

**Connecticut Department of Transportation**

**Town of Glastonbury  
State Project No. 0053-0196  
Route 2 Eastbound Lane Modifications  
Between Exits 6 and 8  
Wednesday, September 13, 2023**

**Minutes of Virtual Public Informational Meeting**

**Present:**

Alvaro Garcia Jr. – Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT)  
Susan Morneault – CTDOT  
Stephanie Maurer - CTDOT  
Ricky Mears – Benesch  
Ryan Allard - Benesch  
Mark F. Levesque – Close, Jensen and Miller, P.C. (CJM)  
Jeffrey J. Fontaine – CJM

**Attendees**

Approximately 34 Total - (29) via Zoom, (5) via YouTube

**Presentation:** A virtual presentation for the project was held through Zoom, live-streamed on YouTube and was delivered by Mr. Ricky Mears from Benesch, with opening remarks by Ms. Stephanie Maurer from CTDOT. The question and answer portion of the meeting was led by Mr. Mark Levesque of CJM, with Mr. Ricky Mears and Mr. Ryan Allard from Benesch answering questions posted by the attendees.

The following items were discussed during the presentation:

- The purpose of the project is to improve the lane configuration along Route 2 Eastbound between Exits 6 and 8 to reduce the weaving movement of traffic in the leftmost lane of Route 2 and maintain the continuity of traffic flow.
- The left, exit-only lane for Route 17 (Exit 7) will be converted to a through lane, with Exit 7 being modified to a standard left exit ramp.
- Bridges 00384 and 00386 are located within the area of the project and will be modified as follows. At Bridge 00384, Route 2 over Griswold Street, widening of the bridge to the west is proposed to remove the visual pinch point for vehicles entering from Route 3 by creating a uniform right shoulder width. Bridge 00386, Route 2 over House Street, is proposed to be widened to provide a 3-lane cross section for Route 2 Eastbound traffic by shifting the median parapet.
- Signal-controlled alternating one-way traffic operations would be implemented along Griswold Avenue and House Street, below each of the bridges during construction.
- Construction will be performed in 2 Stages along Route 2 Eastbound. Stages 1 and 2 would maintain a minimum of 2 lanes at all times, with the exception of shortened durations during Stage 1 where traffic will be temporarily down to one lane.

- Route 2 Eastbound would be milled and paved within the project limits, and drainage structures within the limits replaced; which will be performed during off-peak temporary lane closures.
- Aerial facilities are attached to the bottom flanges at both Bridge No. 00384 and 00386 and will require relocation prior to construction.
- The estimated construction cost is approximately \$12,000,000 (80/20 Fed/State).
- Construction is currently scheduled to occur from Spring 2025 to Fall 2026.

### Public Comments and Questions:

Question:

Impact on Salmon Brook Trail?

*At this point in design, there are no impacts anticipated to the nearby trail or parking lot. While the traffic maintenance plan at Bridge No. 00386 (near the parking lot for the trail) is still under development, access to the trail and parking lot will be maintained during construction.*

Question:

Under bridge 00386, can area available for bicycle and pedestrian travel on House St. be increased, improved?

*The addition of a bicycle lane or any improvements to widen House Street would result in Bridge No. 00386 being widened (distance between abutments), which would ultimately require the bridge to be replaced. Based on the existing conditions, the bridge appears to be in satisfactory condition, not warranting replacement at this time. Since there appears to be a lengthy service life remaining for the bridge, full bridge replacement was not considered for this project.*

*Regarding pedestrians, it is noted that the sidewalk along the west side of the roadway ends at the bridge; however, there are crosswalks available within the vicinity to allow pedestrians to access the sidewalk along the east side of the roadway. Discussions with the Town and CTDOT will be on-going to determine if any improvements to the pedestrian traffic warrant further consideration and incorporation into the project.*

Question:

Will there be additional changes coming regarding the left exit off of route 17 onto New London Tpke?

*There is a separate project with the CTDOT and Town of Glastonbury planning to install a roundabout and eliminate a bridge, which is likely in preliminary design at this time.*

Question:

Are you guys addressing the lead paint on these bridges – the paint is peeling everywhere.

*Both bridges were fully painted in 2006. There was a recent phenomenon that occurred throughout the State due to extreme temperature fluctuations that caused the paint to start peeling. While this project had originally proposed touch-up painting to isolated areas of the steel, discussions had begun prior to the meeting on adding a full protective coating, such as paint, to the steel on this project to address the recent paint peeling phenomenon.*

Throughout the meeting several similar questions and comments were made pertaining to the traffic behavior along Route 2. These questions are grouped together as listed below with the general response to these questions summarized as follows:

Questions:

- Rt2 left exit for 17 still means people have to cross all lanes of traffic from Rt3 to 17. This will not help the weaving much. Why not make Rt. 2 stay to the left following the Rt 17 pathway and have 17 be a right exit, incorporating the Hebron Ave. exit?
- With this modification does it do anything to improve all the traffic trying to cross from route 3 to route 17? From my experience they are generally moving far slower since there is such a small amount of space to cross the entire highway to exit, which is probably worse than the people trying to move out of the exit only lane.
- If I'm coming over the Putnam bridge from Wethersfield, and if I take Route 2 East towards Norwich, I will be in the rightmost lane. If I then want to take the Route 17 left exit, I need to quickly move one lane to the left, and then another lane to the left. This is not safe. Isn't this dangerous traffic pattern going to be addressed?
- Won't the zig zagging across lanes continue after construction?
- What are the anticipated impacts on route 3 to route 17 crossing traffic?
- Was there any consideration of a complete revamp, by moving the exit for RT 17 ramp to the right side to avoid the need for RT 3 traffic to cross across the highway?

*Early in the planning process of the project, CTDOT reviewed several options for addressing site issues with consideration including but not limited to site feasibility, cost, and safety. Consideration had been given to relocating Exit 7 as a right exit; however, the grading to reconnect the Exit to Route 17 would be very challenging without requiring significant impacts to the surrounding area, including modifications to the Hebron Ave. bridge, increased cost, and potential resultant traffic impacts to Hebron Ave.*

*With the dedicated left lane proposed, the traffic within the leftmost lane of Route 2 EB will not be required to shift to the center lane to remain on Route 2. Traffic merging from the right lane would therefore no longer be competing with the leftmost lane when merging into the center lane, alleviating some of the driver friction that the existing conditions pose.*

*The purpose of this project is to improve the continuity of Route 2 traffic within the project area, essentially allowing both lanes of Route 2 thru traffic the ability to stay on Route 2 without the need to change lanes. While the scope of this project is focused on maintaining traffic continuity on Route 2, other considerations will be given and reviewed to see what improvements can be made within the scope of this project to alleviate the Route 3 to Route 17 weaving behavior, such as the potential installation of a traffic sign restricting the crossing movement.*

Based on the conversations regarding the behavior of Route 3 traffic crossing to Route 17, several follow-up comments and questions were made regarding potential methods for addressing this condition and how said methods would impact the area. These questions/comments are grouped as listed below with the general response as follows:

Questions/Comments:

- Will we still have the ability to cross over Route 2 to 17 South from Route 3 East?
- Could there be a jersey barrier installed to prohibit the crossover from RT 3 to RT 17?
- Prohibiting route 3 to route 17 is not reasonable. What other options do you have?
- If you can't make Rt. 17 a right exit, how does all that Rt 17 traffic be absorbed on the Hebron Ave exit and its impact on local roads. 20,000 people live south of Hebron Ave, which will overload local Glastonbury roads?
- If you live off of Route 17, the weaving is necessary. Otherwise how are we supposed to get off for South Glastonbury by Buttonball?
- I don't think a sign is going to prohibit people from crossing.
- If I'm coming from Wethersfield and you put up a sign saying I can't scoot over to Route 17, then how am I supposed to get onto Route 17 unless I ignore the sign?
- If you still want people to crossover to RT 17, why install a sign?
- How about opening exit ramp on 2W Maple St and people get off, take a left and enter 2E on Maple St.? Not ideal, but workable.
- What about a flyover of Route 3 onto Rte 17?
- A previous attendee is correct when siting the impact on the Glastonbury roadways should movement from Rt 3 to Rt 17 be prohibited. Do you have information on how many accidents are there annually involving cars moving from Rt 3 to Rt 17?
- Is this project absolutely a done deal, or can it be expanded to accommodate the suggestions to revamp the intersection? Doing it correctly would make more sense than doing a small project that did not work in 10-15 years.

- 20 years of driving in that area, never had a problem in either direction. You are fixing a non-problem.
- Do you, by moving a very high volume of traffic onto local Glastonbury roadways, now create new accidents within Glastonbury by increasing traffic on those roadways? It would seem that the reduction of 17 accidents per year would likely be close to a wash when compared to the potential new accidents. Adding congestion also is problematic for Glastonbury.
- If you can't let me get off on Rt. 17, can you do something to let me get off on Neipsic Rd?
- Glastonbury's small side roads do not have the infrastructure to offload the Rte 17 traffic to Hebron Ave. or New London Turnpike. It is already bumper to bumper traffic traveling Main Street, Hebron Avenue and New London Turnpike. This will be very frustrating.
- Any thought to direct Rt. 3 to Rt. 17 traffic to get off at Hebron, then turn left to get to Rt. 17?

*The scope of this project is to work within the parameters of the existing highway with minimal modifications to address the through movement of Route 2 Eastbound while avoiding large scale impacts to the public and surrounding area. The DOT will consider many of the options posed as part of the Virtual Public Information Meeting Question & Answer process. There are many considerations that need to be addressed before any potential design recommendation can be incorporated into the project, and the DOT and design group would need to review the feasibility of each option as well as potential benefits vs. consequences each would pose.*

*For example, installation of a barrier would eliminate the weaving from Route 3. However, further widening of Bridge No. 00384 and Route 2 may be required to accommodate the barrier width, increasing the cost of the project, while potentially introducing new or additional impacts to the surrounding area. A barrier would also remove an important traffic connection, requiring vehicles to seek alternate routes. Traffic analyses would likely be needed to ensure such alternate routes have adequate capacity for any increased traffic and safety along these routes would not be compromised.*

*One of the primary reasons for the project, and criteria reviewed when determining how a project should be implemented, is the improvement of safety. In response to a question, it was clarified that over a 3-year duration (2017-2019), approximately 50 accidents occurred predominantly within the center/left lanes in the project area.*

*While discussions regarding signing, barriers, flyovers, or other potential traffic considerations mentioned during this meeting were held in response to questions or suggestions, final decisions regarding their implementation were not made, further investigation would be required for all options deemed practical and feasible. The project is currently in preliminary design; the purpose of holding the public meeting prior to entering final design is so that consideration can be given to the feedback received by the public and any necessary adjustments can be incorporated early in the design phase.*

The following questions/comments were received during the 2 week period following the presentation:

Question:

Thank you for your time and the presentation. Still doesn't address the frustration to cross 3 lanes to get to rt 17 exit. This whole artery is scary to drive when the objective is to cross the highway. Just a thought, how about a separate flyover exit from Putnam bridge between 2W and 2E exits that goes directly to Rt 17 on the left side of 2 E?

*This question is consistent with those received during the meeting regarding the traffic movement of Route 3 vehicles accessing Route 17. Please refer to the general response above given to the group of questions/comments.*

**Adjournment:** The project was received by those who attended the meeting. The live event virtual presentation was closed at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Department held discussions to address the concerns presented by the public. The information below has been shared with the Glastonbury town officials via email (enclosed).

The feedback received during this meeting suggested some lingering concern regarding the traffic movements of the Route 3 eastbound travelers transitioning to the Route 17 left exit.

In response to these concerns the Division of Bridges has coordinated with the Project Development Unit (PDU) to make them aware of this public comment. The PDU indicated that any future investigation of this Route 2 corridor would consider the possibility of changing the lane configuration of Exit 7 to Route 17 from a left lane exit to a right lane exit. The Department will be proceeding with the current scope of this project as presented; the proposed changes will develop the area for any future elimination of the left lane exit more smoothly. The current project will more immediately alleviate the safety concerns by reducing the current number of traffic movements in the area. Any future investigation of the Route 2 corridor will incorporate the updated traffic pattern, as a result of this project, when reevaluating the traffic movements and safety in the area.

**From:** Garcia Jr., Alvaro  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 10:12 AM  
**To:** Jonathan Luiz  
**Cc:** Daniel Pennington; Maurer, Stephanie G.; Morneault, Susan L; Mark Levesque; Jeff Fontaine; Lessard, Derick M.  
**Subject:** Project No. 0053-0196 - Route 2 Lane Modifications Exit 6 to Exit 8 - Glastonbury

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Good Morning Mr. Luiz,

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) conducted a virtual public information meeting for the subject project on September 13, 2023.

The purpose of the project is to improve lane continuity on Route 2 EB in Glastonbury. The Route 17 left exit only lane will be converted to a standard left exit lane; the left lane will become a through lane for Route 2 traffic. Two bridges within the project limits will be widened to accommodate consistent shoulder widths and roadway geometry. I encourage you to watch the VPIIM linked here ([\(1\) State Project No. 53-196 Route 2 Eastbound Lane Modifications in Glastonbury - YouTube](#)) to gain a better understanding of the project.

The feedback received from the public during this meeting suggested some lingering concern regarding the traffic movements of the Route 3 EB travelers transitioning to the Route 17 left exit (Exit 7). In response to these concerns the Division of Bridges has coordinated with the Project Development Unit (PDU) to make them aware of this public comment. The PDU indicated that any future investigation of this Route 2 corridor would consider the possibility of changing the lane configuration of Exit 7 to Route 17 from a left lane exit to a right lane exit. The Department will be proceeding with the current scope of this project as presented; the proposed changes will develop the area for any future elimination of the left lane exit more smoothly. The current project will more immediately alleviate the safety concerns by reducing the current number of traffic movements in the area. Any future investigation of the Route 2 corridor will incorporate the updated traffic pattern, as a result of this project, when reevaluating the traffic movements and safety in the area.

Thanks,  
Al

**Alvaro Garcia Jr., P.E.**  
Transportation Supervising Engineer  
Consultant Bridge Design – CLE Program