

**CT Department of Transportation
State Project No. 0171-0523
Installation & Revision of Traffic Control Signals in District 1
Virtual Public Informational Meeting
July 15, 2026 6:00 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Event**

Report of Meeting

In Attendance: There were 7 attendees in the Zoom webinar, six (6) of whom were panelists. The following individuals were identified:

Panelists:

Name	Organization	Email
Kaethe Podgorski	CTDOT	Kaethe.Podgorski@ct.gov
Roel Roldan	CTDOT	Roel.Roldan@ct.gov
Leonardo Gamez	CTDOT	Leonardo.Gamez@ct.gov
Malcolm Thomas	CTDOT	Malcolm.Thomas@ct.gov
Lisa Conroy	CTDOT	Lisa.Conroy@ct.gov
Ferdinand Orlie	CTDOT	Ferdinand.Orlie@ct.gov

Audience:

Name	Organization	Email
Chris D'Antonio	Planning & Zoning Commission, Enfield	N/A

Presentation: The meeting went live at 6:00 p.m. with an informative introduction slide for attendees to view before the event began. The official start of the meeting was at 6:05 p.m. with an introduction from Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) Project Manager, Kaethe Podgorski, who also covered the process for how attendees could interact with the project team, provided a meeting outline, summarized the Title VI information, and introduced the project team before giving an overview of CTDOT's "District Various" traffic signal projects.

The meeting was then turned over to Leonardo Gamez, who gave an overview of the signal equipment that will be used and pedestrian upgrades that should be anticipated at project intersections, then discussed specific plans for upgrades at each of the full and partial replacement locations.

After all locations were discussed, Kaethe shared previous, ongoing, and future coordination efforts under the project. Malcolm Thomas, CTDOT Assistant Rights of Way Coordinator then provided a brief overview of the acquisition process of property rights where needed. Kaethe then shared the cost, schedule, and next steps for the project. The team gave an approximately 50-minute PowerPoint presentation followed by a Question-and-Answer session assisted by Ferdinand Orlie, a Transportation Engineer with CTDOT.

The presentation covered the following items:

- The purpose of the project was presented: to replace aging signal infrastructure with new signal equipment to achieve a state of good repair.

- An overview of “District Various” signal replacement projects was provided.
- Signal components (mast arms, signal heads, pedestrian accommodations, detection, controllers, pre-emption, and communication) were summarized for general information purposes.
- The concept plans for each signal replacement location were reviewed in detail.
- Rights of Way processes were reviewed.
- An overview of project coordination efforts was provided.
- The estimated construction cost was provided: approximately \$13.3 million with 100% State funds.
- The project schedule was summarized.
- Pending next steps were summarized.
- Information on how to contact the design staff with questions/comments was provided.
- A Question and Answer session was held.

Question-and-Answer:

During the Q&A session that followed the presentation, one question and comment was submitted by the audience using the Zoom Q&A function. No questions and comments were submitted via email or voicemail during the meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting ended at 7:02 pm when no more questions came in. Attendees were reminded to fill out the survey and that the comment period would be open until July 29, 2026, should anyone wish to submit further comments or questions to the project email or phone number.

The email and voicemail were monitored throughout the two-week comment period. All questions and comments received before, during, and after the meeting up until the end of the comment period are listed below with the following responses.

Questions and Comments before the Virtual Public Interest Meeting:

Comment:	Hi there, I'm glad to see that pedestrian infrastructure is included alongside traffic signals in this project and I'd like to add comment around this... it should go without saying that the pedestrian signals and crosswalks included in this project are merely supporting actors to the base pedestrian infrastructure of sidewalks, or to be precise, the sidewalk network. I specify "network" because the interconnectedness of sidewalks is crucial to their public value, but it's lacking in key areas. Of relevance to this project is the Route 5 in Enfield corridor, which is having signals updated across most of its length in town. I understand that this project is not addressing sidewalks except for extensions and curb cuts, but because it's directly impacting pedestrian infrastructure, I want to make it known that the east side of Route 5 in Enfield (at least from the MA state line to Oliver Rd, the densest part of town) is sorely lacking in sidewalks and that is something that must be addressed. To constitute a proper network, sidewalks must be on both sides of Route 5 here in Enfield.
-----------------	---

	There are numerous neighborhoods, residences, businesses on the east side of Rt 5 and practically no sidewalks the entire length of the east side, which forces pedestrians and cyclists often onto the roadway itself, creating a major risk for themselves, road cyclists who share very limited shoulder space (bike lanes would be a boon as well, but a different story), and of course, it creates a major hazard for drivers. I live on one of the roads impacted by the project (15. 048-235 Enfield U.S. Route 5 (Enfield St) at Montano Rd and Dunkin Donuts Driveway) and regularly drive and cycle Route 5, especially that vicinity, and I can assure you that pedestrians do commonly walk and cycle on the sidewalk-less east side of Route 5, both on the roadway and immediately adjacent. As a cyclist legally riding northbound on the east edge of the road, I've had to dangerously swerve into the higher-speed-than-should-be traffic lane to avoid both pedestrians and inexperienced wrong-way cyclists on numerous occasions. Again, I know this isn't the direct scope of the project, but this project is almost certainly building or updating pedestrian infrastructure on both sides of the road, and it must be pointed out that this is leaving important value at the table due to the lack of sidewalks on the east side. (And also the quality of the sidewalks on the west side is very degraded at parts.) The one signal I noted earlier at Montano Rd itself is one such example: it has a still sidewalk on the west side, but cross over to the east side and it's a pitiful pedestrian island that has no sidewalk connection. If possible, I would appreciate if you could forward this to the most applicable area/department. Thank you, Chris D'Antonio, Enfield 845-220-8225 Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission, Vice-Chair
Response:	Good Afternoon Chris, Thank you for providing your thoughts and experiences about the Route 5 corridor in Enfield. I'm glad you were able to attend the public information meeting and we were able to discuss sidewalks during the Q&A session. Although our signal replacement project is only filling some gaps in the overall system, it is actually fortunate that we are making upgrades at several traffic signals along the corridor, so it can have more of a coordinated impact on pedestrian infrastructure in Town. Future projects, potentially initiated by the Town with grant funding, could help fill some more of the gaps. I would suggest you communicate with the Local Traffic Authority in Enfield: Sergeant Matthew Meier from the Enfield Police Department mmeier@enfield.org, who should have more knowledge of local projects and priorities. Thank You,

Questions and Comments during the Virtual Public Interest Meeting:

Question:	Specific to Enfield, Rt 5, you're planning on enhancing pedestrian facilities on the east side of Rt 5 (which is great), but there's no sidewalk on that side across nearly all of Enfield...
------------------	---

	it's understandably out of the scope of the project, but what can you say about future sidewalk developments that connect the facilities you're enhancing here?
Response:	<i>Kaethe Podgorski:</i> Sure yeah, you are correct that the extensive sidewalk work between intersections is outside the scope of the project. We think that improving pedestrian accommodations at intersections are really helpful as intersections can be some of the greatest barriers and safety hazards for pedestrians. And it's actually a little bit more challenging to install crosswalks and push buttons and ped heads, curb ramps to facilitate those movements but it's setting up future projects to make those connections between the intersections. So, if the town is wanting to initiate a project to make some of those connections, they can do that or if a developer is making improvements to a property, the town can request that they construct sidewalk along the property frontage, and you can start to fill in those gaps with the difficult parts of the network at intersections provided already. I'm not aware of any specific project that plans to do that, and I'm not sure if you're with the Town of Enfield, I would say to make sure you are coordinating with your Local Traffic Authority in Enfield. They should also be aware of the types of improvements that folks in the town are looking to have move forward. So that would be a good next step to get more sidewalk development realized. If anybody else has anything to add feel free. <i>Lisa N. Conroy:</i> I just wanted to add on that the town of Enfield the designated representative of the local traffic authority is sergeant Mathew Meyer. The traffic division supervisor. The LTA is actually the town manager, but sergeant Meier is designated representative. So that would be someone we could certainly reach out to and see if the town does have any plans for future network or with any other sidewalk improvements in that area.

Questions and Comments after the Virtual Public Information Meeting:

Comment (via phone message):	A call was received from Mario Marrero after he saw a public meeting notice for 0171-0523, which includes improvements to signals along the Route 5 corridor in South Windsor. He has observed that there are no detection zones behind the setback stop bars east of the railroad tracks on the side streets along this corridor. He says trucks will often stop in advance of the tracks on the WB approaches since there is not enough room to queue at the stop bars closer to the intersections. So the sidestreet phase can get skipped when trucks and buses stop and wait too far back causing congestion and back ups.
Response:	A phone response was provided. It was noted that the scope of improvements to traffic signals in the Route 5 corridor in State Project 0171-0523 is limited and only at two intersections and that construction for the project is expected to occur in 2028-2030. But since there is an existing operational issue, the comment will be forwarded to other CTDOT units for investigation and follow up.