



Report of Meeting #4

Present: See attached sign-in sheets.

Welcome, Introduction & Ground Rules: Following the welcome and introductions, the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) reviewed the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) ground rules for continued membership and participation on the PAC and commitments of the project team.

Meeting Purpose: The CTDOT reviewed the purpose of the meeting: to solicit input from PAC members on the Conservation Alternative and two Off-Alignment Alternatives as part of the National Environmental Policy Act/Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (NEPA/CEPA) process. These, along with the previously discussed No-Build, Rehabilitation, and On-alignment Replacement alternatives, are being used as drafts or starting points for discussion to determine their impacts on the various environments. The final alternatives that will be carried forward in the EA may be a combination of the draft alternatives or others that come out of discussions with PAC member groups.

Binders: The new distributed binder materials for PAC members were reviewed including: summary report of PAC meeting #3, PAC meeting #4 presentation slides, draft concepts of alternatives (for discussion purposes only), and alternatives comparison matrix.

Comments on Comparison Matrix

- Add costs. CTDOT will use estimates from the Rehabilitation Study Report previously completed under Project 158-212, dated June 2016.
- Add new row to note possible construction disruption to local area, such as parking space loss and business disruption.
- Include the controlling (lowest) vertical clearance for each alternative.
- Add another row for Rights-of-Way impacts, such as the number of properties affected by each alternative (i.e., full, partial takings).
- Reference previous study of amount of traffic that backs up from half a mile away from bridge

ALTERNATIVES

The focus of PAC Meeting #4 was the Conservation Alternative and two Off-Alignment Alternatives. PAC members were asked to provide concerns about each of the presented alternatives, as well as suggestions for how to address any concerns PAC members identified for each alternative. Input from PAC members is summarized below and attached.

Conservation Alternative

- Interested in design considerations for new truss steel to resemble original steel, plus inclusion of a possible rail system (Baker two rail).
- What will be the height of bridge (highest and lowest points) once the electrical box is raised? Concerned about clearance for trucks.
- Would like to know about staging for construction, especially regarding properties in the north.





- Concerns about impacts to stone walls (northeast); reconstruct if affected.
- 1990s marine clearance a concern (less than 4 feet at mean high water).

Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative

- Maintain traffic lights on roads to the bridge, calm traffic; traffic congestion a concern at the intersection (west side).
- Strong preference to keep swing bridge by majority of PAC members; rolling bridge concept doesn't fit into character of community, unless it can be built with a truss.
- Would like to know more about "marketing" the bridge, reusing the old truss, would like to know more about design exceptions.
- If bridge is removed along causeway and shifted to the north, there is interest in a returning causeway to town for public use (i.e., fishing pier) as part of mitigation.
- Concerns as to how many property takes are needed.
- Want to understand elevation of approach roadway, especially with regards to lights from vehicles affecting nearby houses and overall character of the area. Inquired about a light analysis.
- Marine concerns with navigation restrictions during peak season.

Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative

- Superimpose existing bridge on top of the other alignment alternatives, Should also superimpose the alternatives so that the scale/street-level image can be compared.
- Preference for this off-alignment alternative when comparing the two, since it requires less permanent impacts on northern properties.
- Would like to see the new truss look as much like the old one as possible.
- Would not recommend south sidewalks on any alternative due to lack of continuity on east approach and challenges/safety issues of a potential crosswalk located on the east side of the bridge.

Next Meeting: The final PAC meeting is anticipated to take place in spring of 2019. The CTDOT will revisit each of the alternatives under consideration for discussion, and review the remaining steps in the process and schedule. PAC members were asked to go back to the groups they represent, communicate the concepts, and gather feedback for all reviewed alternates before the final meeting. Following the final PAC meeting, the Department will proceed towards drafting the Environmental Assessment. Documentation will be released to the public for review in advance of a Public Hearing. Questions and comments can be sent throughout the process directly to the Department, via:

Priti S. Bhardwaj, P.E.
Transportation Supervising Engineer
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT 06131
Phone: 860-594-3311
E-Mail: Priti.Bhardwaj@ct.gov



WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
Bridgebrook Marina	Existing bridge height too low No improved sidewalk No access for mooring police & fire No increase in width of roadway Environmental impact in a positive way – north of bridge for business – bridge to downtown	[no input]	Scale Bridge opening issues Enviro disturbance Land take that are permanent	[no input]	Same	[no input]
Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation	Not in attendance					
DeStefano & Chamberlain, Inc.	Not in attendance					
Imperial Landing Homeowner's Association	It would be helpful to know the exact vertical clearances for this option.	Request that staging happens away from the residential properties	Will any “full takes” of property be required on the northeast side of the bridge? Need a definitive answer on this.	If any full land takes are ever a possibility, we would not be <u>at all</u> in favor of this option.	This off-alignment option appears to have a far lower impact on land takes and gives more flexibility on the type of bridge that can be built. Not sure why	Suggest removing the <u>non-parallel</u> off-alignment option based on all of the concerns that were raised.

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	<p>Are there any differences in the temporary bridge (ROW, temporary easements, etc.) between this and other options.</p> <p>Environmental impacts of construction (i.e., noise, pollution, staging areas)?</p> <p>Will staging areas affect our neighborhood or require access through our neighborhood?</p>	<p>abutting the bridge.</p>	<p>What will the roadway elevations be at the rear of the residential properties at the northeast side of the bridge? Will it be different than it is today?</p> <p>Aesthetics of a new bridge is of major concern. Would like this to be vetted more fully.</p> <p>Traffic on the northwest side due to new driveway for Parkers [Mansion, sic].</p> <p>Any additional street lights required that will affect residential properties to the north?</p> <p>Why would we ever consider a south-side sidewalk? There is no</p>	<p>This does not appear to be a favorable option based on all of these concerns.</p>	<p>we would even want to consider the other off-alignment option.</p> <p>Still want to ensure that no "full land takes" would be required due to properties begin rendered out of code.</p>	

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
			safe crossing on the east side of the bridge! Without a continued south side sidewalk on Bridge St., this does not appear to be a viable design.			
Saugatuck Rowing & Fitness Club, LLC	Not in attendance					
Westport Boating Advisory Committee	<p>Clearance at mean high water is limited and very low (approx.. 4'-5') further hampering boat traffic.</p> <p>Roadway is still very narrow, no real change. No real investment benefit.</p> <p>No real benefit to traffic flow.</p> <p>Repairs will continue due to vehicle traffic hitting the guardrails, truss members</p>	<p>New bridge with shoulders and sidewalks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ample clearance for boat traffic • Straight approach from roadway to bridge 	<p>Impact to traffic attempting to get in and out of businesses on west side could create backup. Needs a traffic study.</p> <p>Loose the low profile of a swing bridge. Draw bridge is very high at the counter weight section.</p>	None. Design is not desirable.	Same concerns as noted in off-alignment notes. Minimal difference between the two.	None.

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	<p>reducing the life span of the bridge at a faster rate than a modern bridge roadway system.</p> <p>Flooding will impact electrical and motor components</p>					
Westport Board of Selectmen	<p>Would the existing bridge be closed during the construction of this alternative?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary bridge? • Alternating one-way? (traffic back up result) <p>Economic impact on area businesses (immediate Saugatuck area and further up-river)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term (construction) • Long-term (post-construction). Likely the up-river businesses 	<p>Pursue the temporary bridge; the traffic impact of the alternating one-way would be terrible</p> <p>Pursue a broader economic impact study as part of the EA</p>	<p>Need to limit bridge openings of existing bridge during construction (impact on marine traffic)</p> <p>What type of bridge opening capability? (bascule vs. rolling lift vs. vertical lift)</p> <p>Eastbound headlight impact on Imperial Landing neighborhood</p>	[no input]	Speed of bridge opening/closing (bascule vs. rolling vs. swing)	Speed of bridge opening/closing – estimated times for various alternatives

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This needs analysis for all alternatives that are being seriously considered (short list) 					
Westport Chamber of Commerce	<p>Appreciate seeing this option</p> <p>The height remains the primary reason to do this vs. rehab.</p> <p>If rehab., then what about the railings? It's really the only difference other than waterproofing items.</p>	<p>Railings – cannot be 3 rail – huge and ugly.</p> <p>Something that keeps the bridge safe and cars from being destroyed in a crash is an issue.</p>	<p>Height, character, intersection / on west side with 2 driveways.</p> <p>No need for 2 sidewalks; not enough pedestrians.</p>	<p>Not doing it. No way to keep height nor keep character.</p> <p>Intersection with new driveways, maybe lights, but won't work.</p>	[no input]	[no input]
Westport Fire Department	<p>Ability to cross the bridge with fire apparatus due to size and weight restriction.</p> <p>Cannot cross bridge during flooding conditions. Hurricane Irene & Sandy – could not cross.</p>	<p>Increase weight rating and size clearance so we can drive fire apparatus across the bridge</p>	<p>Ability to drive fire apparatus across the bridge.</p>	<p>It is a new bridge with wider opening so I can drive the fire apparatus over it.</p> <p>Raised up so it could still be used in a flooding condition.</p>	<p>New modern bridge that gives me the ability to drive fire apparatus across the bridge.</p> <p>Higher bridge out of flooding.</p> <p>Wider so less damage to apparatus striking bridge components.</p>	<p>Ability to cross with a fire engine.</p>

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	Damage to fire apparatus striking bridge components.			Lessen damage to apparatus striking bridge components.		
Westport Flood and Erosion Control Board	<p>Bridge will still be an impediment to traffic and dangerous for vehicles because of limited horizontal clearance between vehicles</p> <p>2 school buses in different directions will still hit.</p>	There is nothing possible in this scenario because this bridge won't be any wider than the existing.	<p>This would change the aesthetic of the area significantly (the bridge depicted).</p> <p>Significant impact to mansion clam house access is a concern as to how it would impact traffic.</p> <p>Cannot be open (old bridge) for periods during construction. This would impact boat traffic.</p>	Truss from end to end with pony truss or bascule type in between (sort of solves aesthetics).	Closure of swing bridge during construction.	Rolling bridge could possibly swing old bridge during construction.
Westport Planning and Zoning	<p>Exact vertical height of finished bridge?</p> <p>Who owns the bulkhead on the east side after the existing bridge is removed?</p> <p>Can it be given to town as green space?</p>	Replace "guide rail" with same size, style and strength as existing.	<p>Need estimate of time when bridge is closed.</p> <p>Would substitute an "open bridge" during construction for a bridge which starts and finishes same spot.</p>	[no input]	[no input]	[no input]

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
WestCOG	Not in attendance					
Westport Police Department	<p>Pedestrian and bike safety</p> <p>Vehicle congestion</p> <p>Width of road and lanes</p> <p>Boating safety – bridge height at high tide</p> <p>Marine traffic</p>	<p>Wider bike and pedestrian walkways and lanes</p> <p>Increase the height of bridge for increased marine traffic use and public safety vessels</p> <p>Increase width of lanes to avoid vehicle side by side contacts</p>	<p>Clearance for boating traffic at high tide</p> <p>No bridge openings during a period of construction</p>	<p>Addresses pedestrian and bike safety concerns</p> <p>Addresses width of roadway concerns</p> <p>Increase height of bridge for boating traffic</p>	<p>Not in favor of a southern sidewalk – public safety issue</p> <p>Concern about bridge openings during construction</p>	[no input]
Westport Public Works Department (former Director)	<p>Safety concern without increase in lane width</p> <p>Would push for inclusion of water resistant mechanical equipment</p> <p>Would maintain existing appearance</p>	<p>Rehab option allows for increased width to address safety concern while still providing for appearance of truss system</p>	<p>Scale/size not appropriate for area</p> <p>Maintenance of truss system desirable for neighborhood</p> <p>No advantage to replacement on-line with significant</p>	[no input]	<p>Preferred to non-parallel option but still out of scale for neighborhood</p> <p>No need for southern sidewalk.</p>	Reduce scale of bridge by reducing width of shoulder

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	Repetitive damage to truss system is a disadvantage		disadvantages in appearance			
Westport Representative Town Meeting	<p>Still historical</p> <p>Still the same bridge</p> <p>Still the same aesthetic looks and remains in its original structure [illegible]</p> <p>Would suggest enamel, turtle shell paint to prevent rust/rot and some wear repairs if bridge is hit again.</p>	[no input]	<p>Old bridge is completely removed</p> <p>Historical factor is gone</p> <p>Wider</p> <p>Taller (16'3")</p> <p>Built over wetlands, abandoning existing roadway</p> <p>Damages to ecosystem, noise pollution</p> <p>Still flooding possible on west side</p>	<p>Access to lot will invite vehicles to "beat" the light in traffic</p> <p>Crossing bridge and immediate entrance/exit to flow dangerous</p> <p>Entrance/exit to lot will be too close to river wall/seawall is precarious, not sturdy, well maintained</p> <p>Removal of trees and property to Parker Mansion is disastrous and changes the look of our historic area</p>	<p>Sidewalk/footpath safety</p> <p>Electric building house added next to Peters Bridge Square</p> <p>Loss of property to Parker</p> <p>Higher elevation by 3-foot and 6-foot higher bridge = more visual intrusion to neighbors</p> <p>Loss of buffer land to homes</p>	[no input]
Westport Shellfish Commission	Any work must include a sediment trap basin to capture all heavy metals and any required or additional prevention, corrective or remediation of	<p>Assumes part of EA</p> <p>Ensure sediment trap basin to capture all</p>	Same concern for all issues related to Westport Shellfish Commission	Same concern as outlined previously by Westport Shellfish Commission	Any work must include a sediment trap basin to capture all heavy metals and any additional prevention corrective or remediation of existing roadway run off should be	Same as previously stated

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement: Solving Concerns You Identified
	existing roadway runoff should be included as part of any work.	heavy metals and construction equipment & material and remediate area (surrounding) directly impacted by all road traffic			included as part of any work.	

PAC Representative	Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified
Section 106 Consulting Parties	<p>We need a <u>baseline study</u> of how traffic, pollution (diesel, asbestos, etc.) affects the environment</p> <p>Further studies should provide specific, data driven explanations</p>	<p>Will conserve the <u>historic integrity</u> of the district</p> <p>Will minimize the already troublesome level of traffic</p>	<p>This will create problems & solve <u>NONE</u></p> <p>Limits marine use</p> <p>Kills one commercial property</p> <p>Takes too much wetlands</p> <p>DESTROYS THE HISTORIC BRIDGE</p>	<p>This solution destroys the residential character of the east side of the river.</p> <p>There would have to be massive light shields</p> <p>Historical mitigation – I doubt</p>	<p>Completely out of character of Westport.</p> <p>Destroys historic integrity, hostile to the economic vitality of the Saugatuck business neighborhood.</p>	<p>This creates a million concerns. It solves nothing.</p>

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative		Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified
		Sediment pollution? Construction debris Concern about staging area		<u>Unacceptable</u> A southern sidewalk is nonsense & <u>unsafe</u>			
	Green's Farms Association	Not clearly stated what the final roadway vehicle clearances will be.	[no input]	If we build a <u>better</u> bridge, "they" will come & demand changes in west-side street alignment	Need "exception" ruling to state & federal standards & guidelines to ensure local control of neighborhood traffic	See non-parallel comments & concerns	See non-parallel General question: using the No-Build option as a baseline with a cost of \$100, it would help to assign a relative cost for all the other options; e.g., if the No Build cost is \$100, then the "on line rebuild" would cost \$100,000. General cost ratios.
	Historic Bridge Foundation	<i>May receive input from Kitty Henderson</i>					
	HistoricBridges.org	<i>May receive input from Nathan Holth</i>					
	Historic District Commission	Concern that if the commitment is to conserving the existing bridge, that modifications will truly retain as	CTDOT could engage with historic bridge authorities such as the Historic Bridge	It would destroy the existing bridge completely and replace it with one of completely different character.	Keeping existing bridge where it is and pursue the rehabilitation solution.	Same as Off-Alignment Replacement Scale and character would be drastically	Same solution as Off-Alignment, work to rehabilitate the existing bridge, don't replace it in it's entirety.

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative		Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified
		much of the structure as possible while incorporating new construction that reflects its current features and character.	Foundation to contribute to the design and preservation effort.			different from existing bridge	
	Save Westport Now	<p>Increase in height will allow larger trucks</p> <p>Rights of way required</p> <p>Disruption period (2-3 years)</p> <p>Potential use of commuter lot for staging (a disaster for commuters)</p>	<p>Post the height so it matches the <u>existing actual</u> clearance (i.e., with elec. box)</p> <p>Stage elsewhere (not commuter lot)</p>	<p>Use of commuter lot for staging disruptive</p> <p>The entrance to Parker House property will create traffic issues</p> <p>Aesthetics: too modern? Not consistent with historic neighborhood</p> <p>The roadway on east side will be higher elevation and more intrusive for neighboring houses</p> <p>Wide lanes will encourage faster</p>	<p>Build a truss bridge – so it “looks like” what we have</p> <p>Can’t really address other concerns</p> <p>Use a staging area outside of immed. area (<u>not</u> the commuter lot)</p>	<p>Same problem with Parker House entrance</p> <p>Large and <u>tall</u> structure (<u>scale</u> is off for the neighborhood)</p> <p>The wide shoulders will encourage speed (rather than calming)</p> <p>Aesthetics (may lose truss appearance)</p> <p>Possible use of commuter lot as staging area</p>	<p>Reduce scale of bridge</p> <p>Use truss design (can’t solve speed issue)</p> <p>Use a staging site outside of Saugatuck</p>

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative		Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified
				speeds (reverse of our goal) Light spillage to neighbors Right of way (takings) a problem			
	Westport Coalition	Given the demands on our community now and in the future, the conservation alternative does not make sense. The bridge needs to open and close efficiently and be resilient given anticipated rising water levels. The town needs to create more safe alternative modes of transportation to and from the train station. The current bridge is not safe for cyclists and safe pedestrian access	This alternative should only be pursued if the bridge is re-located upstream, maybe as a pedestrian bridge closer to downtown – link downtown commercial / retail on both sides of river.	Thank you for adding sidewalk on south side. If possible, please provide recommendations for pedestrian movement once a person crosses the bridge (east side). What happens to the old bridge under this alternative? Can separate bike lanes be added on both sides?	Is funding available for relocating the bridge upstream? Can the parking lot access be moved/enhanced to the northern currently narrow access maybe by removing / replanting trees and obtaining a few feet from parking lot at the Saugatuck Rowing Club?	<u>Please add south sidewalk!</u>	[no input]

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

PAC Representative		Conservation Alternative: Concerns	Conservation Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Concerns	Parallel Off-Alignment Replacement Alternative: Solving Concerns You Identified
		to the train station is limited. If costs are added to the matrix, then the present value of the maintenance costs & police time associated with open and closing					
	Westport Preservation Alliance	We appreciate this approach as it preserves the key character defining aspects of the span and is consistent with the original MOU from the '90s. Further, it leaves in place the traffic calming geometry which the majority of Westporters have indicated is critical.	Consider seeking design waiver (bridge is NR Listed) to allow for narrow section crash rails.	Creates problematic traffic conflicts on west side approach (Parker). Opens span to all legal loads (e.g., 18 wheelers). Appears to <u>possibly</u> involve permanent taking which presents a hardship for residents. Destroys historic bridge.	Avoid the Off-Alignment Replacement to mitigate negative impacts to property and traffic flow.	West side traffic conflicts appear to be problematic. Scale appears out of sync with prevailing streetscape. Loss of NR Listed bridge.	Avoid Parallel Off-Alignment to mitigate negative impacts to historic span, traffic flow and private property.

SIGN-IN SHEETS



SIGN IN SHEET

January 30, 2019

Attended	First	Last	Title	Organization	EMAIL	PAC Member	Alt.
X	Sam	Arciola		Westport Police Department	sarciola@westportct.gov		X
	Priti	Bhardwaj		CTDOT	Priti.Bhardwaj@ct.gov		
X	Morley	Boyd		Westport Preservation Alliance	boyd.cthh@gmail.com	X	
X	Bob	Caporale		Imperial Landing Homeowner's Association	bobcaporale@gmail.com	X	
X	Andrew	Colabella	Member	Westport Representative Town Meeting – Selectmans Office	acolabellartm4@gmail.com	X	
	Sarah	Connolly	General Manager	Saugatuck Rowing & Fitness Club, LLC	sconnolly@saugatuckrowing.com	X	
X	Ron	Corwin		Coalition for Westport	ron@roncorwin.com		X
	Jim	DeStefano, P.E.	Resident	DeStefano & Chamberlain, Inc.	jimd@dcstructural.com	X	
X	Steven	Edwards	Consultant	Westport Board of Selectmen & Public Works Consultant	sedwards@westportct.gov	X	
X	Francisco	Fadul		CTDOT	Francisco.Fadul@ct.gov		
X	Tim	Fields		CTDOT	Timothy.Fields@ct.gov		

Attended	First	Last	Title	Organization	EMAIL	PAC Member	Alt.
	Kevin	Fleming		CTDOT	Kevin.fleming@ct.gov		
X	Jeff	Fontaine		CJM	JFontaine@cjmpc.com		
X	Robbie	Guimond	Owner	Bridgebrook Marina	robbieguimond@gmail.com	X	
	Kristen	Hadjstylianos		WestCOG	khadjstylianos@westcog.org	X	
X	Steven	Harlacker		H & H	sharlacker@hardestyhanover.com		
PHONE	Kitty	Henderson	Executive Director	Historic Bridge Foundation	kitty@historicbridgefoundation.com	X	
X	Randy	Henkels	Chair	Westport Historic District Commission (HDC)	fhenkels@gmail.com	X	
	Clarinda	Higgins	Chair	Westport Shellfish Commission	rindyhiggins@gmail.com	X	
	Nathan	Holth		HistoricBridges.org	nathan@historicbridges.org	X	
X	Jennifer	Johnson		Coalition for Westport	jbarrjohnson@gmail.com	X	
X	Bill	Kiedaisch	Chairman	Town of Westport Boating Advisory Committee	billkiedaisch@gmail.com	X	
X	Foti	Koskinas		Westport Police Department	fkoskinas@westportct.gov	X	
	Norman	Kramer		Green's Farms Association	normankramer@yahoo.com	X	
X	Paul	Lebowitz	Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission	Town of Westport	paul4pandz@gmail.com	X	
	Kim	Lesay		CTDOT	Kimberly.Lesay@ct.gov		
	Mark	Levesque		CJM	mlevesque@cjmpc.com		
X	Werner	Liepolt		Residents of the Bridge Street Neighborhood	wliepolt@mac.com	X	

Attended	First	Last	Title	Organization	EMAIL	PAC Member	Alt.
X	Dick	Lowenstein	Vice President	Green's Farms Association	dick.lowenstein@gmail.com		X
X	Matthew	Mandell	Executive Director and President	Westport Chamber of Commerce	matthew@westportwestonchamber.com	X	
X	James S.	Marpe	Selectman	Westport Board of Selectmen	Jmarpe@westportct.gov	X	
X	Mark	McMillan		CTDOT	mark.mcmillan@ct.gov		
X	Lynn	Murphy		CTDOT	Lynn.murphy@ct.gov		
X	Ted	Nezames		CTDOT	Theodore.Nezames@ct.gov		
X	Peter	Ratkiewich, P.E.	Director of Public Works Flood and Erosion Control Board	Town of Westport	pratkiewich@westportct.gov	X	
X	Tom	Ryan		CJM	tryan@cjmpc.com		
X	Kurt	Salmoiraghi		FHWA	Kurt.Salmoiraghi@dot.gov		
	Art	Schoeller		Green's Farms Association	art@optonline.net		X
X	Valerie	Seiling Jacobs	Co-Chairman	Save Westport Now	valerieseilingjacobs@gmail.com	X	
	David	Shorrock		Imperial Landing Homeowner's Association	dwshorrock@yahoo.com		X
X	James	Walsh		Westport Shellfish Commission			X
	Christopher	Wigren	Deputy Director	Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation	CWigren@cttrust.org	X	
X	Robert	Yost	Fire Chief	Westport Fire Department	ryost@westportct.gov	X	

Attended	First	Last	Title	Organization	EMAIL	PAC Member	Alt.
Took materials home	Mary	Young	Director, Planning & Zoning	Westport Planning and Zoning	maryyoung@westportct.gov	X	
	PUBLIC SIGN IN						
	First Name	Last Name			Email Address		
	Robert	Meyer			millpondfarms@aol.com		
	Amy & Michael	Greenberg			Amygreen912@yahoo.com		
	Sara	Harris			sharris@westportct.gov		
	Gerald	Romano			Gromano1@optonline.net		
	Ward	French			wardfrench@gmail.com		
	Annette	French			annetteffrench@msn.com		
	Pete	Hughes			<u>Peha06855@gmail.com</u>		
	Jennifer	Johnson			jbarrjohnson@gmail.com		
	Anthony	Rossi			Arossi06880@gmail.com		