

**CT Department of Transportation
State Project No. 0174-0471
Federal Aid Project No. 000T(420)
Traffic Control Signal Replacements in Northwest CT (District 4)
Virtual Public Informational Meeting
August 11, 2025 6:00 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Event**

Report of Meeting

In Attendance: There were 36 attendees in the Zoom webinar, seven (7) of whom were panelists. The following individuals were identified:

Panelists:

Name	Organization	Email
Kaethe Podgorski	CTDOT	Kaethe.Podgorski@ct.gov
Daniel Veronesi	CTDOT	Daniel.Veronesi@ct.gov
Vincent Huang	CTDOT	Vincent.Huang@ct.gov
Leonardo Gamez	CTDOT	Leonardo.Gamez@ct.gov
Malcolm Thomas	CTDOT	Malcolm.Thomas@ct.gov
Lisa Conroy	CTDOT	Lisa.Conroy@ct.gov
Gina Musinski	Fuss & O'Neill	Gina.Musinski@fando.com

Audience:

Name	Organization	Email
Gary McMahon	Public	gtmcmaho@gmail.com
Erik Vath	Hoffman Auto Group	erik.vath@hoffmanauto.com
Ted Kreinik	Public	tedkreinik3@gmail.com
Thomas Wamser	Public	Thomas.james.wamser@gmail.com
Rick Osborne	Town of Kent	publicworks@townofkentct.gov
Anne Westerman	Southbury Historic District Commission	awesterman@earthlink.net
Martin Lindenmayer	Town of Kent	firstselectman@townofkentct.gov
Lynn Harrington	Public	Lynnharrington284@yahoo.com
Lynn Worthington	Town of Kent	lynnworthington@townofkentct.gov
Nancy Schaefer	Public	jonquil4@charter.net
Southbury Record	Southbury Record	news@southburyrecord.com
Lauri Bates	Public	Lauri.bates@fedex.com
Marie Papaioannou	Public	Jvanstone24@gmail.com
Charlotte Couchon	Public	charcouc@gmail.com
John LaForest-Roys	Public	jjcklr@gmail.com
Adrian McIlveen	Public	mcilveens@aol.com
Will Crocco	Public	william.g.crocco@intel.com
Jerry Hancock	Public	hanjth@aol.com

Doug Kenyon	Kenco Engineering and Construction LLC	Dkenyonpe@gmail.com
Arleen Kline	Public	arleenk823@att.net
Daniel Reilert	Public	berkshire@snet.net
Kathryn Stevens	Public	katebegertstevens@gmail.com
Janet Brzezinski	Public	jbrzezinski@earthlink.net
Judith Larkin	Public	nuthatch27@comcast.net
Alice Hicks	Public	alicebhicks@gmail.com
TJ Donohue	Killian & Donohue, LLC	22cc@comcast.net
Rick Schultz	Public	lecschultz@gmail.com
Wayne Hayes	Public	bnanews@aol.com
Mary Korsu	Public	315817651a@gmail.com

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 overview, summarized the Title VI information, and introduced the project team before giving an overview of CTDOT’s “District Various” traffic signal projects.

The meeting turned over to Daniel Veronesi, CTDOT Project Engineer. Daniel 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 full replacement location. Once Daniel finished, Vincent Huang, CTDOT Transportation Engineer, explained the difference between the full replacement and partial replacement locations under this project, and then discussed specific plans for upgrades at each partial replacement location.

After all locations were discussed, Kaethe shared previous, ongoing, and future coordination efforts under the project. Malcom 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 60-minute PowerPoint presentation followed by a Question-and-Answer session assisted by Gina Musinski, Consultant Liaison Engineer from Fuss & O’Neill.

The presentation covered the following items:

- The purpose of the project is 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, detection, controllers, pre-emption, and communication) were discussed for general information purposes.
- The proposed signal replacement locations were reviewed in detail. Installations of crosswalks and new sidewalk construction were highlighted.
- Project coordination efforts were discussed.
- Rights of Way processes were reviewed.

- The estimated construction cost and funding source were shared - approximately \$14 million with 100% State funds.
- Project schedule was summarized for general review.
- Pending next steps were summarized.
- Information was provided on how to contact the design staff with questions/comments.
- The Question-and-Answer session was initiated.

Question-and-Answer:

During the Q&A session that followed the presentation, seven questions and comments were submitted by the audience using the Zoom Q&A function. No questions and comments were submitted via email and voicemail.

Adjournment: The meeting ended at 7:25 pm when no more questions came in. Attendees were reminded to fill out the survey and that the comment period would be open until August 25, 2025, 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:

Question:	Over town I have seen such upgrades which are seemingly pointless. Adding 10 light on a 3 way intersection with a pedestrian crossing that goes to nowhere. There are no sidewalks or even platforms. Why would anyone cross into weeds and then have to walk on busy roads where there are no sidewalks?? A lot of time and money spent for something that is more dangerous than not having anything.
Response:	Thank you for your email. The pedestrian facilities being designed at intersections in Avon as part of State Project 0174-0471 are being done in coordination with the Town's Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan dated February, 2024 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan) which shows a proposed network of pedestrian facilities. While our signal upgrade project is only making improvements at signalized intersections, future sidewalk construction will be able to connect areas in between intersections to complete the envisioned network. We are also coordinating our project design elements with Transit agencies to provide improved pedestrian access to and from bus stops. Please also feel free to share other observations and concerns regarding pedestrian facilities in Town with Avon officials.
Comment:	I am unable to attend the public forum on this topic. Please consider replacement of the signal at Backus Ave/Kenosia Ave in Danbury as well as the other signals on Backus Ave.
Response:	Thank you for reaching out with your comment on this project. State Project 0174-0471 is a signal replacement project that is part of an ongoing program to maintain State-owned traffic signals in a "state of good repair." Locations are selected annually based on the condition of the existing structures (mast arms/span poles), age of equipment, and

	<p>outdated design elements with the purpose of improving reliability and functionality. The traffic signal at the intersection of Backus Ave at Kenosia Ave is actually City owned and maintained as are the other signals along Backus (except for those intersecting Route 7 on/off ramps). Please feel free to share any observations or concerns regarding City-owned signals with Danbury officials.</p>
Question:	Can you tell me if traffic control signal 12/-226 (Rt 44 and Hoffman Plaza) will have a light for westbound traffic planning to turn south in to the private driveway with CT Auto Spa?
Response:	Thank you for reaching out with your question. Under project 0174-0471 the traffic signal at intersection 128-226 will be receiving a “partial upgrade.” This will include new pedestrian accommodations (crosswalks, curb ramps, pedestrian signal heads, APS push buttons, and NTOR blank out signs), controllers, detection equipment, and communications equipment. No changes are being made to the existing vehicular signal heads or phasing at this location. Please let us know if you have any further questions.
Comment:	I emailed Vincent Huang questions about this project 19 March 2025. No reply was received so I would like those questions answered at this hearing.
Response:	CTDOT received your email on March 19, 2025. Please contact Vincent Huang to follow-up with any additional concerns
Question:	Many of the proposed traffic light changes in Southbury are located in an historic district. Is there a plan to meet with the Historic District Commission to discuss impact?
Response:	It is the Department of Transportation's understanding that the Main Street Historic District covers both sides of Main Street North, beginning at Old Waterbury Road. Only one intersection in State Project 0174-0471 is adjacent to this district. There are no plans to meet with the Historic District Commission. Correspondence with the Town has been limited to First Selectman Manville and Southbury Police Sergeant Markette (Local Traffic Authority representative)
Question:	Can a pedestrian walk signal be attached to traffic light so people turning right on red know that the pedestrian crosswalk is in use? Also, in Kent we would really appreciate a yield sign for the Rt. 7 south bound right (to Rt341 W) turning lane.
Response:	<p>Current CTDOT standard is to install blank-out signs facing directions where a vehicle's movement may conflict with a pedestrian's movement. Blank-out signs are electronic signs that illuminate a message for the motorist when the pedestrian walk sign is on, and remain dark when the walk sign is off. In this case, motorists will see the "No Turn on Red" message when the Walk sign is on.</p> <p>The existing Route 7 southbound roadway configuration is not conducive to yield operation and will remain controlled by the traffic control signal under State Project 0174-0471</p>
Comment:	1. Rte 4 Farmington “passive” crosswalks (Knolwood, Monteith, Brickyard, Town Farm). NEED to be changed to “active”, especially Rte 4 & Knollwood due to pedestrian traffic. 2. Add “active” crosswalk at Rte 177 & West District for New Horizons residents
Response:	The only Farmington location in Project 0174-0471 is the intersection of Colt Highway at Fienemann Road and Birdseye Road. Concerns about the operation of a State-owned traffic signal should be discussed with the Local Traffic Authority (LTA) first. Every town or

	city in Connecticut has a designated LTA who works with CTDOT on traffic related matters on State roads. If the LTA concurs with your concern, they will forward for CTDOT to address. Contact information for the Farmington LTA is: Russ Arnold, Director of Public Works, arnoldr@farmington-ct.org , 860-675-2305
Comment:	The intersection of Main St South and Rt 172 road needs to allow for more cars to pass on the left hand signal from Main St South towards the 84 interchange. Also the newly added light at the 84W offramp and 84W on ramp from 172 causes congestion.
Response:	These traffic signals are installed under Project No. 0130-0173, which is still ongoing. We informed that project team of your concern.
Question:	Is their a plan to install a Left Turn signal at the Intersection of CT-177 (South) and West District RD in the Unionville section of Farmington? At present there is no left turn Signal making it impossible to turn safely onto West District Road.
Response:	The only Farmington location in Project 0174-0471 is the intersection of Colt Highway at Fienemann Road and Birdseye Road. Concerns about the operation of a State-owned traffic signal should be discussed with the Local Traffic Authority (LTA) first. Every town or city in Connecticut has a designated LTA who works with CTDOT on traffic related matters on State roads. If the LTA concurs with your concern, they will forward for CTDOT to address. Contact information for the Farmington LTA is: Russ Arnold, Director of Public Works, arnoldr@farmington-ct.org , 860-675-2305
Question:	The new style traffic lights at Exit 14 and Main St. South are out of proportion with the area (too large and bulky). Why did the style need to be replaced and why do we need have more in our quaint town?
Response:	The CTDOT preferred design is for mast arms. Span designs are reserved for locations where mast arm installation is not achievable. We understand your general concern for the design and will take that into account in trying to minimize the impact to the general area.
Comment:	Please don't make the same mistake for left turning traffic you have at the intersection of Rt172 and South Main St. To give southbound traffic a solid red arrow when turning left after the green arrow makes no sense. The site lines are immense and there
Response:	In addition to sight distances, CTDOT also considers the speed and number of lanes of oncoming traffic, the number of left-turn lanes on an approach, the intersection geometry, traffic volume, and pedestrian needs to determine if a left-turn movement should be protected-only, protected-permissive. CTDOT considers these factors in selecting the left-turn phasing to use at each signal getting replaced in Southbury
Comment:	Town of Kent, traffic control box
Response:	Could you please clarify what is your concern with the traffic control box at U.S. Route 7 at Route 341 in the Town of Kent?
Comment:	Curious to hear the sound of the signal if any
Response:	The new push buttons emit a beep every second to help pedestrians with disabilities locate the button. The beep volume will rise and fall based on surrounding noise. The volume is set to be audible no more than 12 ft from the button or the building line, whichever is closer. At its lowest volume, the button beeps at 30 dB, similar to a whisper.

Comment:	I'm sure I'll have questions following the presentation.
Response:	<i>(No response provided)</i>
Comment:	I e mailed you 2 times, never got a response. I think you've become a full of shit Politician.
Response:	Please resend your concerns to this email address
Question:	At this rt 63 and rt 64 intersection, there have been plans to widen the intersection, also closing Exit 17 and moving that to a new location, as well as moving Richardson Drive entry to Rt 63. Where does all this stand?
Response:	This is Project No. 0080-0128. It is currently in design, with the current final design plans expected to be completed by February 2028.

Questions and Comments during the Virtual Public Interest Meeting:

Question:	Is the island being removed?
Response:	The raised island at the US Route 6/Route 67 northbound right-turn into the Southbury Shopping Center at Intersection No. 130-203 is proposed to be removed under the project.
Question:	Will there be any re-timing of lights in Southbury? The Main St South to 172 left turn lane light is too short, and too many cars blow through after the green arrow. Also, The new added light on 172 at the 84W off and on ramps is a headache, causing congestion on 172.
Response:	There are no proposed revisions to signals on Route 172 through project 0174-0471. We can pass along the concerns to the appropriate Traffic Engineering unit to ensure the traffic signal equipment is working properly.
Question:	Will the existing extension lines for the westbound through movements at intersection 130-212 in Southbury be maintained/replaced? They were installed a few years ago and solved an issue with drivers not maintaining their proper lane.
Response:	Existing pavement markings will be maintained at 130-212.
Comment:	I typed a question when I registered
Response:	<i>(Live answered)</i> Questions provided at the time of registration will be available to the project team after the meeting. The project team will follow up with responses by email. Alternatively, you may type in your question now using the Zoom Q&A function.
Comment:	Placing a pedestrian crosswalk across Route 7 north of the Monument will be very dangerous and I urge you to consider it thoroughly in discussion with local authorities.
Response:	<i>(Live answered)</i> Thank you for your feedback. The project team recognizes there is no existing crosswalk on U.S. Route 7 north of the monument and that the monument would impact sight distances to pedestrians and vehicles. The project team discussed this internally and would like to discuss with the Town of Kent as well.
Question:	Will this project extend to all Towns.
Response:	<i>(Live answered)</i> Every year, the CTDOT initiates projects to replace State-owned traffic signals at various spot locations throughout the State. Signals are selected for replacement based on factors mentioned in the presentation (age, rating of structures, number of

	maintenance calls, local input, existing pedestrian treatments, existing hardware). CTDOT encourages citizens to contact their town or city's Local Traffic Authority with concerns regarding the operation of a State-owned traffic signal. If the Local Traffic Authority concurs with the concern, they will contact CTDOT and CTDOT will examine possible solutions and/or program the signal to be replaced in a future project.
Question:	Are there any other alternatives to the oversize and bulky masts which do not fit with the character of a small town like Southbury?
Response:	<i>(Live answered)</i> CTDOT prefers mast arms over span poles and wires when designing traffic signal replacements because mast arms have more options in locating equipment to best detect vehicles at or approaching the intersection. Span pole and wire design may require additional structures than mast arm design. CTDOT will consider your feedback while coordinating with the Town of Southbury.

Questions and Comments after the Virtual Public Information Meeting:

Comment:	Cars are always going through red lights as they change. and speeding on Rte 44.
Response:	<p>The Connecticut Department of Transportation does not install or maintain automated traffic enforcement safety devices, such as red light cameras or speed cameras. They are installed by the municipality.</p> <p>To pursue these devices please contact your municipality's Local Traffic Authority (LTA).</p> <p>You can look up the LTA representative at the following link, ltalist.</p>
Question:	Could you please send a pdf of the PowerPoint presentation slides?
Response:	<p>I received your voicemail this afternoon. Thank you for attending the meeting last night and reaching out with your question. The slide deck will be posted on our project website three weeks after the meeting date (so it should be up September 2). Here is a link to our project website for you to check back:</p> <p>0174-0471 Northwest CT</p> <p>In the meantime, if it is helpful, you could refer to the recording of the presentation that is available already on CTDOT's YouTube page here:</p> <p>174-471 Traffic Control Signal Replacements in Northwestern CT (District 4)</p>
Comment:	<p>Regarding project No. 0174-0471 signal lights in Southbury, there is a currently dangerous situation that can be alleviated with this project.</p> <p>Route 67 (Southford Road) at State Route 487 (Kettletown Road) & Community House Road.</p> <p>This intersection is very dangerous as it is controlled as if Kettletown Rd (SR487) and Community House Rd are a through-way but the roads are offset by a significant amount and the intersection is very large. Drivers turning left, crossing Rt67 from Kettletown, do not expect to see a car crossing their path coming from Community House. There have been</p>

	<p>numerous near-miss accidents there, including with myself. After the first incident, it was weeks later that I realized that I had been in the wrong because it made no sense to me for this intersection to be controlled this way.</p> <p>It's wonderful that the traffic control is being addressed at this intersection. I only hope the way it's controlled is better, not just with new infrastructure.</p>
Response:	During preliminary design, we did note this operational characteristic and are proposing signal phasing that would eliminate this situation you describe.
Comment:	<p>I see new lights are in place but not yet operational at this intersection, so I am submitting comments on the current lights. Hopefully the new lights will address my concerns. Heading south on Rt 172, at the intersection there is a green left turn light, which turns to a full stop red light when the north bound traffic on Rt 172 is given a green light. This causes traffic heading south and wishing to turn left to have to wait for the north/south light to turn red, and the east/west light to turn green and then red. This setup causes unnecessary delay for left turning traffic from Rt 172 south. Driver vision at the intersection is unobstructed and there is no reason the left green light, when removed cannot turn into either a red flashing light or just a plain green light. The left turn at this intersection is no more dangerous than turning left at any other intersection. By making it a solid red light, I've seen people turn right in order to perform a U turn on south main in order to catch the east/west green light. This is by far more dangerous than allowing a normal left turn from Rt 172 south when traffic is clear.</p> <p>I hope the new lights will reflect allowing left turns after the left green arrow is cancelled.</p>
Response:	<p>Your concern was received by the Department of Transportation and forwarded to appropriate staff. This signal was revised under Project 0130-0173. You should anticipate a response from that project team.</p> <p>The other project you are referencing, 0174-0471, will replace traffic signals along Route 67 between Kettletown Road and Old Waterbury Road. There is no work along Route 172.</p>
Comment	We received the attached notice from your office. Regarding the traffic signal replacement project, are there any anticipated power disruptions, easements or right of ways anticipated? Or will the project solely focus on the replacement of the traffic signals?
Response	<p>This is a traffic control signal replacement project at various locations throughout the northwest region of Connecticut. The project does have a right of way component to obtain easements, however there are no proposed easements or right of way impacts affecting the CVS #1180 in Avon.</p> <p>There are no anticipated power disruptions as the existing traffic control signal will remain in place and active during construction.</p> <p>Let me know if you have any additional questions</p>