

Meeting Summary | Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3

Date/Time: Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 9:00 a.m.

Location: Riverfront Community Center, Conference Room, 300 Welles Street, Glastonbury

Purpose: Review refined alternatives and new preliminary alternatives for shared use path connections to the future Putnam Bridge walkway. Discuss public meeting preparations.

Attendees: Attendee sign-in sheet attached.

Summary of Meeting Discussion:

1. Dave Head opened the meeting at approximately 9:00 a.m. Advisory Committee (AC) members, CTDOT staff, CHA staff, and public attendees provided introductions.
 2. CHA reviewed the preliminary Glastonbury alternatives presented at AC Meeting No. 2 in April.
 3. CHA presented Alternative 6, a new alternative for the Glastonbury path connection. Alternative 6 follows along the northbound side of Route 3 and is generally a composite of Alternative 2 (path on new embankment) and Alternative 3 (path cut into existing embankment). The objective for this new alternative was to create more separation from Route 3 while still minimizing environmental impacts and not significantly increasing construction cost. In the area of the bridge, the path will diverge from Route 3 and provide the greatest separation from the roadway, approximately 50 feet. Since there is an existing berm at the end of the bridge and the elevation of the roadway and bridge are relatively high, potential floodplain and wetland impacts are reduced. As the path continues towards Naubuc Avenue, the alignment will gradually shift closer to Route 3 with an average separation of 29 feet.
 4. CHA presented a sketch illustrating the path approach to the Route 3 Bridge in Glastonbury. The sketch represents the potential layout in this area, including a rest area with amenities and aesthetic enhancements (such as benches, overlook area, wayfinding/informational signage, lighting, and textured/colored pavement) adjacent to the path.
 5. CHA presented an updated comparison matrix for the Glastonbury alternatives showing an estimated construction cost of \$2.6 million for Alternative 6.
 - It was noted that the estimated construction costs for Alternatives 1 and 5 were revised down from the previous version of the matrix.
 - The revisions reflect changes in assumed retaining wall type (sheet piling instead of segmental block), and assumed unit prices for major items (consistent with CRCOG guidelines for Federal funding program applications) that were applied to all alternatives.
-

6. The following comments and questions (in italics followed by responses or additional discussion, where applicable) were provided in response to the Glastonbury alternatives:

- *Where will the excavation be to mitigate for fill in the 100-year floodplain? There is concern about additional flooding and ponding in the area as a result of this excavation.*
 - Material could be removed from the existing berm at the east end of the bridge. Depending on the quality of this material, there is potential to use it for construction of embankments for the path.
 - It is anticipated that the material will be removed down to an elevation that is above the elevation of the floodplain; consequently, no ponding of water would occur within the excavated area after heavy rain or flood events.
- *Will fencing be provided along the path to deter users from trespassing on adjacent private property?*
 - It is anticipated that either the existing right-of-way fencing will be replaced, or new fencing will be erected between the path and DOT's right-of-way for the purpose of deterring users from trespassing. Additionally, railing will be provided along the south side of the path to protect users from steep side slopes, and protective fencing will be provided along the north side between the roadway and the path.
- *Will the path still be usable when the bridge is fully replaced in approximately 25 years?*
 - Yes, it is anticipated that the path will still be usable when the bridge is replaced. Proposed retaining walls can be designed for a 50-year life. Proposed bituminous pavement surface would need to be repaired and replaced periodically over the same time frame.
- *What would the lighting relocation noted on the comparison matrix entail for Alternative 6?*
 - For a relatively short distance on the bridge approach, the path would be separated from the roadway by a concrete barrier adjacent to the existing shoulder. The location of the barrier would impact the existing lights, requiring relocation. It is anticipated that new lights could be mounted on top of the concrete barrier.
- *What type of structure crosses Keeney Cove and what type of modifications to the structure are required to accommodate a path crossing here?*
 - The existing structure is a double box culvert. It is anticipated that relatively minor modifications will be required to accommodate the path on the existing structure.
- *There was some concern expressed about the location of the potential shared use path connection to the proposed Goodwin College trail network as shown on the map due to its proximity to private property.*
 - It was noted that the potential connection is shown because the connection would be desirable to help achieve regional interconnectivity between trail/path networks. The feasibility of a connection in terms of potential property impacts, environmental impacts, and actual location would be evaluated under a separate study.

- The need to not restrict existing farm access in this area was noted as an important property owner concern.
 - *There was general agreement among the AC members that Alternative 6 represented a reasonable compromise between providing greater separation from the roadway and limiting potential floodplain and wetland impacts.*
 - *There was also general consensus that Alternative 6 should be advanced in the study and presented as the favorable/preferred Glastonbury alternative at the public meeting.*
 - It was noted that the other alternatives and the process for selecting Alternative 6 should be presented at the public meeting.
7. CHA presented recommended sidewalk improvements and parking accommodations on Naubuc Avenue in Glastonbury.
- A new parking lot with approximately 10 spaces is proposed on DOT's right-of-way on the east side of Naubuc Avenue across from the shared use path terminus. The access drive would align opposite the driveway for Venora's Salon.
 - The recommended sidewalk improvements include sidewalk on both sides of Naubuc Avenue and would provide full connectivity between the path terminus, new parking, and existing sidewalks on Naubuc Avenue, Putnam Boulevard, and Glastonbury Boulevard.
 - It was noted that not all of the recommended sidewalk improvements would have to be built concurrently with the path and could be implemented in phases over time. It was also noted that, at a minimum, a complete sidewalk connection should be provided between the path terminus, new parking, and sidewalks on Glastonbury Boulevard and Putnam Boulevard on at least one side of Naubuc Avenue concurrently with the path construction.
8. CHA presented a sketch illustrating the path terminus at Naubuc Avenue in Glastonbury. The sketch represents the potential layout in this area, including proposed parking lot location, sidewalks, midblock crosswalk, and trailhead area with amenities and aesthetic enhancements (such as a bench, wayfinding/informational signage, and landscaping). Proposed bollards to prevent motorized vehicle access to the path are also shown in the sketch.
9. The following comments and questions (in italics followed by responses or additional discussion, where applicable) were provided in response to the recommended sidewalk and parking improvements on Naubuc Avenue:
- *Are the sidewalk and parking costs included in the cost estimate for Alternative 6?*
 - Yes, the estimated construction costs shown in the comparison matrix for all six Glastonbury alternatives include costs for the new parking and recommended minimum sidewalk improvements (sidewalk on the east side of Naubuc Avenue between Glastonbury Boulevard and Putnam Boulevard and sidewalk on the west side between the path and existing sidewalk to the south).

- *Installation of “Share the Road” warning signs was suggested on the Naubuc Avenue approaches to the path.*
 - *Can the shared use path be carried over Naubuc Avenue and loop down to the east side of the roadway, eliminating the need for a midblock crossing?*
 - This notion was considered early in the study and it was determined that modifications to the existing Route 3 bridge or a new pedestrian bridge would be required to accommodate the crossing and that this requirement would generally be cost-prohibitive for the project.
 - When the existing bridge is rehabilitated or replaced in the future, accommodations for a shared use path crossing over Naubuc Avenue should be considered as part of that project.
 - *It was noted that there are existing midblock crossings in the Town of Glastonbury. Is the proposed midblock crossing too close to the existing signal and pedestrian crossings at Glastonbury Boulevard? Also, was the potential traffic generation associated with the path and proposed new parking estimated and considered in the preliminary layout of the access drive and crossing location?*
 - The signalized intersection is located approximately 740 feet from the proposed midblock crossing. Most pedestrians will most likely not walk this distance to cross the street, especially if parking is provided directly across from the path terminus.
 - The signal at Glastonbury Boulevard creates platoons of vehicles along Naubuc Avenue which in turn will provide gaps for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross at the midblock crossing. Sight lines would also be sufficient at the crossing.
 - Potential traffic generation was not estimated. It is anticipated that new vehicle trips associated with parking for the path would generally be negligible relative to existing traffic volumes on Naubuc Avenue (which has average daily traffic of 8100 vehicles, per CTDOT’s 2009 counts).
 - The location of the midblock crossing and sidewalk ramp as shown in the sketch was based on anticipated bicyclist movements directly between the path and roadway. This location could be adjusted during design if an alternative location (such as adjacent to the access drive/Venora’s Salon driveway intersection) is determined to be more desirable relative to path operations and access.
10. CHA reviewed the preliminary Wethersfield alternatives presented at AC Meeting No. 2 in April.
11. CHA presented Alternative 3 (Modified), a new alternative for the Wethersfield path connection from the walkway to the proposed terminus at the intersection of Great Meadow Road and the I-91 Exit 25 off ramp. This alternative generally maintains the proposed alignment and grades of Alternative 3 (with minor modifications near the terminus), but utilizes a retaining wall along a section of the path to reduce the limits of the embankment and eliminate potential wetland impacts in this area.

12. CHA presented a sketch illustrating the path terminus at Great Meadow Road. The sketch represents the potential layout of this area including pedestrian crossing enhancements, intersection improvements, and trailhead area with amenities and aesthetic enhancements (such as a bench, wayfinding/informational signage, and landscaping).
13. CHA presented an updated comparison matrix for the Wethersfield alternatives showing an estimated construction cost of \$600,000 for Alternative 3 (Modified). Alternative 3 (Modified) replaced the original Alternative 3 in this matrix.
14. The following comments and questions (in italics followed by responses or additional discussion, where applicable) were provided in response to the Wethersfield alternatives:
 - *It was noted that CTDEEP's preference, as expressed at a May 3, 2013 project coordination meeting with CTDOT, is for any new parking improvements to be located on the east side of Great Meadow Road as close as practicable to the existing Route 3 bridge.*
 - *Does the \$600,000 estimated construction cost include parking improvements?*
 - No, parking is not currently reflected in any of the Wethersfield estimates because it has been assumed that the need for parking improvements would be determined subsequent to the construction of the path and would therefore be provided as a separate improvement project.
 - Wethersfield representatives expressed a desire to have the estimated cost for parking included as part of this project.
 - CHA will estimate the construction cost for the potential parking improvements and include this cost in the overall construction costs for all of the alternatives shown in the matrix.
 - *Would the bollards shown at the path terminus be removable and who would be able to remove them?*
 - Yes, the bollards would be removable by unlocking with a key. The town, emergency services, and CTDOT maintenance personnel would have keys for the bollards.
 - *There was general consensus that Alternative 3 (Modified) should be advanced in the study and presented as the favorable/preferred Wethersfield alternative at the public meeting.*
15. It was noted that the towns should start investigating potential funding opportunities as soon as the feasibility study is complete. It was also noted that, if possible, the towns should move forward concurrently with the design and construction of their respective connections such that these connections will be completed at the same time and will provide a fully functional and continuous facility.
16. Potential funding sources, both traditional and innovative, will be discussed during as part of the public meeting presentation.

17. CHA presented preliminary details of the public information meeting scheduled for Tuesday, June 18, 2013. There will be an open house session at 6:30 p.m., followed by a formal presentation at 7:00 p.m. and a question and answer session. Public notification will include:
 - A meeting flyer to be sent to the AC in the coming days with a request for assistance in distributing the flyer.
 - A letter mailed to property owners/residents on Naubuc Avenue in the study area. Wethersfield representatives indicated that a similar notification was not necessary in Wethersfield.
 - Display ads in the *Glastonbury Citizen*, *Reminder News*, and *Rare Reminder* (two runs each), and *Hartford Courant* (one run). AC members did not identify any other publications for additional advertising.

18. The meeting concluded at approximately 11:00 a.m.

