

**CT Department of Transportation
State Project No. 0174-0481
Traffic Control Signal Replacements in Northwest CT (District 4)
Virtual Public Informational Meeting
January 12, 2026 6:00 p.m.
Zoom Virtual Event**

Report of Meeting

In Attendance: There were 12 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
Daniel Veronesi	CTDOT	Daniel.Veronesi@ct.gov
Leonardo Gamez	CTDOT	Leonardo.Gamez@ct.gov
Jack Carlson	CTDOT	Jack.Carlson@ct.gov
Lisa Conroy	CTDOT	Lisa.Conroy@ct.gov
Ferdinand Orlie	CTDOT	Ferdinand.Orlie@ct.gov

Audience:

Name	Organization	Email
John Gemetro Jr	Public	jgemetrojr@gmail.com
Jerry Lukowski	Town of Watertown	lukowski@watertownct.org
Virginia Riggs Lyons	Public	wenvirly@aol.com
Nancy Mullen	Public	sausenancy@hotmail.com
Matt Blume	CTDOT	Matthew.blume@ct.gov
Scott ODell	Public	Ssodell2016@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.

After all locations were discussed, Kaethe shared previous, ongoing, and future coordination efforts under the project. Jack Carlson, 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 \$11.5 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.

Question-and-Answer:

During the Q&A session that followed the presentation, three questions and comments were 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 January 26, 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:	Will private property be taken/used with the full replacement of the traffic control signal at the Burlington site (spielman hwy and Canton rd)?
Response:	There are no plans to acquire easements at the Burlington location in this project. All project work will occur within the state highway right of way.

Questions and Comments during the Virtual Public Interest Meeting:

Question:	With the Route 4 upgrades, is the state looking at either making independent through and left turn lanes (going from Unionville to Burlington), or extending the time on the left turn green arrow? Currently, only 3-4 cars get through before the left green arrow disappears.
------------------	--

Response:	Part of the design process is to obtain current turning traffic volumes to determine if the lane-use is appropriate and to evaluate if any changes are needed to how the traffic signal operates. This can include providing sufficient times for each phase of the traffic signal based on demand. The comments on this location will be taken into account as part of the above noted considerations as the design progresses. Widening the roadway to add a new lane would be beyond the scope of this project. But if feasible, re-striping and/or modifying lane arrangements could be investigated if the operational analysis indicates it would be beneficial.
Question:	Kaethe, I provided a few comments and you did reply. Do i have to send them to the project email that was provided. Jerry
Response:	Answered during the meeting: It is okay for Jerry to continue to correspond with Kaethe and Dan as usual.
Question:	I see an orange box on the south west corner of the Route 4 Burlington intersection. Will that location if that is a box allow [sic] for farm vehicle passage behind this structure... if in fact this is a structure.
Response:	Answered during the meeting: The orange box you are talking about is the controller cabinet. The existing controller cabinet is in a similar location to the proposed location. With regards to farm vehicles being able to pass behind it, we can not say for sure if vehicles will be able to pass behind the new cabinet. Additionally, the symbol of the cabinet on the plan is larger than the cabinet will be in the field. A better approximation would be the black symbol that is shown on the actual plan. There probably will be a bit more space behind the actual cabinet than there appears to be in the drawing.

Questions and Comments after the Virtual Public Information Meeting:

None