

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST**

Date: November 8, 2022

Project Name: Route 85 Improvements – South of Route 82 / State Project Number 85-146

Municipality: Montville and Salem

Staff Contact: Kevin Fleming

This assessment is being conducted in conformance to the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s Environmental Classification Document (ECD) to determine Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) obligations.

Project Description:

The project description as presented in the CEPA scoping notice on February 22, 2022, is as follows:

The proposed improvements include widening shoulders, upgrading guiderail, addressing vertical geometry deficiencies, addressing isolated drainage, accommodating bypass and bicycles, and constructing new climbing lanes where appropriate. The proposed work also includes the relocation of approximately 2000 feet of Route 161 from its present location to be realigned opposite with a local road named Deer Run. The new intersection of Route 85, Route 161, and Deer Run is proposed to be a single lane roundabout. The existing intersection of Route 85 at Grassy Hill Road and Chesterfield Road will be expanded to incorporate improved turning radii, auxiliary turning lanes, and a new traffic signal. Two bridges are proposed to be replaced, Route 85 over Fraser Brook (Bridge No. 02538) and Route 85 over Latimer Brook (Bridge No. 01248), to meet the latest design standards and upgraded Route 85 geometry. The project is anticipated to be undertaken with 80 percent Federal funds and 20 percent State funds

Since this time, however, the scope of the project has been reduced. The previously proposed Route 161 realignment and the new roundabout at Route 85/Route 161/Deer Run have been removed due to heavy impacts to the quarry/rock-crushing facility. Additionally, there will be no construction of climbing lanes. CTDOT will continue moving forward with the rest of the proposed Route 85 improvements and the existing Route 85/Route 161 signalized intersection will be upgraded within its existing footprint.

This project was scoped in the *Environmental Monitor* on February 22, 2022, and the public comment period remained open until the close of business on March 30, 2022. CTDOT received comments from two State agencies – CTDEEP and OPM, and multiple comments from the public at the public scoping meeting and during comment period. The public comments received outside of the public meeting were generally requests to obtain additional project information. Comments received at the meeting, and CTDOT responses, are included in the attached report of meeting.

The proposed action is non-site specific, or encompasses multiple sites;

Current site ownership:

- N/A, State; Municipal, Private,
 Other: Please Explain.

Anticipated ownership upon project completion:

- N/A, State; Municipal, Private,
 Other: Please Explain.

Locational Guide Map Criteria:

<http://ctmaps.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ba47efccdb304e02893b7b8e8cff556a>

Priority Funding Area factors:

- Designated as a Priority Funding Area, including Balanced, or Village PFA;
- Urban Area or Urban Cluster, as designated by the most recent US Census Data;
- Public Transit, defined as being within a ½ mile buffer surrounding existing or planned mass transit;
- Existing or planned sewer service from an adopted Wastewater Facility Plan;
- Existing or planned water service from an adopted Public Drinking Water Supply Plan;
- Existing local bus service provided 7 days a week.

Conservation Area factors:

- Core Forest Area(s), defined as greater than 250 acres based on the 2006 Land Cover Dataset;
- Existing or potential drinking water supply watershed(s);
- Aquifer Protection Area(s);
- Wetland Soils greater than 25 acres;
- Undeveloped Prime, Statewide Important and/or locally important agricultural soils greater than 25 acres;
- Storm Surge Inundation Zone(s);
- 100 year Flood Zone(s);
- Critical Habitat;
- Locally Important Conservation Area(s),
- Protected Land (list type): Enter text.
- Local, State, or National Historic District(s).

Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) Section 22a-1a-3 Determination of Environmental Significance (Direct/Indirect)

1. Impact on water quality, including surface water and groundwater

Water Quality – No negative impacts are anticipated. All CTDOT projects must conform to the CTDOT Standard Specifications for Roads, Bridges, Facilities, and Incidental Construction Form 818. Section 1.10.03, Environmental Compliance, specifically deals with water pollution control and Best Management Practices (BMP). If required, a Water Quality Certificate from CTDEEP pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be obtained.

Surface Water – No negative impacts are anticipated.

Stormwater - No negative impacts are anticipated as Best Management Practices will be employed regarding stormwater management. Registration under CTDEEP's *General Permit for Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters Associated with Construction Activities* will be completed in required. Any CTDOT project that changes impervious area, stormwater drainage or drainage patterns pre to post construction shall meet the requirements of the CTDEEP's General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater from Department of Transportation Separate Storm Sewer Systems (DOT MS4 Permit) and submit a CTDOT MS4 Designer Worksheet. Lake Konomac, which is a reservoir for the City of New London Water Department is located at the south limits of the project. CTDOT will coordinate closely with the owner to ensure appropriate treatment of stormwater will be incorporated into the design.

Groundwater – No negative impacts are anticipated. All CTDOT projects conform to the CTDOT Standards Specifications for Roads, Bridges, Facilities and Incidental Construction Form 818. Section 1.10.03, Environmental Compliance, specifically deals with water pollution control and Best Management Practices. As design progresses, a testing plan will be developed to assess soil and groundwater in any moderate- to high-risk areas within which intrusive construction activities are proposed. Remediation measures will be put in place to mitigate potential impacts if contaminated soils or groundwater is confirmed by the testing.

2. **Effect on a public water supply system** - No negative impacts are anticipated. The project is not located within a source of public drinking water.
3. **Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation:**

Flooding – Although the project is located within a FEMA-mapped flood zone, no negative impacts are anticipated. Flood Management Certification will be obtained.

In-stream flows – No negative impacts are anticipated. Coordination with CTDEEP will continue.

Erosion or Sedimentation – No negative impacts are anticipated. All work will be consistent with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.

4. **Disruption or alteration of an historic, archaeological, cultural, or recreational building, object, district, site or its surroundings** – No negative impacts are anticipated. After coordination with the CT State Historic Preservation Office (CTSHPO), qualified staff at CTDOT determined, in a letter dated July 22, 2022, that the project would result in No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties, Conditional upon the following stipulations:
 - a) To prevent potential impacts to the NEHFES Creamery and Synagogue Site, both shoring or stabilization of the creamery foundation prior to the start of work and vibratory monitoring throughout construction shall be employed. The former may include the installation of either cribbing or helical anchors within the creamery foundation itself, however, the final approach shall be selected following review and approval of a preservation plan by SHPO.
 - b) All historically notable stone walls and features identified in the 2020 Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment and Survey and Phase II Intensive Archaeological Surveys

shall be reconstructed with their original materials and in as close to their existing location at the conclusion of construction.

- c) The three historic stone turnpike mile markers located within the APE shall be removed and safely stored during construction and reset in as close to their existing location at the conclusion of construction.
- d) The cellar hole associated with archaeological Site #121-11 shall be carefully backfilled per recommendation by the 2020 Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment and Survey and Phase II Intensive Archaeological Surveys.
- e) Erosion control and slope stabilization measures shall be employed along the section of the Gilbert Cemetery abutting the APE per the 2020 Phase 1A Archaeological Assessment and Survey and Phase II Intensive Archaeological Surveys.

- 5. Effect on natural communities and upon critical species of animal or plant and their habitat; interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species –** No negative impacts are anticipated. The project is located within a Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) area, and CTDOT will submit a *Request for NDDDB State Listed Species Review Form* to CTDEEP for further review. CTDOT provided preliminary plans to CTDEEP Fisheries and in November 2021 DEEP Fisheries provided information on fish species, details for construction, and best management practices. The memos reference the time frame for unconfined instream work, the need for proper erosion and sedimentation control measures, channel configuration to include sufficient depth to allow fish passage at low flow, and restoration of riparian zones after construction. CTDOT will continue to coordinate CTDEEP as the project progresses and adhere to best management practices to ensure no negative impact to State listed species in the project area.
- 6. Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to create extensive detrimental environmental impact –** No negative impacts are anticipated. Should there be sites with known contamination issues in vicinity of the project, additional study will be performed within the project area and/or adjacent right-of-way. As design progresses, a testing plan will be developed to assess soil and groundwater in the moderate- to high-risk areas within which intrusive construction activities are proposed. Remediation measures will be put in place to mitigate potential impacts if contaminated soils or groundwater is confirmed by the testing. If needed, registration under the CT DEEP's *General Permit for Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management* (Staging & Transfer) will be obtained, and soil management will be conducted in accordance with the General Permit.
- 7. Substantial aesthetic or visual effects –** No negative impacts are anticipated.
- 8. Inconsistency with (a) the policies of the State Plan of Conservation and Development developed in accordance with Section 16a-30 of the CT General Statutes, (b) other relevant state agency plans, and (c) applicable regional or municipal land use plans –** This project is consistent with the Statewide Plan of Conservation and Development. CTDOT has adopted a programmatic approach for meeting the requirements of CGS Chapter 297 Section 16a-31(a) and Chapter 297 Section 16a-35(c) and 16a-35(d) for determining consistency of proposed actions with the Statewide Plan of Conservation and Development, as indicated in a memo from CTDOT to OPM. As indicated in that memo, CTDOT has characterized this project type under the category: "Renovations for Safety, No Significant Capacity improvements," an activity type

which is consistent with Growth Management Principle #1: “Redevelop and Revitalize Regional Centers and Areas with Existing or Currently Planned Physical Infrastructure”, and Growth Management Principle #5: “Protect and Ensure the Integrity of Environmental Assets Critical to Public Health and Safety”. This category of projects constitutes an exception to the definition of a Growth-Related Project as defined in Sec. 16a-35c, Item (2), Subsection (D), Sub-Subsection (i) “Projects for maintenance, repair, additions, or renovations to existing facilities”.

- 9. Disruption or division of an established community or inconsistency with adopted municipal and regional plans, including impacts on existing housing where sections 22a-1b(c) and 8-37t of the CGS require additional analysis** – No negative impacts are anticipated. This project is not in conflict with any municipal or regional plans. Furthermore, the project will not result in community division.
- 10. Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people** – No negative impacts are anticipated. This project does not involve the displacement or addition of people.
- 11. Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other)** – No negative impacts are anticipated. The project once complete will reduce congestion. If needed, CTDOT will coordinate with the Municipalities as the project progresses regarding any potential vehicular or pedestrian detours during construction.
- 12. A substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a direct or indirect result of this action** – No negative impacts are anticipated. No new construction of any buildings is proposed. The project is safety related and is not anticipated to result in any change to land use or traffic conditions that would impact energy use.
- 13. The creation of a hazard to human health or safety** – No negative impacts are anticipated. The project will be reviewed for the potential of having lead, asbestos, or other hazardous material constituents in existing infrastructure components. Testing will be performed on any suspect materials. Should the presence of hazardous materials be confirmed through the testing, specifications to properly handle and dispose the hazardous materials will be incorporated into the design to mitigate potential impacts to human health or safety. Therefore, significant impacts associated with hazardous materials or waste sites are not anticipated.
- 14. Effect on air quality** - No negative impacts are anticipated. The project is located within the boundaries of the portion of the state that has been classified as attainment for carbon monoxide (CO), attainment for PM 2.5, non-attainment for Ozone, and attainment for PM 10. A project level Air Quality Conformity Determination is not required, nor is an analysis or discussion of Mobile Source Air Toxics, as this project is exempt under the Clean Air Act. Any potential temporary impacts during construction can be avoided or limited by proper operation of construction equipment and adherence to regulations limiting idling of engines.
- 15. Effect on ambient noise levels** - No negative impacts are anticipated. Any noise impacts during construction will be temporary and will be minimized to the best extent practicable by compliance with CTDOT Standard Specifications for Roads, Bridges, Facilities and Incidental Construction Form 818 regarding construction noise pollution:

“1.10.05 – Noise Pollution: The contractor shall take measures to control noise intensity caused by his construction operations and equipment, including but not limited to equipment used for drilling, pile driving, blasting, and excavating or hauling. All methods and devices employed to minimize noise shall be subject to continuing approval of the Engineer. The maximum allowable level of noise at the nearest residence or occupied building shall be 90 decibels on the “A” weighted scale (dB(A)). Any operation that exceeds this standard will cease until a different construction methodology is developed to allow work to proceed within the 90-dB(A) limit.”

- 16. Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands** –The project does involve impacts to wetlands and will require an Inland Wetland General Permit, 401 Water Quality Certification (CTDEEP), and a Pre-Construction Notification Permit from the United States Army Corps. Of Engineers (USACE). Coordination with CTDEEP and ACOE will ensure no more than minimal impacts to wetlands will result as a result of the proposed project.
- 17. Effect on agricultural resources** – No impacts.
- 18. Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure** – No negative impacts are anticipated.
- 19. Effect on greenhouse gas emissions as a direct or indirect result of the action** – No negative impacts are anticipated. Construction phase impacts on greenhouse gas emissions will be limited. Any potential temporary impacts during construction can be avoided or limited by adherence to regulations limiting idling of engines.
- 20. Effect of a changing climate on the action, including any resiliency measures incorporated into the action** – No negative impact is anticipated. The project is located outside of the coastal boundary and will not be exposed to climate change hazards.
- 21. Any other substantial effect on natural, cultural, recreational, or scenic resources-** No other substantial effects are anticipated.
- 22. Cumulative effects** – This project does not involve any cumulative effects that have the potential for significant effects on the environment.

Conclusion:

After examining any potential environmental impacts and reviewing all comments received, CTDOT has concluded that the preparation of an Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) will not be required for Route 85 Improvements – South of Route 82 / State Project Number 85-146. Publication of this document to the Environmental Monitor shall satisfy the agency’s responsibilities under Section 22a-1a-7 of the RCSA.

During the comment period, CTDOT received comments from two State agencies – CTDEEP, and the Office of Policy and Management (OPM). However, the portions of the project that concerned OPM are no longer a part of the project under the latest reduced scope. Additionally, CTDOT received comments from the public at the scoping meeting and during the scoping period. The comments received at the meeting (and CTDOT responses) are in the attached report of meeting. The comments from the public received during the scoping period were mainly requests for additional information. Below is a synopsis of the relevant comments received from the two State agencies. Comments are addressed in the appropriate sections above where needed.

Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Fisheries Division

CTDOT provided preliminary plans to CTDEEP Fisheries and in November 2021 DEEP Fisheries provided information on fish species, details for construction, and best management practices. The memos reference the time frame for unconfined instream work, the need for proper erosion and sedimentation control measures, channel configuration to include sufficient depth to allow fish passage at low flow, and restoration of riparian zones after construction. CTDOT/CTDEEP will continue coordination as the project progresses.

Natural Diversity Database

The project is within a Natural Diversity Database Area. Please submit a formal application to the Wildlife Division prior to submitting permit applications for a detailed review of the species that may occur in the area.

Land and Water Resources Division

If the reconnaissance of the site by a certified soil scientist identifies regulated areas, they should be clearly delineated. Any activity within federally regulated wetland areas or watercourses at the site may require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Staff from the Land and Water Resources Division will be able to clarify if this project would qualify for Self-Verification or a Preconstruction Notification during the DOT's Project Management Meetings. If a permit is required from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Water Quality Certificate will also be required from DEEP pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

Stormwater General Permit

The General Permit for Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities may be applicable depending on the size of the disturbance regardless of phasing. This general permit applies to discharges of stormwater and dewatering wastewater from construction activities where the activity disturbs more than an acre. The requirements of the current general permit include registration to obtain permit coverage and development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP). The SWPCP contains requirements for the permittee to describe and manage their construction activity, including implementing erosion and sediment control measures as well as other control measures to reduce or eliminate the potential for the discharge of stormwater runoff pollutants (suspended solids and floatables such as oil and grease, trash, etc.) both during and after construction. Stormwater treatment systems must be designed to comply with the post-construction stormwater management performance requirements of the permit. These include post-construction performance standards requiring retention and/or infiltration of the runoff from the first inch of rain (the water quality volume or WQV) and incorporating control measures for runoff reduction and low impact development practices.

The construction stormwater general permit dictates separate compliance procedures for Locally Exempt projects (projects primarily conducted by government authorities) and Locally Approvable projects (projects primarily by private developers).

Projects that are exempt from local permitting that disturb over one acre must submit a registration form and Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP) to the Department at least 60 or 90 days, as identified in the permit, prior to the initiation of construction. Locally Approvable construction projects with a total disturbed area of one to five acres are not required to register with the Department provided the development plan has been approved by a municipal land use agency and adheres to local erosion and sediment control land use regulations and the CT Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Locally Approvable construction projects with a total disturbed area of five or more acres must submit a registration form and SWPCP to the Department at least 60 days prior to the initiation of construction. Registrations shall include a certification by the Qualified Professional who designed the project and a certification by a Qualified Professional or regional Conservation District who reviewed the SWPCP and deemed it consistent with the requirements of the general permit. In addition to measures such as erosion and sediment controls and post- construction stormwater management, the SWPCP must include a schedule for plan implementation and routine inspections.

Air Management

CTDEEP typically encourages the use of newer off-road construction equipment that meets the latest (EPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards. If that newer equipment cannot be used, equipment with the best available controls on diesel emissions including retrofitting with diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters in addition to the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel would be the second choice that can be effective in reducing exhaust emissions. The use of newer equipment that meets EPA standards would obviate the need for retrofits.

DEEP also encourages the use of newer on-road vehicles that meet either the latest EPA or CARB standards for construction projects. These on-road vehicles include dump trucks, fuel delivery trucks and other vehicles typically found at construction sites. On-road vehicles older than the 2007-model year typically should be retrofitted with diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters for projects. Again, the use of newer vehicles that meet EPA standards would eliminate the need for retrofits.

Additionally, section 22a-174-18(b)(3)(C) of the RCSA limits the idling of mobile sources to three (3) minutes. This regulation applies to most vehicles such as trucks and other diesel engine-powered vehicles commonly used on construction sites. Adhering to the regulation will reduce unnecessary idling at truck staging zones, delivery or truck dumping areas and further reduce on-road and construction equipment emissions. Use of posted signs indicating the three-minute idling limit is recommended. It should be noted that only DEEP can enforce section 22a-174-18(b)(3)(C) of the RCSA. Therefore, it is recommended that the project sponsor include language similar to the anti-idling regulations in the contract specifications for construction in order to allow them to enforce idling restrictions at the project site without the involvement of DEEP.

Connecticut Office of Policy and Management (OPM)

First, OPM would like to highlight a potential concern regarding this portion of the scoping notice's project description:

The proposed work includes the relocation of approximately 2,000 feet of Route 161 from its present location to be realigned opposite with a local road named Deer Run. The new intersection of Route 85, Route 161, and Deer Run is proposed to be a single lane roundabout.

That aspect of the project would move the intersection of Routes 161 and 85 into or near drinking water watershed land of the nearby New London Department of Public Utilities Lake Konomoc reservoir. DOT's control of project construction and future highway operations can mitigate direct threats to the public water supply, but DOT should thoroughly consider the potential for that new orientation to induce development incompatible with that reservoir and that might threaten the current or future water supply. This is doubly important due to uncertainties about future precipitation patterns and other changes that might impact the quantity and quality of public water sources as well as future demands for that water. DPH faced comparable issues in the CEPA review of the nearby New London – East Lyme water system interconnection and DOT might review how those concerns were resolved via local agreements.

Finally, please clarify whether the DOT or the Town of Montville will assume responsibility for the bypassed section of road. If DOT plans to retain responsibility, the post-scoping document should provide the estimated additional cost to the DOT.

Please note that OPM's comments pertain to a portion of the scoped project that have been since removed from the project and no longer apply.



Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06111

120 Hebron Ave. Floor 2
Glastonbury, CT. 06033

REPORT OF MEETING

PROJECT NO.: 85-146

PROJECT NAME: Route 85 Improvements - South of Route 82

TOWN/CITY: Salem and Montville

LOCATION OF MEETING: Microsoft Teams Live Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: Tuesday, March 15, 2022

SUBJECT OF MEETING: VPIM meeting summary & Live Q&A

IN ATTENDANCE:

Susan Libatique	CTDOT	Susan.libatique@ct.gov
Robert Moore	CTDOT	Robert.moore@ct.gov
Dennis McDonald	CTDOT	Dennis.mcdonald@ct.gov
Jeffrey Pfaffinger	CTDOT	jeffrey.pfaffinger@ct.gov
Jason Vincent	CTDOT	Jason.vincent@ct.gov
Kevin Fleming	CTDOT	Kevin.fleming@ct.gov
Steve Drechsler	Benesch	sdrechsler@benesch.com
Layth Al-Attar	Benesch	lalattar@benesch.com
Jeffrey Koerner	Benesch	jkoerner@benesch.com
Jim Jussel	Benesch	jjussel@benesch.com
Stephen Ulman	Benesch	sulman@benesch.com
Stephen Lecco	GZA	stephen.lecco@gza.com
Stephanie Brooks	FHI Studio	sbrooks@fhistudio.com
Nick Campbell	FHI Studio	ncampbell@fhistudio.com
Bonnie Torres	FHI Studio	btorres@fhistudio.com
9 Public YouTube Attendees		
21 Public Teams Attendees		



Public Informational Meeting Format:

The project team delivered a recorded presentation to the public and stakeholders of the Towns of Salem and Montville on March 15, 2022, at 7:00 pm. This presentation is included with this report of meeting as an attachment. Attendees had the option of attending the meeting via YouTube or Microsoft Teams live stream, or by calling in and listening by phone.

Following the presentation, a live question and answer session was held. Members of the public and stakeholders submitted questions via email, phone, and through the Teams Q&A window. The project team and Department addressed all comments and questions verbally or via Teams Q&A.

It was noted and reiterated throughout the live Q&A session that Project information and plans can be found on the Project website, and that questions can be sent by calling the phone number or email address below. Attendees were also encouraged to fill out a survey. Attendees were notified that comments are open for a two-week period until March 30, 2022. A recording of this meeting will be available on the website within five (5) days of this event.

Project Webpage: https://portal.ct.gov/DOTSalemMontville85-146
MS Teams Recording: https://portal.ct.gov/dot/general/CTDOT-VPIM-Library
Email: DOTProject85-146@ct.gov
Phone: (860) 944-1111
Survey: https://survey123.arcgis.com/share/8f49e1ad5d3946d083f71825ee49f67f

Question and Answer Session:

The following are the questions and comments submitted by the public and stakeholders, along with their respective responses, organized into subject matter categories for ease of review.

PUBLISHED

Do these improvements to the Route 85 corridor completely shut down any hope for the completion of Route 11 to 395 or I 95?

- The improvements proposed to Route 85 will improve the roadway to current design standards by providing wider shoulders and provide safety and capacity improvements at numerous intersections throughout the corridor. These are needed improvements to Route 85 that are independent of whether Route 11 is ever completed. We are unable to speak to the probability of whether the final section of Route 11 will ever be completed. The improvements being proposed under this project would not preclude the completion of Route 11 should it be pursued in the future.



How can 5-8' shoulders be created on both sides of Route 85 at Horse Pond? There is a sheer cliff going straight up to houses on Horse Pond Road, and the water immediately on the right.

- The existing shoulders to the north of Horse Pond Road are very close to 8'(feet) existing. There will be very minimal widening across. There will be a little fill just around the intersection to provide site distance because the embankment restricts the site distance a little bit as you're looking northerly but will be cut back a little bit. All the proposed improvements will be incorporated into the existing right away and there's no proposed fill encroaching anywhere near the pond itself. There should be no wetland impacts at this location or property acquisition.

Will the 4 sections of road work be done in series, or in parallel? creating significant delays and detour of traffic which would utilize these areas of Route 85?

- The project just finished up preliminary design, so a detailed sequencing of the construction has not been finalized. There's anticipation that there will be some overlap of work between adjacent sections or different sections of the project when the schedule gets determined. It is proposed to maintain one lane of traffic in each direction and all lanes open during peak hours, so rush hour traffic shouldn't be affected. It is anticipated that the same temporary bridge could be used at each location. Those two portions of the work would not be able to be done concurrently based on that assumption. It's anticipated that the bridge replacement will be done at different times.

Are the 2 Bridges planned on being constructed at the same time?

- We will lay out the spans of the temporary bridges for both sites to be the same length. The intent is to construct each bridge at a different time so they would not be constructed at the same time.

With the increase in impervious surfaces, has stormwater handling been addressed in the design phase? What about increased use and discharge of road salts into Latimer Brook?

- There will be increased impervious surfaces because of the widening of roadway. We haven't performed the detailed drainage analysis on any of the portions of this segment. As a requirement, we are going to have to go through a whole stormwater management process and permitting for the project. It will be addressed in some manner in the final design, which hasn't been done yet. We are looking at the location and widening of the road, but those issues will be addressed in the future and will be permitted as required through the permitting process with CTDEEP (Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection).

I live on the corner of Route 85 and Valley Drive (Salem), there is proposed roadway widening that may impact the stone wall. Will this need to be moved?

- We looked at all the cross sections in the widening of the roadway near Valley Road, and we don't think there will be any impacts regarding the retaining wall. The wall at those locations we believe will be maintained in place. There are several stone walls that line Route 85 throughout this whole corridor. One of the things we have worked out with the State Historic Preservation offices is that all these walls need to be relocated and rebuilt using the original stone, assuming



that is what the abutting property owner would want done. Should any other walls be impacted by the project, they are going to be rebuilt as part of the project.

Please describe the anticipated construction phasing of the project.

- The detailed phasing for construction hasn't been determined yet and will be finalized in Final Design. Speaking conceptually, the plan is to maintain all existing lanes open during peak hours. During off peak hours one lane of traffic, alternating directions, would be used to construct the road in sections. An exception to that is because of the nature of the work, there's no way to do the alternating traffic for the construction of those bridges. As such, the temporary roadway and temporary bridges will be used. There will be alternating traffic in areas where there is live traffic, with all lanes being open during peak hours. There will be allowance for emergency vehicles to pass through the site at all times.

The timeline for this project is Summer 2024. How does this tie into the Exit 74 work on I-95 which will be creating significant delays and detoured traffic which would utilize these areas of Route 85?

- There will be some overlap in construction. The Exit 74 project is going to be starting construction this Fall or next Spring and is slated to last three or four seasons. There will be some overlap between the construction of the two projects; however, we are unaware of any detours from the Exit 74 project that would be diverting traffic towards Route 85 in the project area.

Will there be a detour for summer traffic that uses Route 85 to alleviate backups from I 95 to the beaches?

- There will not be a full detour for Route 85 drivers to go to I-95 and the beaches. There will be a posting and advance warning north of the site at Route 82 and at Route 161 to warn people there is construction on Route 85 and to use an alternate route. There will not be any formal alternate routes but will be notified ahead of time of what is going on. There will possibly be the use of smart work zone technology. These specifics will be determined through the design process.

Will residents have access to their driveways during construction?

- We are proposing to maintain traffic to all private residents throughout construction. It may not be on a paved surface, but it will be traversable gravel at best. At worst, a surface to access your driveways.

How will the improvements to the replacement bridge affect the FEMA floodplain maps?

- We have done preliminary hydraulic analysis on both replacement bridges. Fraser Brook is not within FEMA food insurance studies, Latimer Brook is. We don't anticipate any changes to the flood maps at this location. When doing the hydraulic analysis, you're required with the FEMA discharges to not increase any water surface elevations either in the floodway conditions or the flood plain condition. Our preliminary analysis does not have any of these increases and we will need to finalize that analysis as the project design moves forward.



Have you evaluated time delays during peak travel times, winter conditions, and summer storms and major accidents?

- What is analyzed are the peak hours of volumes. They're based on actual counts done during early spring and summer months along the corridor. There are those numbers with projected numbers and numbers for other development and general growth in the area. What is analyzed normally is the AM Peak and PM Peak of an average day. For this corridor that average day is assumed to be during the summer. In terms of winter conditions, there's no anticipation of major construction going on during winter as there is usually winter shutdown. During all seasons, there will be two lanes (one in each direction). In terms of storms and major accidents, you can't plan or analyze for that. With a major accident, you try to get the construction picked up if possible, to help alleviate the patterns. If you have a hurricane coming through or major summer storm, you have some advance notice and you can possibly not do construction during these times. These are items that are not studied or analyzed; however, normal situations were analyzed for normal operations.

When construction of the additional 5-8 foot lanes (shoulders) is being done, how will reconstruction of driveways be handled?

- There are several ways that this may be done. One way is to widen the roadway approaching the driveway while the existing driveway is maintained, or a temporary driveway may be installed to the north or the south. Further coordination will take with the property owner and the Contractor during construction to make sure that access is provided through construction.

Will there be a light with a turn signal for people turning left onto Chesterfield Road coming from Salem? It is difficult to get a break in traffic to make the turn.

- Yes, Route 85 will be widened through this intersection providing 2 lanes southbound (a left turn and a through/right) and 3 lanes northbound (a left turn, a through, and a right). The phasing for the signal will accommodate the left turns. There will be advanced left turn green arrows to give the left turns protected movements, and then the through movements will be allowed with permissive left turns.