



REPORT OF MEETING

PROJECT NO.: 0053-0199

Date Prepared: 04/08/2024

PROJECT NAME: Rehabilitation of Bridge No. 00417 (Putnam Memorial Bridge)

TOWN/CITY: Wethersfield & Glastonbury

LOCATION OF MEETING: Virtual, Zoom Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: 4/4/2024, 7:00 PM

SUBJECT OF MEETING: Virtual Public Information Meeting (VPIM)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Name	Office	Position
Tracey Brais	CTDOT	Project Manager
Jessica Carvajal	CTDOT	Project Engineer
Gregory Kozma	CTDOT	District Project Manager
Jonathan Luiz	Town of Glastonbury	Town Manager
Dan Pennington	Town of Glastonbury	Town Engineer
Derrick Gregor	Town of Wethersfield	Town Engineer
Ron Sacchi	GM2 Associates, Inc.	Project Manager
Michael Dalickas	GM2 Associates, Inc.	Project Engineer
Al Sylvestre	Public	Attendee
Allen J Friedrich	Public	Attendee
Barnett Black	Public	Attendee
Chris Siwy	Public	Attendee
Dimitris Koutoumbas	Public	Attendee
Ellen Carter	Public	Attendee
Josh Eannotti	Public	Attendee
Kevin Sullivan	Public	Attendee
Margo Gordon	Public	Attendee
Michael Avicolli	Public	Attendee
Noreen Cullen	Public	Attendee
Rick Eldridge	Public	Attendee
Robert O'Connor	Public	Attendee
Sally Patterson	Public	Attendee
Steve Happenny	Public	Attendee
Thomas Perkins	Public	Attendee
Tom Carson	Public	Attendee



TRANSACTIONS AND DETERMINATIONS:

This was a Virtual Public Information Meeting (VPIM) to introduce the proposed project to the public within the Towns of Glastonbury and Wethersfield. Tracey Brais, from CTDOT gave an initial introduction and Ron Sacchi from GM2, Inc., presented the proposed project to the attendees.

What follows is the discussion between the attendees:

1. CTDOT Project manager Tracey Brais gave acknowledgements to Derrick Gregor and Dan Pennington, the Town Engineers of Wethersfield and Glastonbury, respectively, along with Jonathan Luiz, the Town Manager of Glastonbury.
2. Ron Sacchi gave a brief project introduction related to the Purpose and Need for the rehabilitation of the existing bridge along with existing issues with the bridge and repair methods to increase the bridge rating from its present Structural Evaluation rating of 5 (Fair).
3. Tracey Brais finished the presentation with the preliminary Construction dates and planned schedule before addressing the audience to address questions sent into the live meeting session.

Key Points of the presentation were:

- Maps of the project area and project locale of the bridge were presented with aerial views and a conventional map view along with brief descriptions of the navigation channel, where the bridge is located in relation to I-91 and Route 2, and the average daily traffic volume.
- The existing bridge inspection ratings were indicated as a “five” (Fair Condition) for the Superstructure and Deck, and Substructure having an inspection rating of “six” (Satisfactory). Photo examples were presented of deterioration present at the structure as visual representations of these inspection ratings.
- The existing roadway was described as a fourteen-span structure, approximately 2,393 feet long over the Connecticut River, with a 31.9-foot wide curb-to-curb width for two lanes lane in each direction. The bridge main span unit consists of the four spans over the Connecticut River which includes the longest length span (319 feet), while the approach spans are defined as being over land.
- The Purpose and Need statement was presented to address the observed structural deficiencies of Bridge No. 00417 and to provide a structure that provides safe travel to all vehicular traffic, stating the bridge is currently safe to travel on but cannot be left to deteriorate over time.
- The proposed rehabilitation work to the bridge was presented as multiple components requiring (but not limited to):
 - Strengthening repairs to the main girders,
 - Patching and repair of the concrete deck slab including replacement waterproofing membrane, and new overlay,
 - Replacement of all expansion joints, including the main span expansion joints, and
 - Miscellaneous repairs to the steel stringers, and concrete abutments and piers to increase the current bridge condition rating.
- Maintenance of traffic is anticipated to have one lane in each direction operational. It is not anticipated the bridge would require closure during this rehabilitation work.



- Typical Sections and steel strengthening details were presented to indicate the proposed work needed for the increase of the current bridge rating and load capacity. Sections consisted of a typical section, floorbeam typical section, proposed bracing assembly for the approach and Main Spans. These details also indicated the proposed locations of repair and strengthening planned.
- A description and layout of what a detour for weekend traffic would encompass, if ever required, was also presented.
- The anticipated schedule has construction starting in Spring 2026 and complete by Fall 2027.
- The anticipated construction cost dependent on steel beam end painting and full steel structure painting was stated to be anticipated between \$31.4 to \$65.3 million dollars, dependent on collection of older lead-based paint before rehabilitation vs. removal of all existing lead-based paint with new steel paint coating. The project is to be funded with federal and state funds.

Public Question and Answers section:

1. A question from an attendee asking if the presentation is planned to be recorded and watched at a later date. Tracey Brais had stated the presentation from 4/4/2024 was recorded and can be watched from the CTDOT project website and from the Department's YouTube site.
2. A question asking if the rehabilitation project will impact the nearly completed Putnam Bridge Trail. Ron Sacchi responded that the Trail will remain open for the duration of construction, and it is anticipated that there will be minimal impacts with the construction and the Trail. The branch trail on the Glastonbury side will be temporarily/intermittently impacted when working on substructure on Glastonbury side.
3. A question was asked by an attendee asking why the cost of painting the full bridge cost seems higher than they expected. Ron Sacchi responded that that the original paint on the bridge was lead-based paint and will need to be fully contained during the paint removal process prior to the application of the new paint along the bridge superstructure steel components.
4. A question was asked by an attendee regarding clarification of what "off-peak" hours are referring to and if construction work is planned for weekends. Ron Sacchi responded to the question replying off-peak hours are considered non-rush hour traffic times and the construction work could occur during the afternoon, nighttime and weekends but not anticipated to occur during holiday weekends or Town events that the access to the bridge is necessary.
5. A question was asked by an attendee regarding the last time the bridge was refurbished. Ron Sacchi replied that in the mid-2010's, there was a project to address deck patching, construct the previous sidewalk structure, as well as reconstruct the existing bridge parapets with modern style parapets. Tracey Brais added that there are funds available now to address deteriorated elements before they fall into poor condition.
6. A comment was made requesting the Department consider adding a separation fence along the parapet wall between the travel lanes and the trail stating the fencing is needed to protect drivers and trail users. Tracey Brais had acknowledged she had



Report of Meeting:
Virtual Public Information Meeting



received e-mail communications from Mr. Sullivan stating the Department is looking into the fencing and materials to separate the vehicle travel lanes and the trail pedestrian traffic as part of the rehabilitation project presented by GM2.

7. A question was asked by an attendee regarding if federal funding was related to the Federal infrastructure bill that was passed into law. Tracey Brais confirmed that the Federal funds for this rehabilitation project are part of that infrastructure bill, passed by congress recently.
8. A question was asked by an attendee questioning if the barrier between the road and users of the Trail could be raised. Ron Sacchi mentioned barrier height follows AASHTO design requirements and typically would have fencing on top of the barrier. Barriers, he mentioned, have been tested for crash impacts and typically not increased in height. Tracey Brais also added that making the parapets higher will add weight to the bridge.
9. A question was asked by an attendee regarding what would cause the bridge to be closed and if closed would it be closed on both sides. Ron Sacchi mentioned all of the details regarding staging of construction have not been worked out, however it is anticipated that closure of the bridge in either direction is not likely and would only be where the Contractor would not be able to perform rehabilitation work without closing an entire barrel. This would require additional detours to the local Charter Oak bridge if traffic was to be required to be detoured during construction.
10. A question was asked by an attendee regarding any concerns for the surrounding area for lead paint and if testing has been done regarding any paint falling off the bridge. Tracey Brais responded that there is currently lead based paint on the bridge and the removal of the paint would be contained during removal and re-painting. She did mention no additional testing of the surrounding areas were checked for any lead from the falling paint but stated all removal is anticipated to be properly contained and disposed of.
11. A question was asked by an attendee regarding contractors' access to complete lower flange repairs. Ron Sacchi mentioned temporary suspended platforms are intended to be hung under the bridge similar to what was performed under the walkway during those repairs.
12. A question was asked by an attendee that the Charter Oak and Bissell Bridge trail/pathways both have a protective fence for pedestrians and cyclists and why it could not be considered for this bridge rehabilitation. Tracey Brais had mentioned the Department was looking into protective fencing. She did mention that trucks/large vehicles can tip over into barriers and hit/damage fencing in the area however the Department is looking into fencing options that balance safety and costs of potential replacement after crashes.
13. A question was asked by an attendee regarding where the planned staging area of equipment and vehicles are planned to be during construction and to be aware of any impacts to the trail on the Wethersfield side of the bridge structure. Ron Sacchi replied that the staging typically areas under the bridge as was with the previous construction staging for the Trail project. None of the staging areas will affect the function of the new trail.



Report of Meeting:
Virtual Public Information Meeting



14. A question was asked by an attendee whereas the last renovation this bridge had closed the bridge on weekends with little to no weekday work and had asked if that is likely for this rehabilitation project. Ron Sacchi replied that with this project, it is highly unlikely that little or no work will be performed during the week. Mr. Sacchi also mentioned the required repairs are different than the previous rehabilitation work done in the past project requiring closure of the bridge.
15. A question was asked by Mr. Jonathan Luiz, Glastonbury Town Manager regarding if this project includes renovations to the Justin A. DeNino Memorial Bridge on the Wethersfield side of the bridge. Tracey Brais stated that there are no plans to do any work under this rehabilitation project. If there are rehabilitation needs that was asked by Mr. Luiz, to contact the Department to indicate what should be considered and the Department will look into the matter.
16. A question was asked by an attendee regarding if any consideration(s) were made for a noise barrier between the travel lanes and the pedestrian trail and referenced the Tappan Zee bridge as an example. Ron Sacchi and Tracey Brais mentioned that this idea was in early consideration and is something to be looked into. Tracey Brais had mentioned these clear noise wall barriers start ending up to a “foggy” look that makes the barrier walls look dirty over time, however did not state the Department would rule this out.
17. A question was asked from an attendee in regards of dealing with long periods of high water on the CT River and Keeny Cove. Ron Sacchi replied that this may fall outside of the scope of the rehabilitation project but had mentioned that during his daily use of the bridge he did not see any water flood damage for the recent construction for the Trail. Ron Sacchi followed up that the construction equipment and staging areas are to be outside of the 100-year flood limits.

The project was generally well received by the attendees.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. The presentation will be distributed to all attendees, via the project website along with the VPIM presentation recording via the provided web access links
2. Additional comments outside of the presentation are to be addressed and responded to within the 2-week open comment portion of the Project, stated to be received and addressed by April, 18, 2024.

Reviewed By: _____

Tracey Brais, PE, CTDOT