The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) is undertaking the Seaview Avenue Corridor Project; utilizing federal funds provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Seaview Avenue serves an important local transportation function and is one of the few roadways in Bridgeport connecting I-95 with US Route 1 (Boston Avenue). The existing two-lane roadway is in poor condition and does not safely, efficiently, and adequately accommodate the type and volume of traffic currently using this route. Any development or expansion of businesses in the Seaview Avenue area, are expected to further exacerbate the existing traffic and safety problems. The purpose of this project is to improve traffic circulation patterns; improve operation of the Boston Avenue intersection for vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians; provide aesthetic and pedestrian safety improvements along the entire corridor; and provide access to underutilized properties while preserving neighborhood integrity.

**Project Description**

The project includes reconstruction and streetscape improvements centered on portions of the Seaview Avenue and Bond Street corridors. The project includes two distinct sections: 1) Section 1, which begins at Barnum Avenue extending north to Boston Avenue (US Route 1); and 2) Section 2, from the Seaview Avenue/ Boston Avenue intersection north to the Bond Street / Steward Street intersection. The total length of the project corridor is approximately 4,750 feet.

**Section 1 – Seaview Avenue from Barnum Avenue to Boston Avenue (US Route 1)**

Improvements will include pavement rehabilitation, replacement and/or upgrade of traffic signal equipment, new sidewalks and curbs, streetscape enhancements, and relocation of above ground utilities. The intersection at Boston Avenue (US Route 1) will be realigned to accommodate a “normalized” four-way intersection with Seaview Avenue and relocated Bond Street. In addition, a new storm drainage system will be constructed along Seaview Avenue and the existing combined sewer system that currently extends from approximately Huron Street to Boston Avenue will be separated.

**Section 2 – Bond Street from Boston Avenue (US Route 1) to Stewart Street**

Improvements in this section will include the construction of a new three-lane roadway and relocation of Bond Street slightly to the west. Configuration of this road will be one lane in each
direction and will include left turning lanes along the corridor to facilitate access to current and future potential development (including the new Harding High School) along Bond Street between Boston Avenue and Stewart Street. No additional left turn lanes are proposed at the intersection of Stewart Street and Bond Street, and the intersection will remain as an all-way stop sign controlled intersection. Work will include the incorporation of streetscape improvements; and the existing Bond Street footprint will be rehabilitated and modified to become a frontage road with additional on-street parking. Additionally, new drainage trunk lines and stormwater drainage structures will be constructed along the relocated Bond Street.

Construction for the project is anticipated to begin in the Spring of 2019 and the current approximate total project cost is estimated at approximately $14 million.

**Alternatives Considered**

Through a separate earlier project, the Seaview Avenue corridor was evaluated as part of a larger effort for developing transportation improvements between I-95 and Boston Avenue (EA/EIE, March 2006). In that document, a number of alternatives were reviewed including those listed below:

- Alternative 1 – Two-lane upgrade to conform to current roadway standards
- Alternative 2 – Four-lane widening, maintaining existing Seaview Avenue centerline
- Alternative 3 – Four-lane widening, shifting the Seaview Avenue centerline west
- Alternative 4 – Three-lane widening, shifting the Seaview Avenue centerline west
- Alternative 5 – Combined Seaview Avenue upgrade and construction of two-lane arterial
- Alternative 6 - New limited-access arterial west of Seaview Avenue
- Alternative 6a-6d – Alignment variations focused on the approach to the US Route 1 intersection with Seaview Avenue

At that time Alternative 6 was the chosen as the preferred alternative. However, the old project did not advance to construction due to funding constraints and potential environmental impacts. It was since determined that the current project would be targeted to improving existing infrastructure to safely handle existing and expected traffic volumes while adhering to available levels of funding. Therefore, none of the previously studied alternatives were carried forward, as this project is intended to have a much smaller footprint, and fewer impacts than the previously studied alternatives.

**Alternatives Considered in Addition to the Proposed Design**

This current project is proposed to include limited widening and improvements between Barnum Avenue and Boston Avenue where there are ROW restrictions and/or adjacent resources, and more extensive widening where there are potentially less restrictive areas north of Boston Avenue. The current proposal will have a much smaller project footprint, and fewer impacts than the previously studied alternatives.

During preliminary design, the City of Bridgeport, CTDOT and the design team met on several occasions with representatives from General Electric (GE) to discuss potential alternatives given...
GE’s concerns about property acquisition with the proposed intersection alignment of Seaview Avenue, Bond Street and US Route 1. The design team prepared two (2) additional alternatives to assess whether there were alternate designs that could minimize impacts to the GE property, optimize safety and traffic flow through the intersection and avoid extensive impacts to existing businesses and residences in the area. Full descriptions and schematics of each can be found in Appendix A of this FONSI; however the following provides a summary of these alternatives:

**Intersection Configuration “A” – Boston Avenue (US Route 1)/ Seaview Avenue/ Bond Street**

The initial alternative that was prepared and discussed with GE sought to minimize impacts to GE property (1285 Parcel) and shift the new Bond Street roadway (and intersection) to the east, away from GE property. This results in reductions to impacts to the GE property; however, the alternative creates a number of undesirable impacts including:

- This alternative creates a skewed intersection of 72 degrees; while this is minimally acceptable for geometry, it is not optimal for maximizing safety and sight lines.
- Total acquisition of four (4) properties is required (3 multi-family residential buildings and a minority-owned commercial muffler shop).
- Given the multi-family residential relocations needed and the current socioeconomic demographics of the local population, Environmental Justice (EJ) concerns are introduced.
- Additional costs associated with the increased ROW are estimated at approximately $1.45 million.

**Intersection Configuration “B” – Boston Avenue (US Route 1)/ Seaview Avenue/ Bond Street**

The design team presented a modified alternate concept that was a ‘middle ground’ in alignment between the selected alternative and Intersection Configuration ‘A’. This alternative sought to lessen impacts to the GE property while at the same time maintaining limited skew angle and minimizing other property impacts. The expected impacts include:

- Maintains the same skewed intersection as “Configuration A”.
- Eliminates impacts to the 3 multi-family residential buildings; however, this alignment would require the acquisition of approximately half of the existing parking on the Yankee Muffler site (1290 Boston Avenue), thereby negatively impacting the business and/or potentially rendering the site as non-conforming for parking. Assuming there is a need to acquire the entire minority owned business to limit partial acquisition of GE property, this would raise considerable concerns as the project lies within an EJ community.
- Shifting the intersection to the east would cause additional operational issues.
- Cost associated with a potential total acquisition of the Yankee Muffler business (if required), estimated at approximately $540,000 (including demolition and miscellaneous costs, such as relocation assistance).

GE submitted a further refinement to the Intersection Configuration ‘B’ concepts (see FONSI Appendix A, figure 5) however, many of the concerns with Intersection Configuration ‘B’
• Creates an even larger skew (66 degrees) for the Bond Street leg of the intersection. This represents a worsening of potential sightlines, safety and turning movements, as well as longer pedestrian crossings on Boston Avenue (US Route 1).
• Given the further shifting of the intersection alignment to the east, not only do the potential operational concerns identified with Intersection Configuration ‘B’ for the Yankee Muffler driveway location (Boston Avenue) increase but with this refinement, the driveway would enter the intersection proper and is no longer at or behind a stop bar (Boston Avenue, eastern approach) which is a safety concern for business users and traffic within the intersection. Given the skew of the intersection and access point to the property on Boston Avenue, it is likely there would be further safety concerns introduced related to visibility of signal heads from the egress at Yankee Muffler.
• The alignment results in similar impacts to the Yankee Muffler shop outlined above (Intersection Configuration ‘B’), negatively impacting the business and potentially rendering that property non-conforming for parking as well as safety concerns of ingress and egress on Boston Avenue.

Outreach

A scoping notice was published in the Environmental Monitor under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) to inform the public of the proposed project on April 7, 2015. The notice included a project description and solicited written comments from the public and state regulatory agencies. The comment period closed on May 7, 2015, and although several comments were received there were no requests to hold a public scoping meeting. A list of comments received during scoping are available in Appendix B of the EA. A full list of public outreach efforts and agency coordination that took place prior to the publication of the EA is available within the Public Involvement section of the EA.

A public hearing for the EA was held on Thursday, February 8, 2018 in the Hollander Auditorium at Bridgeport Hospital. Per 23 CFR 771.119, a notice of availability of the EA/notice of the public hearing was published in the Connecticut Post on January 24, 2018 and February 6, 2018, as well as La Voz, a Spanish periodical, on Friday, January 26th. These notices can be found in the attached Appendix C. The 30-day public review period closed on February 23, 2018. Hardcopies of the EA were made available for public inspection at the Connecticut Department of Transportation, FHWA’s Glastonbury Connecticut Division Office, the Bridgeport Public Library (Main Branch), the Bridgeport Public Library (Old Mill Green Branch), and the Connecticut State Library (Hartford). The EA was also available online at www.ct.gov/environmentaldocuments.

Additionally, the following various units of Federal, State, and local government received a notice of availability of the EA/notice of the public hearing: CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CTDEEP), CT Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD), CT Department of Public Health (DPH), CT Office of Policy and Management (OPM), CT State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), US Fish and Wildlife
Service (USFWS), Office of the Governor, the Bridgeport Mayor’s Office, and the relevant US Senators, State Senators and State Representatives.

Seventeen (17) members of the public signed the attendance list at the hearing. Additionally, a Spanish translator was available at the hearing; however their services were ultimately not needed.

One individual provided oral comments at the hearing; and throughout the 30-day public comment period, CTDOT received comments from five (5) organizations/businesses, and two (2) members of the public. The organizations/businesses that submitted comments include East Side Neighborhood Revitalization Zone, Greater Bridgeport Transit, Optimus Health Care, DuPont Corporation/Sporting Goods Properties Inc., and General Electric. Comments and responses are located in Appendix A; and a transcript of the public hearing is available as Appendix B. No response was required for the comment received during the public hearing.

**Environmental Impacts and Analysis**

The various environmental impacts and analysis associated with this project are described in detail in the EA. Since circulation of the EA, no new impacts have been identified; and a list of environmental commitments is located in the EA. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated from the proposed action; and the following brief summary of impacts supports decision to issue a FONSI:

**Right of Way (ROW)** – The ROW impacts along Seaview Avenue should generally be marginal, and would only entail minor sliver acquisitions. A total of ten (10) commercial and one (1) residential property will likely be impacted. These are necessary to accommodate the additional roadway widths. All sliver acquisitions are expected to occur along the western side of Seaview Avenue. The largest acquisition will occur on the property owned by General Electric on the western side of Bond Street between US Route 1 (Boston Avenue) and Stewart Street. General Electric submitted comments regarding the impacts to their property, and these comments along with responses are located in Appendix A of this FONSI. In addition, minor easements to accommodate proposed slopes and drainage system improvements may be required; however this will be determined at a later date as the design process progresses.

No acquisitions are expected along the eastern side of Seaview Avenue or Bond Street.

**Surface Water Resources** – The project site is located in an urbanized area, and is not in proximity to Wild and Scenic Rivers, or surface waters on the Nationwide River Inventory list. The project is also not anticipated to impact reservoirs, lakes, detention basins, or stormwater management facilities. The modifications to the existing roadway drainage systems may result in minor direct impacts to Yellow Mill Channel. New drainage trunk lines and drainage structures will be installed along the relocated Bond Street and the majority of Seaview Avenue. Additionally, any combined sewers will be separated within the project limits. The roadway improvements associated with this project that could potentially contribute to the degradation of water quality are temporary in nature and minor in scope; and will be avoided or minimized by following Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction. The project is
not likely to adversely affect water quality.

**Wetlands** – Installation of new or improved drainage system structures within wetlands may be required. This may result in minor impacts on jurisdictional wetlands requiring approval from both the ACOE and CTDEEP. A determination of the need and appropriate permit review process will be determined once detailed drainage design information is available.

**Drinking Water Sources** – Impacts to drinking water sources are not anticipated. The project is not located within a public drinking water supply source. However, the project is located within the public water supply service area for the Aquarion Water Company (AWC) main system. CTDOT will coordinate with AWC regarding any proposed water distribution main relocations or replacements as design progresses.

**Floodplains** – Installation of new or improved drainage structures within the 100-year floodplain may be required. A Flood Management Certification will be required, but any impacts will be minor. A final determination of impacts and any required permitting will be made following completion of a detailed drainage design. No impacts on the floodway for Yellow Mill Channel are anticipated.

**Terrestrial Habitat** - There are no unique or high-quality habitats present within the project area, nor will the project require CTDEEP fisheries coordination.

**Threatened and Endangered Species** - No impacts to threatened and endangered species are anticipated for this project.

**Historic/Cultural Resources** – The Section 106 process has been completed and it was determined that the project will have “No Adverse Effect” on historic/cultural resources.

**Parks and Recreation Impacts** – This project will not impact or use any parks, recreation areas, or wildlife/waterfowl refuges.

**Air Quality** - An Air Quality Assessment was performed and the project is in conformity with the Clean Air Act.

**Noise** – A noise analysis was performed using the FHWA-approved traffic noise prediction model; and it was determined that substantial noise increases are not predicted as a result of the project. Noise abatement will therefore not be implemented. The noise analysis is included in the EA as Appendix G.

**Hazardous Materials** – The project vicinity includes sites with known contamination issues. This includes the former General Electric facility located on the west of Bond Street and to the north of US Route 1, a hazardous waste management facility under Connecticut law and a federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site. Buildings have been removed and hazardous waste areas have been investigated and remediated in recent years. GE is currently performing corrective action pursuant to RCRA. Any acquisition of the GE property will require the City of Bridgeport and/or the State to coordinate with GE and appropriate regulatory...
agencies to complete any remaining remediation.

A Corridor Land Use Evaluation was performed by CTDOT in October 2016. Based on the results, it was determined that additional study should be performed in areas of anticipated intrusive activities along the roadway and/or ROW that are on or adjacent to parcels identified as moderate or high-risk. This more detailed investigation will be completed as design progresses and more detailed information is available. Should there be any contaminated soils or groundwater present in areas proposed for construction, remediation measures will be put in place to mitigate any potential impacts. As a consequence, significant impacts associated with hazardous materials or waste sites are not anticipated.

Community Impacts - The project does not result in any significant adverse impacts to the communities in the project area. The project will likely provide improved economic activity and safety enhancements for the surrounding community.

Environmental Justice - The project takes place in an area that is home to an EJ population; however, there are no foreseeable adverse social, economic, or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations as defined by the DOT and FHWA environmental orders. Any impacts associated with the project are minor, largely limited to the construction period, and will be sufficiently minimized and mitigated.

The residents and neighborhood will benefit from traffic improvements, visual and aesthetic improvements and prospects for improved long-term employment opportunities. Additionally, no businesses or residents will be displaced due to the project.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts - No significant negative indirect or cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the project.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Finding**

The EA has been independently evaluated by FHWA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the purpose and need, environmental impacts of the project and appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, FHWA has reviewed all comments received during the public comment period and provided responses to substantive comments. Pursuant to 23 CFR 771.121, FHWA finds that the Seaview Avenue Corridor Project, as proposed, will result in no significant impact on the environment. The record provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required. The FHWA takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the EA, which is incorporated by reference to this FONSI.
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February 21, 2018

Ms. Kimberly Lesay  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06111

Re: Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Lesay,

On behalf of the East Side NRZ, this letter comes in support of the Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvement Project. We recognize well laid out roads, infrastructures, and utilities are important to our neighborhood vitality. The Grant Street intersection is currently seen as a serious bottle neck for the employees and emergency vehicles going to Bridgeport Hospital which has one of the region’s best Emergency Departments. Additionally, the environmental assessment notes these roadway improvements will help reduce motor vehicle idling at congested intersections and help reduce pollution. Finally, the improvements provided by the proposed roadway alignments will make the intersections on US Rt 1 / Boston Ave safer for both pedestrians and vehicles.

We, therefore, strongly endorse the Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvements Project, from Barnum Ave. to Stewart St., which will improve roadway safety along this key transit corridor for cars, buses and pedestrians.

Regards,

East Side NRZ

Kim Bianca Williams  
President

Response Key

No response required.
Ms. Kimberly Lesay  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, Connecticut  

Subject: Seaview Avenue Corridor Roadway Improvement Project - NEPA

Dear Ms. Lesay:

By way of this letter, I am writing to express GBT’s support for the ongoing Seaview Avenue Corridor Roadway Improvements Project. GBT provides bus service in the Bridgeport region with several routes serving the area of this project.

The new configuration of this roadway and intersection with Boston Avenue will improve safety and accessibility for bus service in the vicinity. The improvements will allow for improved traffic flow and provide protected turn lanes - important for bus service. The current configuration with the off-set intersection is less than ideal for bus service.

As the main access to the newly located High Scholl, the configuration and improvements will make it more convenient for students and buses (school and transit), and the installation of new sidewalks will be an improvement for both pedestrians and cyclists - important to bus transit.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important project.

Best Regards,

Douglas C. Holcomb, AICP  
GM/CEO  
Greater Bridgeport Transit
February 16, 2018

Ms. Kimberly Lesay  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT. 06131

Re: State Project No.15-371

Dear Ms. Lesay:

I am writing as the CEO of a major employer in the region. I fully support the project and the improvements to the Seaview Avenue Corridor.

This project will improve access to the new Harding High School, where Optimus is a provider of health services there through operation of a school based health center. The improvements will make trips there easier and safer with the addition of a right turn lane. It will also open access to other economic development projects in the area.

As a member of the East Side Neighborhood Revitalization Zone, I endorse the effort and look forward to its prompt completion.

Sincerely,

Ludwig Spinelli  
CEO

Response Key

No response required.
10 Penfield Place  
Bridgeport Ct 06605

February 22, 2018

Ms. Kimberly Lesay  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, Connecticut 06131

Re: Seaview Avenue Corridor Roadway Improvement Project  
NEPA Comments

Dear Ms. Lesay,

I am writing to express my support for the ongoing Seaview Avenue Corridor Roadway Improvements project.

This corridor program was begun over a decade ago with the intent of providing access to the underutilized antiquated properties that exist adjacent to the Yellow Mill.

Since the time that Bridgeport was the Arsenal of Democracy, our waterways were the primary modes of transportation, which was then followed by rail and roadways. This corridor is pretty much the same configuration it has been since the early 20th Century, with narrow roadways, inadequate parking, and underpasses that are not conducive to truck or bus traffic.

Due to low bridges and flooding, even Bridgeport Hospital, located ¼ miles from this roadway, will not let emergency vehicles utilize Seaview Avenue due to the possibility of flooded underpasses or vehicles that have gotten stuck under the bridges.

Although this project will not address all the needs of this corridor, it will begin to address some of the deficiencies in this roadway. In particular, the intersection improvements at Grant St. as well as Boston Ave. / US Rt 1 will allow for a standard intersection configuration with turn lanes. This improvement will allow traffic flowing in all directions to move smoother, and provide safer dedicated turn lanes.

As the main artery to the new Harding High School, these roadways improvements will make it more convenient for student and buses, and the installation of new sidewalks will provide a better surface for both pedestrians and bicycles.

Environmentally, the separation of the storm and sanitary lines will help improve water quality flowing into the Long Island Sound.

Thank you very much for helping to modernize the aging infrastructure of the state’s largest city.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephen J. Tyliszczak  
Resident of Bridgeport
Gentlemen:

Two particular points:
1) This is an overall excellent improvement for transportation access throughout the Seaview Avenue & Bond Street area;
2) Please make sure your documentation for the parking & resident access lane along Bond Street is well documented for safety evaluations.

In reviewing the plans for the Bond Street - Seaview Avenue extension portion, it appears that the parking for residents is across an inside or curbside access lane. This poses a problem for residents loading and unloading vehicles. Carrying material to & from a vehicle means there will be a high probability of residents needing to set material down in the street, as opposed to the broadway/sidewalk. Furthermore, children entering & exiting the parked cars are likely to display a lack of care crossing the access lane - a high potential for conflicts. Lastly, in an age of increased bicycle ridership, especially adjacent to the new school, the right angle parking poses an increased risk of conflicts. Many cities are starting to encourage back in angle parking that provides much better visibility for drivers and riders alike.

My parking suggestion (backing-in along the house side curb) reduces three areas of hazard and roadway-use-conflicts or incident points. The obvious drawback to my suggestion is a reduced number of parking spaces. However, a quick review of the existing curbside parking (granted it is not a long term predictor) shows that angle parking would provide at least 4 additional spaces (making room for driveways) on the street. Clearly not as many as you've indicated with "across the access lane" parking.

Food for thought.

Sincerely

--

Stuart H. Sachs, PLA, ASLA, CWHLP
PRE/view Landscape Architects
120 Quinlan Avenue
Bridgeport CT 06605
203-332-0053
SS-1  There are existing driveways and access points to residential properties along the curb line identified which will not be removed by the project. Residents will continue to be able to use their driveways for access and loading and unloading vehicles so will not need to cross the access lane to do so or use the street to set down materials.

The comment also refers to right angle parking. The proposed parking is 60-degree angled parking. While safety of children and all users is always a concern, the layout of parking and access is in accordance with standard design practice in the City of Bridgeport.

See SS-2 for response to back-in parking.

SS-2  There are a significant number of existing driveways and curb cuts along the entire curbside frontage (eastside) of Bond Street. Placing parking on this curb side as suggested would either significantly reduce the number of parking spaces proposed to replace existing parking spaces (and add additional spaces for flexibility) and/or reduce and eliminate existing access to driveways. While backing-in parking is one method to reduce potential roadway use conflicts, there is some concern, given the unfamiliarity with this by local residents, that there may actually be additional conflicts generated as residents (or visitors) continue to attempt to access parking spots head in, regardless of angled striping. To address any potential conflicts with children etc., the City will review the potential for incorporating additional warning signage in the area to mitigate any potential issues.
February 23, 2018

Ms. Kimberly Lesay  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Connecticut Department of Transportation  
2800 Berlin Turnpike  
Newington, CT 06131  

Re: Seaview Avenue Corridor Project  

Dear Ms. Lesay:  

I am writing to express support for the ongoing Seaview Avenue / Bond Street Corridor Improvements project. Sporting Goods Properties, Inc., and its parent company DuPont, are actively moving forward with remediation activities at the 422-acre Lake Success property located in the northeast section of the City of Bridgeport and the northwestern corner of Stratford. Included in our plans is a future public road that will connect Bond Street in Bridgeport to Broadbridge Avenue in Stratford which will provide a strategic regional traffic corridor for both vehicular and bus traffic.  

This corridor improvement will establish a strategic transportation connection from Interstate 95, Route 1 and the train station through the proposed 422-acre Lake Success Eco Business Park connecting with the Route 8/25 traffic corridor into the Naugatuck Valley. The future LSEBP proposes approximately 950,000 S.F. of commercial, institutional and hospitality uses, a portion of which is being considered as a site for a new regional transit hub. The Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvements project is critical to the future development of LSEBP, the largest economic and redevelopment opportunity in the City of Bridgeport, providing both local job development and increasing the City’s tax base, while providing congestion mitigation to the already overused Route 8/1-95 interchange.  

While expressing support for the Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvements project, I am concerned that the plans, as presented at the environmental assessment hearing on February 8, 2018, will not adequately accommodate the need for public transportation to the site to connect the east side of Bridgeport to northern Stratford and the Naugatuck Valley.  

The intersection of Bond Street and Stewart Street is a key connection to the planned regional connector
road and proposed business park and must be appropriately designed to support future development activity and regional transit connectivity. I hope the Connecticut Department of Transportation will review the designs plans with this in mind and revise the designs as necessary. On behalf of Sporting Goods Properties, I appreciate your consideration of our comments on the Seaview Avenue Corridor Improvements project.

If you have any questions regarding the Lake Success property and the proposed LSEBP, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas E. Stilley, PE
Vice President, Sporting Goods Properties Inc.
Responses to DuPont Sporting Goods Properties Inc.

DU-1 The roadway corridor design has taken into consideration future truck and bus traffic as part of the design for each intersection and in accordance with CTDOT design guidelines to assure the accounting for said vehicles in the corridor. Specifically, the curb radii at the terminating intersection at Bond Street and Stewart Street have been designed to allow Greater Bridgeport Transit (GBT) buses to make the various turns to or from any future roadway serving any proposed development of the Lake Success Eco-Business Park (LSEBP). Should future development of the LSEBP require greater modifications to the intersection based on any specific needs identified, there is available space for modifications to the intersection by future developers.
February 23, 2018

Ms. Kimberly Lesay
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, Connecticut 06111

Re: Environmental Assessment, Seaview Avenue Corridor Project
(State Project No. 150371)

Dear Ms. Lesay:

General Electric Company (GE) hereby comments on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Seaview Avenue Corridor Project (the “Project”) that was prepared on behalf of the City of Bridgeport (City) and the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CDOT). The Project is divided into two sections: Section 1, along Seaview Ave from Barnum Ave to Boston Ave; and Section 2, from the Seaview Ave-Boston Ave intersection north along Bond Street to Stewart Street intersection. GE’s comments focus on Section 2, especially the realignment of the Seaview Ave-Boston Ave intersection. The substance of these comments has been discussed previously both with the City and CDOT beginning in January 2017.

As the owner of three parcels within the Project area that are being prepared for reuse, GE supports the goals of the Project – “improving roadway function, capacity and safety.” (Environmental Assessment, at p.6). Meaningful improvement to the configuration of Seaview Ave, Bond Street and the intersections at Barnum and Boston Avenues would benefit the City, local businesses and neighbors. However, we believe that the selected roadway design and intersection realignment falls far short of the stated Project objectives because it passes over more functional and practical options in favor of a proposed project that negatively impacts both the corridor and GE’s parcel at 1285 Boston Avenue (“1285 Parcel”).1 As more fully described in the next section, the Project will directly take substantial portions of the 1285 Parcel along both Boston Ave and Bond Street, while significantly hindering beneficial reuse of the remaining portions. These constraints reduce the number of contiguous developable acres, drive-up construction costs, eliminate effective parcel access and significantly diminish the economic return available from any redevelopment project. The “gateway” portions of the 1285 Parcel will become unattractive to future

---

1 Along with the 1285 parcel discussed above, GE owns two other parcels within the Project area: (1) 379 Bond Street, which is the location of the new Harding High School. This parcel will be transferred to the City of Bridgeport after the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection issues a Certificate of Completion for environmental obligations under the applicable Stewardship Permit; and (2) 1899 Seaview Avenue. The Project as currently configured will narrow this parcel along Seaview Ave through a partial taking.
developers, severely limiting the Parcel’s potential to catalyze transformational development within the corridor.

**The Project as designed will reduce opportunities for Parcel redevelopment and have negative impacts on the Community.**

One of the Project’s stated purposes is to “[p]rovide access to underutilized properties while preserving neighborhood integrity.” Approximately 53 acres in size, including a 12-acre parcel along the Boston Avenue/Bond Street intersection, the 1285 Parcel is the largest “underutilized” property along Section 2. While it is currently vacant and undergoing remediation, portions of the Parcel have already been actively marketed for productive reuse. Unfortunately, the intersection realignment Project will have a detrimental impact on these redevelopment efforts well beyond just the taking of a portion of the Parcel.

The Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue intersection abuts the most visible, viable and valuable portions of the 1285 Parcel. Current frontage on Bond Street is located at grade-level, while the rest of the Parcel slopes to the west at approximately 10 feet below grade. The proposed Project takes all of the at-grade portion and fills some of the sloped portion to construct the new Bond Street. What remains for redevelopment is a “valley” located more than one story below street grade, with no at-grade frontage and no visibility along either Boston Avenue or Bond Street. Significant investment by a future developer would be required to create even limited utility for this “gateway” portion of the Parcel. To illustrate these concerns, we have attached photos in Exhibit A.

Additionally, the current design proposes a 1:1 slope, as opposed to a retaining wall, to support Bond Street from the western sidewalk down to the “valley” portion of the Property. Use of a slope requires the City to take additional portions of the Parcel compared to what would be required for a retaining wall, thereby further reducing the developable acreage. Moreover, engineers retained by GE have expressed concerns that the 1:1 slope may be inadequate to support the new road, suggesting that the design should be augmented to incorporate a more gradual slope with a wider base to increase structural stability. Widening the base of the slope would require the City to take even more of the 1285 Parcel than the EA identified. The EA did not provide a design for or analyze the impacts of such an extended slope.

Finally, to accommodate the road design with the slope, the Proposal eliminates any access to the “valley” portion of the Parcel, except for a narrow entry point located midway down Bond Street and adjacent to Harding High School. The EA does not analyze the traffic and safety impacts cause by locating the only entrance to the Parcel along the school driveway. Moreover, this Proposal runs counter to a stated goal of the Project—to increase access for underutilized properties. Instead, the design virtually eliminates access to nearly 12 acres of prime, ready-to-develop real estate.

---

2 Access to property owned by Sporting Goods Properties, Inc., sometimes referred to as the “Lake Success Edo-Business Park” is not a purpose of the Project. (See EA, p.7).

3 The EA mischaracterizes the 1285 Parcel as part of a “strip of deteriorated industrial properties … bordering on the west side of Bond Street.” GE has removed the former manufacturing structures from the property and is nearing completion site-wide remediation. GE elected to perform this remediation in a way that would make the property available for meaningful and sustainable development, with minimal additional site preparation work for developers. GE’s efforts have been acknowledged with renewed interest in acquisition of the property.
By reducing the redevelopment potential of the 1285 Parcel, the Project also will have far-reaching, negative impacts for the City and community that are not easily mitigated by the Proposal. 1285 Boston Avenue, especially the portion at the intersection, is nearly ready for sale and reuse. Taking all of the at-grade portions of this Parcel and leaving a minimally developable “valley” reduces the pool of interested developers as well as the potential uses, beyond merely the pro rata reduction in the parcel size. This removes a significant economic engine from the inventory of local properties, creating the real potential that large portions of the Parcel may never be redeveloped or may be underdeveloped. Limited development makes it more difficult to use this Parcel to create jobs, generate tax revenue for the City, and improve property values for the neighbors.

The EA omits consideration of alternatives to the proposed Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue Intersection alignment, some of which better meet the Project objectives.

Given the magnitude of these impacts on the 1285 Parcel and the community and the requirement for the EA to consider appropriate alternatives, it is striking that the EA does not describe, mention, or evaluate any alternatives to the Proposal.

Several alternatives to the proposed Project design, particularly intersection realignment, are available. Stantec prepared at least two alternatives for consideration by the City. See Copies at Exhibit B. GE met several times with both the City and CDOT to discuss the implications of the Project. During these meetings, Stantec presented these two alternatives to GE. On behalf of GE, WSP recently prepared an additional alternative for intersection alignment, attached to these comments as Exhibit C, which provides a comparable level of service to the Proposal. Similarly, as part of a 2006 project to evaluate the Seaview Avenue Corridor, alternatives were reviewed and one was selected.

The EA does not detail or analyze any of these or other alternatives. Regarding the 2006 project, the EA notes in Part I, Subpart C, “Other Alternatives Considered”:

... based on available funding sources and recognition of the greater impacts of the chosen alternative, it was determined that the proposed design would be targeted to improving existing infrastructure to safely handle existing and expected traffic volumes (See Traffic Signal Study in Appendix E) while adhering to available levels of funding. As a consequence, none of the previously studied alternatives are being considered for the current proposed project. This current project is proposed to include limited widening and improvements between Barnum Avenue and Boston Avenue where there are right-of-way (ROW) restrictions and/or adjacent resources, and therefore potentially less restrictive areas north of Boston Avenue, more extensive widening along Bond Street to the west. This will have a much smaller project footprint, and fewer impacts than the previously studied alternatives.

(EA, p.8) (emphasis added). Instead, the EA presents and evaluates only the Proposal and the “no build” option, discounting all other alternatives that have been proposed. (EA, p.9). Proponents of the Project are required to consider and describe viable alternatives and to justify the merits of the selected approach compared to those viable options. The EA fails to do so.
This omission is especially telling because many of these alternatives would provide a comparable level of service and meet the Project goals, while also mitigating negative impacts to the 1285 Parcel and the community. Stantec’s two alternatives and the GE proposal all would reduce the amount of the 1285 Parcel to be taken, albeit by different amounts, thereby preserving more of this large parcel for redevelopment. Moreover, the alternatives avoid taking some or all of the at-grade frontage, particularly at the intersection, and require little or no filling or structural work to support road construction. The Proposal requires significant filling and structural work on the 1285 Parcel, but the EA fails even to consider the consequences of this filling and structural work on the 1285 Parcel or the surrounding areas. In sum, the EA is deficient because it fails meaningfully to identify and analyze alternatives, much less to compare consequences of those alternatives with the Proposal.

The EA does not accurately identify or address impacts to the community from taking the GE Property

The EA does discuss community impacts in several sections, specifically Part 1, Subparts L and N, “Community Impacts” and “Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.” While the document concludes that there will be no substantial impacts either to local/regional development patterns, or to the local tax base or property values, the EA does not support this conclusion with detailed analysis.

The 1285 Parcel impacts described above undermine this determination. As the single largest redevelopable parcel in the region, the 1285 Parcel likely would be the primary source for many of the community benefits identified from intersection realignment:

- new and enhanced economic development/growth and associated socioeconomic benefits to the local and regional areas;
- addition of local jobs with new development;
- revitalization of the urban environments and aesthetic qualities within and near the project area;
- opportunities to utilize/develop brownfield sites; and
- increased property values.

(EA, p. 26). The negative impacts to the 1285 Parcel described above would prevent the Parcel from capitalizing on development opportunities. The EA does not recognize these negative impacts or present an approach for mitigating them to assure that the Project will achieve its broader goals.

The EA Does Not Address Required Remediation

In Part II, Subpart K – Hazardous Materials and Waste Sites, the EA provides information about site contamination and remediation:

The proposed project vicinity includes sites with known contamination issues. This includes the former General Electric (GE) facility located on the west side of Bond Street and to the north of US Route 1 (Boston Avenue), a hazardous waste management facility under Connecticut law and a federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site. Several hazardous waste areas were associated with a large industrial facility that occupied the site from approximately 1912 to 2012. Buildings have been removed and hazardous waste areas have been investigated and remediated in recent years in preparation for sale and redevelopment of the property. Remediation
activities at the site have included removal and off-site disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater, backfilling excavations with clean rock and soil materials, and monitoring for residual contamination. Some of the hazardous material areas will be capped in place. Contaminants found at the site have included metals, PCBs, petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, light non-aqueous phase liquids, and solvents. The City of Bridgeport is currently constructing the new Warren Harding High School on a portion of this location. Remediation activities are expected to continue on the site in general, until corrective actions at the entire site have been completed.

(emphasis added).

Several of the statements in that paragraph are inaccurate and need to be corrected.

GE is currently performing corrective action at 1285 Boston Avenue pursuant to RCRA. However, the intent is for final development to complete the corrective action requirements, as has been discussed with both the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) and the City. GE has removed those highly regulated soils from the Site, with new construction to cover the remaining soils. This is the same approach that has been taken under a joint Stewardship Permit for the 379 Bond Street parcel, which is the location of the new Harding High School.

If redevelopment does not occur because the corner is taken, remediation of that corner will not be “complete.” The new owner (the City and/or CDOT) would be required to complete the remediation of the corner through construction or through further soil removal at the City’s expense. We understand that the details of the project are not final; however, the EA plans show much of the corner portion of 1285 Boston Avenue as green space. The corner parcel does not currently meet the standards for green space without further remediation. GE has provided details about this matter to the City. Moreover, because 1285 Boston Avenue will continue to be an “interim status treatment storage and disposal facility” until the completion of corrective action, the City and/or CDOT will be subject to the requirements of RCRA as it performs that work. The EA is silent as to both the technical and legal consequences of the remaining work.

Conclusion

As a local property owner, GE fully supports realignment of the Seaview Ave-Boston Ave intersection, along with the Project’s community revitalization goals. If well-designed to optimize property reuse, the Project could catalyze the improvements identified in the EA. Unfortunately, the proposed design fails to weigh and mitigate the substantial negative impacts on the 1285 Parcel. This failure will undermine the benefits available from the Project. GE advocates expansion of the EA to identify, describe, and compare all viable alternatives for the intersection design, including rigorously evaluating which design provides the greatest Project benefit for the community. We would be pleased to meet with you do discuss these comments and additional ideas.

Sincerely,

Marian E. Whiteman
Exhibit A (cont’d)
Exhibit A (cont’d)
Exhibit A (cont’d)
Exhibit A (cont’d)
Responses to General Electric Company

GE-1  The proposed alignment was designed for optimizing safety and sight distance at the Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue/Bond Street intersection, while minimizing impacts to the serviceability (and potential total acquisitions) of all properties (including minority owned businesses) within the intersection area. While the intersection alignment impacts the 1285 Parcel and requires a partial acquisition, based on a review of the entire property and relatively minor percentage of property acquired (see Figure 1), the property remains able to be developed.

Any perceived financial impacts or claims of reduced marketability or increased development costs will be reviewed and negotiated with the State of Connecticut as a part of the standard Rights-of-Way procurement process. The CTDOT will be procuring all necessary property rights on behalf of and at the request of the City of Bridgeport.

GE-2  The current design provides for standard 2:1 side slopes, not the 1:1 outlined in the comment. This is a standard roadway side slope and provides for full support of the adjacent proposed highway. There would be no need for a ‘wider base’ and increased property acquisition as the comment suggests.

The comment also suggests the inclusion of a retaining wall to further reduce impacts to the property. Such a wall (approx. 6-8 foot in height), would save approximately 12-16 feet of physical impact or roughly .06 acres of area. When compared to an overall parcel acreage of approximately 59 acres (per City records) this represents a very small percentage of the parcel. While feasible, constructing a new retaining wall is not standard practice where there are no physical limitations to sloping of grades. In addition, the City would need additional ROW beyond any retaining structure for access/maintenance purposes, providing further restrictions as compared to a proposed slope treatment. Finally, a new wall would also serve to increase costs for the project and could hinder access to the property as opposed to a graded slope that could be manipulated for access purposes.

GE-3  While access to the property within the proposed slope area identified adjacent to the traffic signal could be physically constrained with the selected alternative, access will be limited in the vicinity of the traffic signal in any case as the City/CTDOT likely would not permit the construction of a new driveway within the approach to the intersection considering traffic safety and potential conflicts with associated turning lanes. However, the proposed design could allow driveway access to the 1285 Parcel to be aligned with the first Bond Street intersection with the new frontage/parking access road (see Figure 2). If appropriately designed, this location could be a reasonable, at-grade access point and a driveway for the 1285 Parcel. Therefore, access to the 1285 Parcel is not eliminated, as suggested. In fact, access to the 1285 Parcel should be improved by the selected alternative given the addition of turning lanes on the relocated Bond Street and optimization of intersection geometry and signal timing.

Further, the above noted potential access point is in proximity (300 feet) to the Bond Street/Boston Avenue intersection and not ‘midway down Bond Street and adjacent to Harding High School’ as the comment suggests. The responsibility to design and analyze traffic and safety impacts for future driveways not yet identified falls to any future developer of the parcels. Any proposed development meeting the threshold for a Major Traffic Generator would require OSTA review for impacts to the State highway network and the City will require any significant development to assess traffic impacts as well as site specific maintenance and protection of...
traffic. The level of review would be dependent on the scale and anticipated traffic impacts of the proposed development.

Figure 1
GE-4 As the proposed roadway construction will not limit the parcels’ development (and associated job creation, increased tax revenues, and improved property values for neighbors) from a physical or zoning (i.e. impacts do not create zoning non-conformity) perspective, the negative impacts to the community resulting from the partial acquisition would be minor. Any perceived financial impacts or claims of reduced marketability or increased development costs will be reviewed and negotiated with the State of Connecticut as a part of the standard Rights-of-Way procurement process.

GE-5 (Consideration of Alternatives)

The comment suggests the need to evaluate alternatives (both past and current) that were identified during the current design process. The following summarizes alternative design considerations for the Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue/Bond Street intersection.

No-Build

The current intersection is a substandard, offset intersection with no turn lanes for the Seaview Avenue or Bond Street approaches to the noted intersection. Given deficiencies, the current intersection operates at a minimally acceptable overall level of service (LOS) “D” (See Appendix F of the EA for definitions), with the Seaview Avenue northbound approach operating at a failing LOS F in the AM peak hour. Given the growth of traffic volumes to the design year of 2040 and no improvements to the intersection, the overall intersection will operate at a failing LOS F and all approaches will operate at failing LOS E/F for the design year of 2040. This condition would negatively impact traffic flow and safety in the corridor along with negatively impacting the other goals of the project as described in the Purpose and Need section of the EA. Consequently, the No Build Alternative was determined not to be an acceptable alternate.
Past Alternatives Considered

As explained in the EA, an earlier project (Project 15-288, 2006) evaluated the Seaview Avenue Corridor as part of a larger effort for developing transportation improvements between I-95 and Boston Avenue. In that assessment, various alternatives were reviewed including those listed below.

- **Alternative 1** – Two-lane upgrade to conform to current roadway standards.
- **Alternative 2** – Four-lane widening, maintaining existing Seaview Avenue centerline.
- **Alternative 3** – Four-lane widening, shifting the Seaview Avenue centerline west.
- **Alternative 4** – Three-lane widening, shifting the Seaview Avenue centerline west.
- **Alternative 5** – Combined Seaview Avenue upgrade and construction of two-lane arterial.
- **Alternative 6** – New limited-access arterial west of Seaview Avenue.
- **Alternatives 6a–6d** – Alignment variations focused on the approach to the US Route 1 intersection with Seaview Avenue.

The study eventually resulted in the selection of Alternative 6 as the proposed action given the anticipated detrimental neighborhood impacts of the previous more extensive widening and alignment proposals.

However, as noted in the EA for this project, the Alternatives that were evaluated in the 2006 EA/EIE were not considered to be reasonable alternatives for several reasons. All the Alternatives, except for Alternative 1, were proposed to include a wider roadway corridor and right-of-way (ROW) (between 70 and 100 feet for the proposed road) when compared to the existing 50-foot ROW or would require construction of at least part of the roadway on a new alignment. This would result in extensive property acquisitions and substantial community impacts, historic resource impacts, and additional impacts on wetlands and surface water features for Alternatives 4, 5, and 6. Given these concerns as well as financial constraints, none of the Alternatives were determined to be carried forward and the proposed design was targeted to improve the existing infrastructure to safely handle existing and expected traffic volumes.

Current Alternatives Considered

This current project is proposed to include limited widening and improvements between Barnum Avenue and Boston Avenue where there are ROW restrictions and/or adjacent resources, and more extensive widening where there are potentially less restrictive areas north of Boston Avenue. The current proposal will have a much smaller project footprint, and fewer impacts than the previously studied alternatives.

During the preliminary design process, the City, CTDOT and consultant met on many occasions with GE representatives to review the project, present potential impacts, and evaluate potential alternatives. Given GE’s stated concerns with the proposed intersection alignment, the design consultant prepared two (2) additional alternatives to assess whether there were alternative designs that could minimize impacts to GE property, optimize safety and traffic flow through the intersection and avoid extensive impacts to existing businesses and residences in the intersection area. The following provides a summary of alternatives considered:
Proposed Design

As outlined above, the proposed alignment was designed to optimize safety and sight distances at the Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue/Bond Street intersection, while minimizing impacts to the functionality (and potential acquisitions) of all properties (including the Yankee Muffler Shop—a minority owned business at 1290 Boston Avenue) within the intersection area. The selected alternative incorporates a 90-degree, non-skewed realigned intersection, which is especially important given the new Warren Harding High School under construction on Bond Street (planned to open in Fall of 2018) and the associated school bus traffic that will be utilizing the intersection as a main point of access to the high school.

The proposed alignment provides only minor encroachments along the road frontage of adjacent properties at the northern approach of Seaview Avenue to the intersection, so only nominal impacts to property use or businesses are realized.

Intersection Configuration ‘A’ - Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue/Bond Street Intersection (see Figure 3)

The initial alternative that was prepared and discussed with GE sought to minimize impacts to GE property (1285 Parcel) and shift the new Bond Street roadway (and intersection) to the east, away from GE property. This results in reductions to impacts to the GE property; however, the alternative creates a number of undesirable impacts including:

- The intersection becomes a skewed intersection. In accordance with CTDOT Highway Design Manual, the skew angle, 72 degrees, while generally minimally acceptable for geometry, is not the optimal geometry to maximize safety and sight lines. Skewed intersections increase travel distance across the major roadway (for both vehicles and pedestrians), can adversely affect sight distance and can complicate designs for turning movements, especially trucks and buses. Additionally, where there is expected to be a higher density of older drivers (65 +) (i.e. elderly housing), skewed angle should ideally be no less than 75-degrees.
- The alignment requires a total acquisition of 4 properties (3 multi-family residential buildings and a minority owned commercial muffler shop).
- Given the multi-family residential relocations needed and the current socio and economic demographics of the local population, environmental justice concerns are introduced.
- Additional costs associated with the increased ROW impacts, estimated at approximately $1.45 million (including but not limited to relocation and demolition costs)
Intersection Configuration ‘B’ -- Boston Avenue/Seaview Avenue/Bond Street Intersection (see Figure 4)

The design team presented a modified alternate concept that was a ‘middle ground’ in alignment between the selected alternative and Intersection Configuration ‘A’. This alternative sought to lessen impacts to the GE property while at the same time maintaining limited skew angle and minimizing other property impacts. The expected impacts included:

- Maintains a skewed intersection at 72-degree (same as Intersection Configuration ‘A’), still less than ideal 90-degree for safety and sightlines
- While eliminating impacts to the three (3) multi-family residential buildings outlined in Intersection Configuration ‘A’, the alignment would take approximately half of the existing parking on the Yankee Muffler site (1290 Boston Avenue) thereby negatively impacting the business and/or potentially rendering the site as non-conforming for parking. Assuming there is a need to acquire the entire minority owned business to limit partial acquisition of GE property, this would raise environmental justice concerns as the project lies within an Environmental Justice community.
- The shifting of the intersection to the east would cause additional operational issues, as the existing curb cut for the Yankee Muffler business (on Boston Avenue) would lack appropriate separation from the Seaview Avenue/Boston Avenue corner radius.
- Cost associated with a potential total acquisition of the Yankee Muffler business (if required), estimated at approximately $540,000 (including demolition and miscellaneous costs, such as relocation assistance).

Figure 4

This alternative also continued to negatively impact (though to a lesser degree) the at-grade portions of the GE property with which they (GE) appear most concerned.
Within their commentary, GE submitted a further refinement to the Intersection Configuration ‘B’ concepts (GE Exhibit C, see Figure 5 below) however, many of the concerns with Intersection Configuration ‘B’ remain, namely:

- Creates an even larger skew (66 degrees) for the Bond Street leg of the intersection (see commentary on skew for Intersection Configuration ‘B’). As outlined above, this represents a worsening of potential sightlines, safety and turning movements, as well as longer pedestrian crossings of the major roadway (Boston Avenue). Excessive pedestrian crossing distances increase pedestrian exposure time, increase the potential of vehicle-pedestrian conflict, and add to vehicle delay.

- Given the further shifting of the intersection alignment to the east, not only do the potential operational concerns identified with Intersection Configuration ‘B’ for the Yankee Muffler driveway location (Boston Avenue) increase but with this refinement, the driveway would enter the intersection proper and is no longer at or behind a stop bar (Boston Avenue, eastern approach) which is a safety concern for business users and traffic within the intersection. Given the skew of the intersection and access point to the property on Boston Avenue, it is likely there would be further safety concerns introduced related to visibility of signal heads from the egress at Yankee Muffler.

  It should be noted that the refinement sketch seems to reflect a ‘closing’ of the existing Boston Avenue driveway serving the Yankee Muffler business with new curb ramp and sidewalk area due to the easterly shifting of the roadway but it is presumed this was not the designer’s intent.

- The alignment results in similar impacts to the Yankee Muffler shop outlined above (Intersection Configuration ‘B’), negatively impacting the business and potentially rendering that property non-conforming for parking as well as safety concerns of ingress and egress on Boston Avenue.
In addition to the above noted impacts, the Bond Street approach (see above) reflected in GE’s refined concept, takes the vast majority of the at-grade portion of the GE property near the Boston Avenue/Bond Street intersection, the portion of the property about which GE is most concerned.

In summary, in comparison to the noted deficiencies found in the current alternatives (intersection configuration optimization and overall impacts to adjacent corridor properties within a designated EJ community, including a minority-owned business and multi-family residential properties), the selected alternative has relatively minor corridor wide impacts, optimizes intersection geometry and safety and offers better sight distances.

**GE-6:** The Environmental Assessment, in assessing the potential indirect and cumulative impacts of the project on the community followed the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) procedures. CEQ defines indirect impacts as those that may result from a transportation project later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable. The Seaview Avenue EA evaluated potential indirect and cumulative impact for the corridor as a whole and not any specific individual property. The roadway improvements would improve safety and traffic flow at the new realigned intersection, thereby facilitating increased economic development, creation of additional local jobs, revitalization of the urban environment and aesthetic qualities in the corridor and increased property values.

While the project will require the acquisition of a portion of GE’s 1285 Boston Avenue parcel, it is not possible to determine the ‘reasonably foreseeable’ impact of this acquisition because no
development plan has been filed with the City to date. However, the partial acquisition of the 1285 Boston Avenue parcel will not prevent the property from being redeveloped in the future.

GE-7 It is understood that the acquisition of any of the 1285 Parcel will require the City and/or State to coordinate with GE and regulatory agencies to complete any remaining remediation. The condition of the property upon purchase by the City and/or State will determine which type of remediation will be required (i.e. capping, additional soil removals etc.)

Any required remediation costs pursuant to the site’s status as an “interim status treatment storage and disposal facility” are typically reviewed and negotiated with the State of Connecticut as a part of the standard Rights-of-Way procurement process.

As noted in the comment, the preliminary plans provided did suggest the potential use of a portion of the acquisition (a non-contiguous remnant portion of the property to be taken) as greenspace or a public park. This was further explained at the Public Hearing as potentially requiring additional soils removals and/or capping with hardscape surfaces (urban hardscape park, additional parking). It was outlined that this would be further discussed with City/CTDOT as design progresses.
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MS. BHARDWAJ: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Priti Bhardwaj from the Connecticut Department of Transportation. And I will be serving as the moderator tonight for the public hearing.

Okay. We are meeting with you this evening in order to discuss the environmental assessment and preliminary design for Project Number 15-371, corridor improvements for the Seaview Avenue located in the City of Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Our goal tonight is to provide an overview of the project; review findings from the project’s environmental assessment and hear from you about how the project might impact or benefit your community.

Some of the items that will be covered on tonight’s agenda will be the project overview; findings from the environmental assessment; the rights of way process and your comments.

I’d like to introduce the various individuals who are here this evening and will be presenting: Ms. Lynn Haig, Director of Planning from the City of Bridgeport, to
be followed by Mr. John Eberle and
Mr. Jeff Simmons, both of Stantec Engineering, who will be giving the technical
portion of the presentation; and
Mr. Matt Geanacopoulos from the Department’s Division of Rights of Way who will be
explaining the rights of way process.

This public hearing is being conducted in accordance with the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s policy on public involvement, public hearings for highway layouts and designs and in accordance to the latest version of the public involvement guidance manual.

Documents are available for the public’s inspection and copying at the Connecticut Department of Transportation, Room 2155, 2800 Berlin Turnpike in Newington, Connecticut.

Also at FHWA, Federal Highway Administration, located in the Glastonbury office, at 628 Hebron Avenue, Number 303, Glastonbury, Connecticut, and at each of the following locations: Connecticut State Library, located in Hartford, Connecticut and
the Bridgeport Public Library, the main
branch, and the Old Mill Green branch.

I will now discuss the format for
tonight’s hearing and then I will turn the
podium over to presenters. I will then
moderate the hearing as we listen to your
comments.

During the hearing we are going to
be limiting it to comments and public
statements only, not questions. For anyone
who has any additional questions, we will be
happy to stay and answer them after the
hearing has concluded tonight.

For your information, our
presentation should take approximately 45
minutes to complete. My intent is to conduct
a fair and orderly hearing tonight by
following a particular format. We would
appreciate your patience during my remarks as
well as the presentations to follow by
holding your remarks and comments until this
portion of the hearing of the hearing has
been completed. We will be happy to remain
here this evening until everyone has had a
reasonable opportunity to speak.
Experience has shown that audible recordings can only be made if the person making a statement uses the microphone connected to the recording equipment. The microphones have been set up, and if you wish to make a statement, please come to the microphone after I read your name from the sign-up sheet. Please introduce yourself, and if you are representing an organization, please give its name as well.

If you didn’t sign up to speak, but a question comes to mind, feel free to raise your hand. I will be happy to recognize you after I go through the speaker sign-up sheet.

For those individuals who have a prepared statement, you may read it into the record if you so desire. However, if the statement is lengthy, you are asked to offer a written copy of the statement for the record and give a brief summary of its contents. Such attachments to the record carry as much weight as the transcribed verbal testimony received here tonight when the transcript is reviewed.
If you wish to speak this evening, we have a sign-up sheet at the entrance to the room. There is a three minute time limit on all first time speakers. There will be no yielding of your time to other speakers, your time is for your own comments. If after all the first time speakers have finished, anyone would like the opportunity to speak again, a reasonable amount of additional time will be allotted for this purpose. Anyone who wishes to present written comments for the public hearing record should give them to me before the end of tonight’s hearing.

As a result of information that you might learn at tonight’s hearing, you may wish to make additional comments on the proposed project. Written statements or exhibits may be mailed or delivered to the attention of Ms. Kimberly Lesay, Transportation Assistant Planning Director, Bureau of Policy and Planning, Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, Connecticut 06131.

This information is also in the handout available when you entered the room.
tonight. The deadline for receipt of
comments on this proposal is February 23rd,
2018. Written statements or exhibits must be
postmarked by this date and must be
reproducible in black and white on not larger
than 8 1/2 by 11 inch paper. This information
will be made part of the public hearing
record and will be considered in the same
regard as oral statements.

At this point I will now turn the
podium over to Ms. Lynn Haig, Director of
Planning from the City of Bridgeport. She
will be followed by Mr. John Eberle and
Mr. Jeff Simmons of Stantec, and then
followed by Mr. Matt Geanacopoulos from the
Department.

(Whereupon Ms. Haig came to the
podium.)

MS. HAIG: Good evening. Thank you
all for coming.

There’s a tremendous potential for
redevelopment and renewal sitting along the
Seaview Avenue Corridor. Improving the
transportation infrastructure is one of
several keys necessary to unlock that
potential.

Over the past two decades there have been numerous studies, concept drawings, neighborhood meetings and an environmental assessment. I spoke to a few of you on the way in and yes, you’ve lived through all of them.

Throughout that time the project scope was large, impacting a greater area and requiring a substantial number of property acquisitions. The project being presented this evening is straightforward and much more simple. It is anchored on the north by the new Harding High School and on the south by a proposed Barnum Train Station. It improves vehicular movement along the corridor with the addition of turn lanes at intersections and a reconfigured four-way intersection at Boston and Seaview Avenues.

The project also encourages and facilitates pedestrian movement through landscaping and incorporation of a ten foot wide multi-use trail. That’s professional speak for wide sidewalks that allows bicycles and pedestrians. We are just as concerned
about the people as we are about the vehicles that move along the corridor.

City efforts to unlock the rivers and waterfront, develop a new train station and set up Terra Place, which is the shop tower space down on Barnum Avenue for development cannot be successful on their own. Each of these efforts have bolstered with nearby successes and improvements.

The Seaview Avenue Corridor Project provides the necessary infrastructure improvements to help all of these other efforts become successful and helps to unlock the redevelopment potential of the corridor. There has been strong public support to date for these improvements.

Thank you for being here tonight, and we welcome your input and continued involvement.

Now for John Eberle for the project overview.

(Whereupon John Eberle came to the podium.)

MR. EBERLE: So what I want to do is, I want to kind of review the actual
project with you before we kind of turn it
over to looking at some of the environmental
assessments that we’ve done and kind of point
those out.

Before I go on, really the
important thing that we kind of want to touch
on that are up on the screen is; why are we
even doing this project? What’s the purpose
and need of this project? And for any of
those who have actually looked at the
environmental assessment, you’ll see those
fairly well laid out.

Number 1. Obviously improve the
traffic circulation through the corridor.
That’s one of key project needs for this.

The operation of Boston Avenue
intersection is another critical purpose and
need of this project, not only for vehicles,
but for pedestrians and bicyclists through
the area. And I’ll talk a little bit about
existing conditions versus proposed and where
we think this is going.

Another purpose is provide the
aesthetic and pedestrian safety improvements
to the corridor so that you, and I’ll share
some of our initial work on that. And lastly, provide improved access to the underutilized properties along the way. And a lot of that is on the western side of the corridor that we’re talking about.

So that’s the, that’s essentially what the purpose is. And before I get into the, just to kind of explain where we stand here when I get into some of the preliminary design; we are at preliminary design. So we’re basically at a 30/35 percent design level. Some of you who came out, maybe it’s now nine months ago to kind of, when we shared some of this, we were pretty much at the same stage, but now we have the environmental work behind us as well.

So what I wanted to do is kind of just walk you through the existing conditions for those who are not familiar. I’m sure many of you are familiar with them, but I’ll walk through.

So the project is, as Lynn stated, are essentially Barnum Avenue to the south. And just so that you know; north is to the right, all right? So right is north, left is
south. Some of the other -- Metro North Railroad is below Barnum, to the left of the page. You see the high school up to the right of the page.

So we’re beginning at Barnum Avenue and we’re ending at Stewart Street. So we’re not extending. We’re not doing any work on the railroad and we’re not going further north than Stewart Street for this.

I’ll be talking a bit -- And what you see in the orange is actually the project, Seaview and Bond. What we do to both of these are a little different as far as reconstruction versus new roadway. And I’ll do that in a minute.

So we’re going to start here with the existing conditions. This is obviously Barnum Avenue intersection. It’s an intersection with reported high accidents. It has capacity issues. As some of you know, most of the approaches here are one lane. So there’s no dedicated left turns, so it creates some capacity problems in this area, especially on northbound Seaview entering the intersection. So I’ll just walk us up
through and just take a quick look.

So this is a typical corridor between Barnum and Seaview. We’re looking at a 30 foot wide existing pavement area. Parking is generally on the eastside. There’s no parking on the westside or left side, as it were. One lane in each direction. And this picture doesn’t really do a good job perhaps, but sidewalks are on both sides, but it’s kind of a mishmash of bituminous and concrete. Same with the curbs. You’ve got granite curbs. You’ve got concrete curbs. You’ve got no curbs in areas. So it’s -- And even the pavement is in poor condition. So another reason for going forward with the project.

The other thing you’ll notice in this is that there’s no bike facilities up and down Seaview. So bikes basically travel in the way of traffic and with the traffic. And the other thing that is fairly clear as we kind of walk up is there’s no streetscape amenities on the corridor. Now you might point out a tree here there maybe, but we don’t call that a full streetscape or
amenity.

The other thing you’ll notice, and I’ll talk a little bit about it as we get into the actual design, is the utilities. All the utilities are generally on the west side or the left of the highway.

So again, just kind of walking up the roadway. Here we’re approaching Boston Avenue. You can see the Boston Commons residential units on the left, in the brick, and Yankee Muffler is up there to the right as we approach. So this is actually a kind of a pinch point, kind of, and I’ll share some of that when we’re looking at, looking at the design.

So here we are. This is at the Boston Avenue/Seaview/Bond Street intersection. We’re kind of looking up Bond Street at this point. This intersection, for those who, you know, know the area, is an offset intersection. It’s offset by like 75 feet, which is certainly substandard if you were to have an offset. And I’ll talk about how we’re going to address that.

For those that use the
intersection, it failed in a lot of attributes and capacity, especially northbound on Seaview where there really is just one lane approaching the intersection. There’s no left-turn lanes, there’s no right-turn lanes. So you get a bottleneck. And the Seaview to Bond and Bond to Seaview offset is a very problematic and awkward movement as well. So that’s just another part of the existing condition.

So here we’re kind of looking up and you’ll notice that we changed the weather to winter, just to keep you guys current.

We’re looking up Bond Street now. This begins Section 2. So you’ve got two sections of this. We’ve got Barnum Avenue to Boston Avenue and then Boston Avenue up to Stewart Street.

In this corridor we’re talking, we’re looking at a 32 foot existing roadway section. Again, one lane in each direction. Basically the same conditions apply; poor pavement, sidewalks. There are sidewalks on both sides. But again, the condition of them is not great. And again you’ll note no formal
bike facility to the corridor. So we’re just walking up.

Here you’re actually starting to see the parking on the westside, which is not illegal. But what you find, because of the tight corridor, sometimes you’ll be out there and you’ll have folks actually parking on sidewalks to try to clear out of the, out of the roadway. So just something that we wanted, we want to keep in mind. And then this side really just kind of gives you the obvious, that it’s a heavily trafficked area. There’s a lot of traffic out there today and growing with other developments that could be in the corridor and Barnum Station and what might come.

So that takes us to what are we going to do. So, you know, how are we going to improve this? I just walked through the existing conditions. Again, I want to start off by there’s two sections here. And I’m going to go through these section-by-section. Barnum Avenue to Seaview. Barnum Avenue on Seaview to Boston Avenue is kind of one section. We’re not doing a new roadway
there, and I’ll walk you through what we’re
going to be doing, but we’re not doing a
realignment. It’s basically going to be
reconstruction of the roadway that’s there
and new pavement along with a whole host of
other things.

So just kind of describing the
section, the cross-section of the roadway as
you would see it; if you look on the right,
these are the residences on the eastside of
the roadway. And again, if anyone afterwards
wants to stay behind and we kind of, you
know, look at your property in particular.
But essentially we’re holding the property
line there and doing all these improvements
heading west. So there will be a widening
here, but all of that is to the west.

So as you come out, you’ll have a
five foot sidewalk outside those residences.
The parking lane that exists now will still
exist. We’re not getting rid of that. We’re
not eliminating that. We’ll have a lane in
each direction, one lane in each direction.
What is being added and what the widening
essentially is for, is now we’re looking to
put in a five foot buffer strip, a element
where the utilities actually will go. You’ll
have planters, decorative pavements,
pedestrian scale lighting and things like
that. So that’s going to be that area. And
then, as Lynn kind of already alluded to,
beyond that is a ten foot shared use path,
okay, that will connect, you know, Barnum
Avenue up to eventually the Warren Harding
High School.

So you’ll have completely new
sidewalks, new granite curbs, new pavement.
Everything will be coming out that’s out
there now and there will be new construction
but within the alignment that’s essentially
there.

So I just want to kind of walk,
through, and -- You know you can see this.
But again, definitely take some time to take
a look at the boards that we gave you, if you
want to take a look at what your property is.
And in plan view, I just kind of want walk
up.

So now you’ve seen what I said as
far as the cross section in plan view.
Again, keep in mind the bottom or the eastside of the roadway, we’ll hold the property line and expand to the other side.

So just looking at Barnum Avenue, that’s one of the first changes that you see here. What you see is that we’re including and incorporating left-turn lanes. So that’s going to help the capacity of that intersection. And no doubt, you know, eventually will help with safety as well. And then there will be a new signal there. So that will be a completely redone intersection.

With some of these other intersections, Huron Street, Grant Street, any intersection you see up here, we’ll also be looking at -- They will be all reconstructed so they’ll have, they’ll be completely in line with ADA accessibility through the area. So that will be the other thing that we looked at.

Grant Avenue, that will remain as is. There’s no signal going there. It will remain a four-way stop. So there’s really no change to that, just more of an improvement
as we go along.

Seaview Avenue. And this is really basically the same cross section, you know. Going forward you note, you know, the elements really on the west side of the roadway going up. And then here we start to enter the intersection, the Boston Avenue intersection. And one thing I’ll note here is; if you look at the streetscape elements, the, you know, the rusty planter strip as it were, this is a tight pinch point. So we have Boston Commons, the residential units that we have, Yankee Muffler on the other side. So one of the things we’ll be looking to do here is to kind of eliminate that strip, use that area so that we can get these, the lanes in that we want to get in, and I’ll talk about that in a minute.

The other thing about this intersection, and this is probably a good time to make sure I don’t blind anyone. So just to kind of give everyone -- So here’s Seaview now. This essentially exists as it is. Right now you come into an intersection, you do an offset. This is Bond Street today.
Okay. So that’s that offset. So the plan here is to realign this intersection, make it a 90 degree four-way with a new signal which will help the capacity and safety in this, in this area. One thing that, and I do want to raise it is that; given this alignment there will be an area here that will be the City’s when we’re all done. We have not determined what’s going to happen with that because there are a lot of issues out here as far as environmental compliance. So whether that remains -- Right now it’s bituminous I believe. Whether that remains a parking lot or something else has not been determined at this point. We’ll kind of work with that through the design going forward.

So one thing that you’ll see here that is maybe not a huge deal for folks, but there are sightline issues at this intersection. And basically because of the wall that’s out in front of Boston Commons, one of the things that we’ll be doing as part of this project is to increase or help with the intersection sight distance by doing some relocation of that wall. So that will be a
net benefit as we go forward.

So Boston Avenue intersection, I kind of talked about it and now you’re just looking at it from a different perspective. This kind of gives you a closeup of the new configurations. So what you see there are now new left-turn lanes on Seaview that’s going to help capacity through the area. Certainly Bond Street you have now an exclusive left, an exclusive right and a through lane on the new Bond Street. So that’s certainly going to help the capacity going through here. And then just even -- Even making this a non-offset intersection is going to make it safer and improve capacity.

So now Section 2. And this is where I talk about being two sections. Where the first section was kind of reconstruction with an expanded area for and pathway, this actually will be a new roadway. And you’ll see it better in the slides that I’m about to show, but I wanted you to see, you know, the treatment of what you’re going to see if you walk out your home across, across the way.
So on the right here, these are the residences along Bond Street to the eastside, okay? Again, we’re holding that right-of-way line, that property line, and all the expansion is heading west. So you come out there, you’ll have a five foot sidewalk. What was old Bond Street will actually now be a dedicated parking area dedicated to the residents and the folks along this stretch. So old Bond Street becomes a new parking area. And what you see on the left of this, that’s the new Bond Street. The new Bond Street is actually constructed to the west of the existing Bond Street. And Bond Street here will have a lane in each direction and it will also have a dedicated left-turn lane, which you’ll see in some of the other graphics for the high school and for any development that happens in this immediate, excuse me, in this immediate area.

The other aspect of this section obviously is the planted medians that we’re going to get in there. I think right now we’re looking at an 8 foot median, plus
medians in the Bond Street itself. So there will be a great opportunity to plant and do a really nice job aesthetically out here. Again, all new sidewalks, new curbing. Everything’s, you know, reconstructed to new, new conditions.

And this is the plan. So this is the plan which probably gives you a better sense of what we’re talking about. I know a section can be hard to look at.

So here are the residences along the westside, or the eastside. This is old Bond Street, okay? So what you’re seeing there is that this now all becomes parking dedicated to the residents and whoever belongs there. So you’re actually moving the roadway further away from the residences, which I think, you know, ends up being a good thing.

Then as I indicated, you know, there will be opportunities for planted medians within here. These are left-turn lanes. This one actually feeds the high school there. So there will be improvements that way.
One thing to note, and as we come to the end of the project, you see the high school up to the north of this, or the top I should say. This part ends at Stewart Street. Basically the same thing I just talked about. So you have your roadway, old roadway here that becomes parking and then you’ll have your one lane in each direction, dedicated left, and another thru lane.

The high school, just as information, was actually designed with this roadway in mind, or a roadway coming. So there’s very, there’s just only a little bit of tweaking that has to be done. So we’re not reconstructing Harding High School to get this roadway in. Some forethought was given to make sure there’s room there.

And Stewart Street with be a three-way stop control. So no signal. Basically it will stay as it is. And that’s basically where we touch down.

So I’m just going to kind of quickly go through some slides to kind of check the boxes on what we should be talking about.
Utilities. One of the key things that we’re going to be doing as we get further in design. We really haven’t done a lot of that right now. That’s really the next stage, design.

All storm drainage systems out there will be upgraded. In new areas you will have completely new storm drainage systems up to the current, up to the current code. We’re looking to separate the combined system in Seaview. So that’s going to be part of this, and provide a new stormwater drainage system in there.

Relocate utility poles. So on Bond Street, those utility poles will be shifted far to the west, you know, on the edge of the new roadway. And Seaview, and maybe I mentioned this, but the poles, actually where they are now, if you want to get a, you know, a sense of where this buffer will be, those poles are not actually going to have to move. What we tried to do to design this is that they are within the buffer area. So there may be some utility coordination there. But we’ll get into that fairly soon.
One thing, green infrastructure features. And now this dawns on me. I didn’t talk about one thing on one of the slides, and it is important to this project, and that’s the stormwater quality.

When we’re talking about the buffered landscape and talk about the planters, those planters are going to work two ways. They’re going to be planters aesthetically pleasing, but they’re also going to act as infiltration basins. So they’re going to be able to treat stormwater with those basins and not just dump the water into the, you know, structure out into the wetlands and the Yellow Mill Channel. So that is an important part of this project, is where we have the opportunity, we’re going to take advantage of them.

So that’s basically the utility construction element. And this is typically, you know, the most important slide as far as the general public because they think everyone can, you know, might be able to get behind what the improvements are, but getting there and doing the construction is always a
very, you know, sensitive thing. And we’ve got, you’ve got to understand that.

As we go forward in design, we’ll be developing fairly detailed construction plans, working with the community and seeing what needs to happen. Some of the main points of that plan in talking to you folks really is maintaining property access, business and residential, you know, through the area. We’re in luck for a lot of this because we’re not making huge changes in grade, which are really a problem when you’re trying to keep access.

The other thing that I should mention that facilitates this is; where Seaview is being built, you know, in its footprint now, which presents certain problems, Bond Street is actually offline. So you’re going to be able to build Bond Street for the most part while existing Bond Street maintains and runs as it is. So that’s actually a plus to this project.

We’ll develop a maintenance and a traffic plan that will detail what we’re going to do with the traffic, any short-term
closures or whatnot. We’ll work with that.

The other thing that we recognize is that there’s a, you know, the bus line and the transit. And during construction, not even just construction, but during design, we’re meeting with GBT and coordinating all their stuff with them. So we’ll work with them on what we need to do to make sure that it’s as painless as possible. There’s always pain, but if we can make it as painless as possible, great.

Streetscape materials, just real quickly.

So we haven’t done anything as far as identifying what the materials were or are going to be. So we’ll have lighting, pedestrian scale lighting, decorative pavers. There will be planted medians. There will be new trees. We haven’t gotten there yet, that’s something we’ll work closely with the City and the State as we go forward. Just to kind of let you know that we haven’t forgotten it.

Rights of way. So this is the other thing. Matt will come up and talk more
about the process, but we want to just reflect, you know, what we’re doing.

We indicated that there’s a seven foot widening to the west for some of this, except when you get into the intersection where it’s a little bit more intrusive on the westside.

We’ve identified 11 properties at this point that we think we’ll need some acquisition, whether it’s a sidewalk easement or something like that. So 11 properties. Most of those properties are on the west side. So on the east side, chances are there will be some temporary rights that we’ll have to get because, you know, we’re redoing the sidewalks so there’s going to be some impact here. So we just wanted to, you know, flesh that out. So there’s 11 properties. No total takes at this point. We think we’re fine. We will look at -- There may be additional drainage easements that we might need as we start the drainage design. We’ll go through that, through that process as we get more details.

And finally, just to kind of give
you, and I spoke to some of you out there, just to kind of give you a sense. I know this has been long delayed and Lynn has, you know, talked about the delays here. All things being equal, if we’re moving forward with this and things look good, we’re anticipating a design completion in the winter or spring of 2019. Bidding of the projects, getting a contractor on board in the spring of 2019.

Construction we anticipate would be spring or summer of 2019 into ‘20. The ‘21 that you see up there is probably punch work, like in the spring ‘20/’21. So we anticipate that ‘20 would probably be the main season here for construction.

And then project cost. Overall right now we’ve got it pegged at the PD level at 11.5 million dollars.

So with that, I will sit down and call Jeff up.

(Whereupon Mr. Simmons came to the podium.)

MR. SIMMONS: All right. Good evening everyone.
I’m going to walk through some of the environmental review that was completed. So I guess the first question that many of you may have is why are we doing an environmental review. Well it’s all required by a federal law, National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, which basically is triggered by any federal program. So federal expenditures or funding or a federal permit would typically trigger a NEPA review. There’s a wide array of different types of impacts and impacts to different resources. I’ll get into that in a little bit more detail very soon. And there’s a lot of underlying federal regulations that kind of drive what we’re looking at, what types of impacts and then also what types of significance criteria we might exceed.

For this project we’re looking at an environmental assessment. The Department and Federal Highway decided at the beginning of the process that we really didn’t understand what the impacts were going to be, and so we go through an EA process to look at all the different impacts.
There are different pathways through NEPA, depending on the complexity of the project and whether or not you are expecting to have substantial impacts.

There’s also a separate review process under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act. I won’t talk about that a whole lot other than to say that it was initiated with the issuance of the notice of scoping back in 2015, in April, which we collected comments from folks on. And it will go through a separate review process, and presumably at the end we’ll publish a checklist results of the environmental review in the environmental monitor.

As I said, NEPA has a lot of different types of impacts that we look at. There’s kind of a laundry list here. I won’t go through all of them, but the highlighted ones here I have flags on and I’ll get into a little bit more of the details. But basically it covers anything from the natural environment. So things like wetlands and surface waters through more human environment types of impacts, so, air and noise and
community impacts.

So I’ll just proceed here through and we’ll talk about surface waters and wetlands.

Obviously we’re talking about a pretty urbanized environment. I will say that this dashed box is not the footprint of the project. I just want to make that clear. It’s actually just to orient you so you can see it in the maze of roads that’s here.

The major feature from a water quality perspective is Stillman Pond and Yellow Mill Channel. It’s well away from the project corridor. So we don’t anticipate any direct impacts from the roadway itself. I think what we may have are some minor impacts. Once we get into the drainage design a little bit further, there will be some, probably some outlet structures or some connection that will have to be made, which most likely would discharge into Yellow Mill Channel or somewhere to the west.

I think overall probably the most important message out of is that there will be a real long-term benefit, I think, from
the project because all the green
infrastructure that John talked about
already. And just updating and upgrading the
stormwater system I think is going to
actually lead to an improvement in water
quality.

I should say that for any of the
minor impacts that we might have from a
drainage system will have to go through a
permit process with the State and the Feds.

Flood plains. Kind of the same
story. We have flood plains associated with
Yellow Mill Channel. It’s kind of hard to
see in the slide here, but it’s well outside
of the project footprint. So we don’t
anticipate any impacts. Again, if we have to
as part of the drainage system, it should be
minor impacts, and we would get whatever
appropriate permits we have to, have to get,
including a flood management certificate.

Rare species. Again, we’re talking
about an urbanized environment. So there’s
not a lot of habitat out there. We did
conduct a review of two databases for rare
species. The IPAC database is a US Fish and
Wildlife Service, so it looks that -- Well let me back up for a second.

So rare species, what I’m talking about that I’m talking about federally listed or state listed threatened and endangered species. So the IPAc database gets a federally, what’s in the federal records for documented occurrences of any rare species.

We also looked at the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protect as a natural diversity database. So we looked at that. And this graphic actually highlights, you know, that there really aren’t any resources in the project corridor. The closest I think you have is down here close to the coast. So we don’t expect any impacts to rare species.

Historic resources. The Department went through a pretty lengthy consultation process looking at both archeological and historic properties in the project corridor. There’s no archeological resources. They consulted with the tribes also. And they did discover that there’s an historic district. It’s on the east side of Bond Street, and
it’s highlighted in pink here. It’s the Remington City Historic District.

In any case, we don’t anticipate any impacts on any of the properties that in the historic districts. So there’s no, no impact.

So the conclusion of this process was that they were issued a determination of no adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The Department also conducted a noise analysis, a noise study. They did a number of things. They went out in the field and collected ambient noise measurements, using noise meters at a number of locations along the project corridor. They also did modeling. They used a traffic noise model which is federal highways, approved noise models for noise studies. They modeled existing conditions and they modeled the future build conditions. And the results of the analysis are that there was no increase in noise levels at any of the model sites. So no significant impacts.

Air quality. This region of the
state is actually in a non-attainment zone or area for ozone, which means it’s not meeting current air quality standards for ozone. It’s in an attainment maintenance area for particulate matter. That’s what the PM 2.5 is.

The Department went through a process of doing a conformity analysis and also a qualitative, they qualitative assessment of mobile source air toxics. Essentially at the end of the process they determined that the project is in conformity with the Clean Air Act. So there’s no significant impacts expected.

There’s been, obviously, a lot of industrial activity in the project corridor dating back quite a ways. So we looked at hazardous materials.

The Department went through a process of doing a land use, a land, a corridor land use evaluation. And basically what that does is they look at -- They do a file review, they do a reconnaissance in the field, windshield survey. They look at some of the past history of the properties, who
owned it. And then they assess the risk of contamination on those properties. So they looked at 107 properties in all and came up with 88 properties that are low-risk potential, five medium risk and then 14 at a high risk.

Essentially what they’re recommending is that the next step of the process would be to look at the properties that are medium or high risk where we have some level of disturbance. So what we’ll do is we’ll do some additional studies in those areas, determine what, you know, if there’s contamination issues and then what it is and then we’ll develop procedures to mitigate any impact. So we don’t expect any significant impacts from this.

And as I’ve said before, we may need to get some permits that would be primarily for any drainage system features. That will be determined later as we get into the design of the drainage system a little further. But it could require a state inland/wetlands/watercourses permit, Clean Water Act, a Army Corp 404 permit, a 401
water quality certification. As I mentioned, a flood management certification may be necessary and then a stormwater permit. So that will all be determined as we go through design and refine some of the features.

We looked community impacts. I think overall there’s -- This has a lot, an opportunity to provide a lot of benefits to the community. John talked about more efficient traffic flow, better access to underutilized properties in the project corridor right now, enhanced property values, improved safety, aesthetic enhancements with all the street scaping that’s proposed and then, obviously, the stormwater quality improvements. But with any project, there’s always some, some impacts. I think we expect minor impacts, and probably most of them will be limited to the construction period. So things like intermittent traffic interruptions, noise and air quality impacts, mostly with construction equipment and whatnot.

John talked about property impacts. There’s going to be some easements and
acquisitions. That will have to happen as part of the project.

A lot of the construction period impacts can be mitigated, things like developing and maintenance of a traffic plan so that we don’t have a lot of interruptions of traffic during construction.

Equipment and operational measures. Basically using state-of-the-art or new equipment that has, you know, up-to-date emissions controls for noise and air quality, you know, really focusing the work on certain periods of time when it disrupts activities to adjacent properties. Those are all things that could be, could be done as part of the construction process.

And then fugitive dust control is dust that’s frequently generated by construction projects. But with application of water or other agents, dust control agents, you can usually take care of it.

Pathway barriers is just kind of like a temporary baffle that can be installed around a piece of equipment or something to buffer an adjacent property from noise
impacts, for instance, for construction, a piece of construction equipment.

Environmental justice. So this is something that’s required by a presidential executive order. And so what it requires is that there’s no adverse disproportionately high or adverse impacts on low-income or minority populations. Based on the census data we have that situation here at Seaview.

I think, as I reiterated before, I think generally a lot of the impacts are, the effects are going to be positive for the community, which includes the environmental justice population that live there. So I think their impacts basically will be overall positive. And there may be, again, some minor impacts associated with construction. So the end result is no disproportionally high or adverse impacts are anticipated on environmental justice communities.

Indirect and cumulative impacts. So I guess the first thing is, you know, indirect impacts are essentially impacts that occur. Your project may have an impact, result in an impact somewhere else later in
time or further away in distance that’s foreseeable. Cumulative impacts would be something along the lines you had an impact on your project added to past, present and future, foreseeable future projects.

So there’s -- We went through an eight step process. It’s a process that follows guidelines with CEQ, or the Council on Environmental Quality, as well as the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. And the process is really kind of a qualitative process. But essentially you look through all the various resources in the area and do an inventory of the resources. You look at and identify the potential impacts and assess the consequences and develop mitigation. So you’re looking at the general of the project and its vicinity.

It has -- We expect that there will be some positive and some negative impacts to the community. Overall a lot of the positive impacts would be things like, you know, safety improvements as we talked about, you know, economic development, jobs that go with that. You know the negative impacts would be
more like what I’ve already discussed, you
know, air quality, noise, mostly temporary
types of things.

I should say I know there was a lot
of concern about development on the Lake
Success Business Park, which is to the north.
As John was indicating, this project ends at
Stewart Street. So we don’t anticipate any
impacts on that property from this project.

I think that, you know, any project
that’s proposed for that property would have
to go through its own review process, through
the Feds, the State and the local community.
So it will go through a review process, but
it’s not part of this project.

So I think at the end of this we
came to the conclusion that there’s no
substantial indirect or cumulative impacts as
a result of this project.

So I guess just to summarize; I
won’t read all of these but the column on the
left indicates there’s no impacts anticipated
for many of the resources evaluated, which a
lot rare species and things like that. There
are some minor impacts anticipated, largely
temporary construction oriented, construction period oriented, which I already went through; surface water, wetlands, air, noise, hazardous materials, community impacts, environmental justice and indirect and cumulative impacts.

So at the end of this process I think, as of now, based on the analysis that we have, the next step would be to go to the finding of no significant impact and not to an environmental impact statement. I guess, you know, you folks will be submitting comments. The Department will have to go back and look at those comments and we’ll do any additional studies that, you know, come up that are required. So all of these documents, there’s -- You can look at the handout that was provided. And on there it tells you how you can download the documents from DOT’s website or where it’s located locally here in the community where you can actually review the entire environmental assessment if you want to. There’s a lot more details and there’s some attachments in there which, you know, if you really want to
dive into the details you can do that.

Now I’m going to hand it off to
Matt to talk about rights of way.

(Whereupon Mr. Geanacopoulos came
to the podium.)

MR. GEANACOPOULOS: Good evening
everyone. I am Matt Geanacopoulos from the
Department’s division of rights of way. It’s
our office’s responsibility to acquire the
property rights that are needed for
transportation projects.

As John explained earlier, the
project plans for this project now at least
call for partial impacts to several
properties up and down the corridor. And the
Department will be acquiring those property
rights on behalf of the City. So I’m just
here tonight to give you a brief rundown of
what that means and what our process looks
like.

First things first. All property
rights will be acquired in accordance with
the Connecticut General Statute
Sections 13A-73 and 13A-98E. And whatever
federal money is used in any aspect of a
project, as it anticipates to be the case here, the Department adheres to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property of Acquisitions Policies Act of 1970 as amended.

Once the design progresses to a point where we have a better idea of what the impacts will be, we will begin the right to our acquisition process and that starts with each affected property owner getting a letter of intent to acquire from the Department. And that letter will be accompanied by a property map which will depict the property impacts to that property.

At that point an evaluation will take place where we will establish an offer of just compensation for the property rights to be acquired. That offer will be sent out to the property owner in writing and subsequently an agent from our office will go out and meet with the property owner. They’ll explain the project, the impacts to their particular property and they will explain how the State came up with the offer.

The property owner will have a
reasonable period to consider the State’s offer and a chance to negotiate if they so desire. If an agreement is reached, the State will prepare the necessary paperwork to effect the transfer of property rights. However, if an agreement cannot be reached, the State reserves its right to acquire the necessary rights to its power of eminent domain.

What happens in that case is; the State files a notice of condemnation in the superior court along with a deposit in the amount of the State’s offer. The property owner would have six months from that date to appeal for a reassessment of the damages, essentially more money.

I just want to one thing clear. Whether or now the owner agrees or wants to appeal for more money, that money that would be deposited into the Court in the amount of the original offer would be available to be withdrawn by the property owner at any time. I know sometimes people don’t like the word eminent domain, and it is a tough process, but the property owner would still be
entitled to at least the State’s offer of
just compensation.

That’s just a brief rundown of our
process. I kind of breezed through it. So
I’ll be here to answer any questions if any
affected property owners are here at the
presentation. But for now, I will turn it
over to Priti to open up to comments.

MS. BHARDWAJ: Okay. We will now be
starting the public statement and comments
portion of the hearing. I would like to
emphasize again to please limit your time to
statements or comments only, not questions.
This is a public hearing geared towards the
environmental assessment to the project.
The ground rules, which I discussed earlier,
are available on the screen for your
reference. Please limit your questions and
statements to the allotted three minutes so
that everyone has an ample opportunity to be
heard.

If you still have additional
questions, we will be happy to remain here
tonight to speak with you one-on-one
regarding any other individual questions that
your might have.

Okay. So I will start with the official public speaker list. And I will start with the elected officials list. And we have zero people signed up. So let me just ask; is there anyone in the audience who is an elected official that would like to come up and speak if you didn’t get a chance to sign up?

(No response.)

MS. BHARDWAJ: Okay. There’s no one here who is an elected public official. Then I will start with the speaker sign-up list. And we have all of one person, Stuart Sachs. Please come up to the microphone and state your name and organization please.

(Whereupon Mr. Sachs came to the podium.)

MR. SACHS: Thank you. Is this on?

THE REPORTER: Yes it is.

MR. SACHS: My name is Stuart Sachs. I am a professional landscape architect. I did the original neighborhood revitalization zone plan. And of particular interest was
the roadway alignment that I drew at the time. It’s what has been adopted. I thank the crews.

What’s not particularly mentioned is that in the future, with the roadway realignment, the traffic congestion will make that intersection more ideal for G.E.’s property development because the passing traffic will only have one intersection to negotiate, not two with congestion. And I think that’s important to know, because at the time some of the residents were asking about not wanting to disaffect some of the neighborhood. And I want to stress that point, that the roadway alignment was particular for safety reasons, but also the aesthetic and functional reasons.

Thank you.

MS. BHARDWAJ: Thank you for your comments, sir.

If there are no more people who have signed up for the public speakers list, I’ll open it up to the audience. Is there anyone who would like to come up and make a comment or statement?
(No response.)

MS. BHARDWAJ: I guess we have a very shy audience here tonight. Anybody?  
(No response.)

MS. BHARDWAJ: Okay. All right. If there are no further comments I will now close tonight’s hearing. On behalf of Commissioner James Redeker, I would like to thank you for coming and expressing your views tonight. Please remember that you have until February 23rd, 2018 to submit any written postmarked comments to the Connecticut Department of Transportation. Thank you for coming and have a good evening.

Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 7:12 p.m.)
APPENDIX C

Public Noticing and Availability of the Environmental Assessment

Seaview Avenue Corridor
Bridgeport, Connecticut

State Project No. 15-371

Finding of No Significant Impact
TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Kimberly C. Lesay
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
Bureau of Policy and Planning

DATE: January 24, 2018

SUBJECT: Notice of Availability – Environmental Assessment (EA)
Seaview Avenue Corridor
City of Bridgeport, Connecticut
State Project No. 15-371

The City of Bridgeport, in cooperation with the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes roadway reconstruction, streetscape enhancements, and a new transportation corridor centered on portions of the Seaview Avenue and Bond Street corridors in Bridgeport, Connecticut. An Environmental Assessment was conducted to determine if any significant environmental impacts would result from the proposed action.

Seaview Avenue serves an important local transportation function and is one of the few roadways in Bridgeport connecting I-95 with US Route 1 (Boston Avenue). The existing two-lane roadway is in poor condition and does not safely, efficiently, and adequately accommodate the type and volume of traffic currently using this route. Considering these deficiencies, the purpose of the project is as follows:

- Improve traffic circulation patterns;
- Improve operation of the Boston Avenue intersection for vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians;
- Provide aesthetic and pedestrian safety improvements along the entire corridor; and
- Provide access to underutilized properties while preserving neighborhood integrity

The proposed project includes two distinct sections: 1) Section 1, which begins at Barnum Avenue extending north to Boston Avenue (US Route 1); and 2) Section 2, from the Seaview Avenue-Boston Avenue intersection north to the Bond Street-Stewart Street intersection. The total length of the proposed project corridor is approximately 4,750 feet.
Section 1 – Seaview Avenue from Barnum Avenue to Boston Avenue (Route 1)

Proposed improvements include pavement rehabilitation, replacement and/or upgrade of traffic signal equipment, new sidewalks and curbs, streetscape enhancements, and potential relocation of above ground utilities. The intersection at Boston Avenue (Route 1) will be realigned to accommodate a four-way intersection with Seaview Avenue and relocated Bond Street. Proposed operational improvements in this section include incorporating left turn lanes at Seaview Avenue/Barnum Avenue and Seaview Avenue/Boston Avenue intersections along with new traffic signal equipment at these intersections.

Section 2 – Bond Street from US Route 1 to Stewart Street

Proposed improvements in this section will include the construction of a new three-lane roadway and relocation of Bond Street slightly to the west. Configuration of this road will be one lane in each direction and will include left turning lanes along the corridor to facilitate access to current and future potential development along Bond Street between Boston Avenue and Stewart Street. No additional left turn lanes are proposed at the intersection of Stewart Street and Bond Street; the intersection will remain as an all way stop sign controlled intersection. Proposed work will include streetscape improvements (planted medians, street trees, etc.). The existing Bond Street footprint will be rehabilitated and modified to become a frontage road with additional on-street parking.

The Environmental Assessment, including a project location map, drawings, analyses of potential impacts, project commitments and mitigation, and additional information about the proposed project is available for inspection at:

CTDOT – Room 2155
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06113

FHWA – Glastonbury Office
628 Hebron Ave, No. 303
Glastonbury, CT 06033

Connecticut State Library
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Bridgeport Public Library
Main Branch
925 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604

Bridgeport Public Library
Old Mill Green Branch
1677-81 East Main St.
Bridgeport, CT 06608

The Environmental Assessment is also available online at: www.ct.gov/environmentaldocuments

A public hearing will be held for the project on Thursday, February 8 at 6:00 p.m. in the Hollander Auditorium (4th Floor) at the Yale New Haven Health – Bridgeport Hospital, 267 Grant Street, Bridgeport, CT 06610. In the event of cancellation due to weather, the hearing will be held on Thursday, February 22, 2018.

The project was scoped in the Environmental Monitor on April 7, 2015 under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA); and a post scoping notice will be published to complete the CEPA scoping process.

Please address any written comments, and/or document hardcopy requests to Ms. Kimberly C. Lesay, Transportation Assistant Planning Director, CTDOT, Bureau of Policy and Planning, 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT 06131 or by email at dot.environmentalplanning@ct.gov prior to the close of business on Friday February 23, 2018.
Seaview Avenue Corridor Project Environmental Assessment - Interested Parties Mailing List:

CTDEEP - Land & Water Resources
Mr. Brian Thompson, Director
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106

CT Department of Economic and Community Development
Ms. Catherine Smith, Commissioner
505 Hudson Street
Hartford, CT 06106

CT Department of Public Health
Ms. Patricia Bisacky
410 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06134

Office of Policy and Management
Mr. Daniel Morley
450 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Office of Governor Dannel P. Malloy
State Capitol Building
210 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

CTDEEP - Wildlife Division
Mr. Rick Jacobson, Director
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Mayor Joseph P. Ganim
Government Center
999 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604

USACOE, New England District
Ms. Susan Lee – Project Manager
696 Virginia Road
Concord, MA 01742

USEPA, Region 1
Mr. Nathan Margason
5 Post Office Square Suite 100
Boston, MA 02109

USFWS, New England Office
Mr. David Simmons
70 Commercial Street, Suite 300
Concord, NH 03301

USFWS
Ms. Cindy Corsair
50 Bend Road
Charlestown, RI 02813

CTSHPO
Ms. Catherine Labadia
450 Columbus Boulevard
Hartford, CT 06103

State Senator Marilyn Moore
Legislative Office Building
Room 2000
Hartford, CT 06106

State Senator Ed Gomes
Legislative Office Building
Room 3800
Hartford, CT 06106

Congressman Jim Himes
1227 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

State Representative Christopher Rosario
Legislative Office Building, Room 4115
Hartford, CT 06106

State Representative Andre Baker, Jr.
Legislative Office Building Room 4037
Hartford, CT 06106

State Representative Jack Hennessy
Legislative Office Building 5002
Hartford, CT 06106

State Representative Ezequiel Santiago
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

State Representative Steven Stafstrom
Legislative Office Building Room 2504
Hartford, CT 06106
State Representative Charlie Stallworth
Legislative Office Building Room 5005
Hartford, CT 06106

United States Senator Christopher Murphy
136 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

United States Senator Richard Blumenthal
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
LEGAL NOTICE

The City of Bridgeport and the Connecticut Department of Transportation, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration, will hold a public hearing for the Seaview Avenue Corridor Project in Bridgeport, Connecticut. The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 8, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in the Hollander Auditorium, Yale New Haven Health - Bridgeport Hospital, 4th Floor, 267 Grant Street, Bridgeport, CT 06610.

The Environmental Assessment is available for inspection at:
- Connecticut Department of Transportation - Room 2155 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT 06111
- FHWA - Glastonbury Division Office 628 Hebron Ave., No. 303 Glastonbury, CT 06033
- Bridgeport Public Library - Main Branch 505 Broad Street, Bridgeport, CT 06604
- Bridgeport Public Library - Old Mill Branch 1677-81 East Main Street, Bridgeport, CT 06608
- Connecticut State Library 231 Capitol Avenue Hartford, CT 06106

Written comments may be submitted either at the public hearing or be mailed, delivered, or emailed to ddot.environmentalplanning@ct.gov on or before Friday, February 23, 2018, to the attention of:
- Ms. Kimberly Lesay
- Transportation Assistant Planning Director
- Connecticut Department of Transportation
- 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, Connecticut 06111

The meeting facility is ADA accessible. Language assistance may be requested by contacting the Connecticut Department of Transportation's Office of Communications at (860) 354-2062 at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting. Persons having a hearing and/or speech disability may dial 711 for Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS). Language assistance is provided at no cost to the public, and efforts will be made to respond to timely requests for assistance.

In the event of cancellation due to weather, the hearing will be held on Thursday, February 22, 2018.

02/06/2018 10:31:30 am
SE SOLICITA PROFESIONALES EN SALUD MENTAL

Se solicita profesionales con nivel de maestría en salud mental para trabajar con niños y familias en una clínica en las áreas de Groton/ New London. Posiciones disponibles de trabajo para tiempo completo y medio tiempo con muy buenos sueldos.

Los puestos de tiempo completo ofrecen un generoso paquete de beneficios que incluye quince días de vacaciones, doce días en caso de enfermedad; once días festivos, sesenta y cinco días de ausencia por causas familiares y seguro médico y dental.

Los puestos de medio tiempo ofrecen una gran flexibilidad con el horario y cantidad de horas trabajadas basados en uno mismo (a)

El currículum debe enviarse a:
Human Resources Department
Child and Family Agency
255 Hempstead Street
New London, CT 06320
O envíe un correo electrónico a: trn@childandfamilyagency.org

Accion afirmativa / EOE.

Para obtener más información acerca de la Agencia de Niños y Familias (Child and Family Agency), visite nuestro sitio web en www.childandfamilyagency.org

THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT

Request for Proposals (RFP)
Enterprise Public Housing Authority Management Software System
Solicitation Number: 099-TI-18-5

The Housing Authority of the City of Bridgeport d/b/a Park City Communities (PCC) is proposing for an enterprise public housing authority management software system with General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Fixed Asset, Inventory, Purchasing, Bid Management, Online Requisitioning, Work Order, Inspection, Bid Management, Section 8 and low rent Public Housing Tenant and Property Management, Rent Billing, Applicant Tracking, Development, Grant/Project Accounting and Reporting modules or functionalities. Only vendors with software that meet Housing Authority region requirements will be considered.

Solicitation package will be available on February 9, 2018, @ 10:00 a.m. Although attendance is not mandatory, submitting a bid for the project without attending conference is not in the best interest of the Offeror.

Additional questions should be emailed only to bids@parkcitycommunities.org no later than February 16, 2018 @ 3:00 p.m. Answers to all the questions will be posted on PCC’s Website: www.parkcitycommunities.org.

Proposals shall be mailed or hand delivered by March 2, 2018 @ 3:00 PM, to Ms. Caroline Sanchez, Director of Procurement, 150 Highland Ave, Bridgeport, CT 06604. Late proposals will not be accepted.

City of Bridgeport (Ciudad de Bridgeport) y el Connecticut Department of Transportation, (Departamento de Transporte de Connecticut), en conjunto con el Federal Highway Administration, (La Administración Federal de Carreteras), llevará a cabo una audiencia pública para el proyecto

Seaview Avenue Corridor Project
en Bridgeport, Connecticut

Proyecto del Estado No. 15-371

La audiencia pública se llevará a cabo el:
Jueves, 8 de febrero de 2018
6:00 p.m.
Holftander Auditorium
Yale New Haven Health - Bridgeport Hospital
267 Grant Street, 4to piso
Bridgeport, CT 06610

Los comentarios por escrito se pueden presentar ya sea en la audiencia pública o pueden enviarse por correo o por correo electrónico a dt.enviroplanning@ct.gov antes del viernes, 23 de febrero de 2018 a la atención de:
Ms. Kimberly Lesay
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, Connecticut 06111

El salón de la reunión tiene acceso ADA. Puede solicitar ayuda con el idioma comunicándose con el Connecticut Department of Transportation’s Office of Communications (Oficina de Comunicaciones del Departamento de Transporte de Connecticut) al 860-594-3062. El servicio de asistencia para personas con discapacidades auditivas o del habla puede llamarse al 711 para el Servicio de Retransmisión de Telecomunicaciones (TRS). La asistencia con el lenguaje se proporciona sin costo para el público, y se harán esfuerzos para responder a las solicitudes de asistencia.

En caso de cancelación debido al clima, la audiencia se llevará a cabo el jueves 22 de febrero de 2018.
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