described the complexity of the Regional Travel Demand Forecasting Model. In an effort to address comments heard during the last Advisory Committee meeting, the model inputs for speed and capacity along a relocated Pigeon Hill Road were modified to more closely agree with Route 305 conditions. Potential traffic increases and decreases were reassessed for the major roads in the corridor study area. These changes were presented to the Committee. The following summarizes the discussion regarding these results:

- Per a committee member’s request, it was clarified that the numbers represent the overall increase/decrease for the 2030 baseline projections in vehicles per day (VPD) totalized for both directions.
- Another committee member remarked that the illustrated traffic pattern changes were significant; it was confirmed that these revised values are the result of the model calibration that was done.
- Rod Bascom posed the question if a new Pigeon Hill Road were constructed in the future would Route 305 still need to be widened. Ms. Carrier felt that capacity improvements would only need to be implemented on one road or the other, not both.
- Tom Maziarz described the key elements of the travel model. Region wide traffic patterns will occur from these proposed concepts, so the forecasted traffic is a result of different travel patterns overlapping and offsetting one another. This may cause some confusion when only reviewing the final forecasted travel numbers. With each concept it is not only one single driver behavior pattern that is changed, several different paths result from each change; all of these pattern changes are totalized and represented in the final forecasted travel numbers. Mr. Maziarz explained examples of the different types of travel behaviors that may result from a single concept.
- A committee member asked if the travel model accounts for gas stations and services at certain exits. Tom Maziarz answered that the model does not directly account for these activities.
- Per a committee member’s request, it was clarified that “Pigeon Hill Road” in these discussions is a new roadway constructed parallel to the existing roadway, to the north. The existing Pigeon Hill Road would remain as is, with the exception that cul-de-sacs on either side of the bridge overpass would be constructed. The existing overpass would be removed.
- The traffic increases and decreases in Concepts A1-A3 indicate that if a new interchange were constructed at Pigeon Hill Road, a full interchange may be the preference. The partial interchange does not address vehicles exiting from or entering to the north. In general, FHWA prefers full interchanges however exceptions could be granted. Further development of the interchange concept will need to be discussed with ConnDOT.
- The traffic increases and decreases in Concepts B1 and B2 showed that these alternatives do not impact Route 305 with any significance. Day Hill Road experienced greater impact. Since this study is focused on Route 305, it is not suggested that these alternatives be pursued further. The Town may wish to continue development of these concepts.

### **4. Route 305 Potential Alternatives—On-Going Discussion**

Jeff Parker explained that a new interchange at Pigeon Hill Road may be difficult operationally since the suggested minimum distance between interchanges on an interstate highway is one mile. Reducing interchange spacing introduces merging issues. An interchange at Pigeon Hill Road would reduce the distances between interchanges both north and south to less than one mile.

Collector-distributor roadways or operational lanes introduce solutions to these spacing issues, but further review and discussions with ConnDOT are needed to fully assess these options. ConnDOT is currently studying Interchange 38; this portion of the Route 305 study should coordinate with these efforts. Committee members were interested in the order of magnitude cost and the potential environmental impact of these alternatives prior to making any decisions about these options.

Mr. Parker summarized for the Committee suggested improvements to Route 305 between Interchange 37 and Mountain Road. The Committee advised the Project Team on items that need further review: the substandard merge and how standardizing it may impact Sheffield Drive; bus accommodations within the area – bus pull out area; Mountain Road traffic signal modifications – can a westbound advance to accommodate the left turn movement or other adjustments be

made; decorative fencing in vicinity of I-91 if required instead of chain link fencing. The consultant also suggested a pedestrian scale or ornamental lighting fixture be considered.

Dave Sousa presented a concept in response to the Committee's interest in a transit center within the south east part of the I-91, Route 305 interchange. Comments were made related to how a transit center may impact traffic patterns in the Route 305 corridor and whether a piece of the concept plan could be placed on the west side of I-91. One Committee member felt the transit center could be a smaller-scale option for the area. The site is currently home to the Agricultural Center and ConnDOT maintenance facility however the Committee would like to keep this long-term concept under consideration.

## **5. Public Informational Meeting**

Jennifer Carrier explained that the next newsletter is under development. This newsletter is scheduled to be mailed in early January.

The Committee discussed potential public meeting dates. January 29, 2008 was selected from 6:00-7:30 PM.

All committee members agreed that the main focus of the public meeting is to hear the public's opinions. There will need to be a presentation to update attendees on study progress since the last public meeting, but interaction with and engagement of the public is important. The meeting will explain tools that may be used for traffic improvement and allow the public to offer ideas for the corridor. Advantages and disadvantages of concepts presented to date will also be highlighted during the meeting.

## **6. Public Comments**

There were no comments made by the public attendees.

## **7. Next Steps**

A Steering Committee meeting will be held in early January 2009.

The next newsletter will be mailed in early January 2009.

The next public meeting will be held on Thursday, January 29, 2009.

## **8. Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.