

# REPORT OF MEETING

Project: I-84/Route 8 Interchange Study

Date: Thursday, March 3, 2005

Time: 4:00 P.M.

Location: Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce, Waterbury

**Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #1, Existing Conditions Report Review**

In Attendance:

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Represented at March 3 Meeting</b>
Waterbury Aldermen	
Engineering Department	x
City Hall	x
U.S. Army Corps Engineers – New England District	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Department of Economic and Community Development	x
Department of Environmental Protection	x
Office of Policy and Management	x
U.S. EPA, Region 1	
Federal Transit Administration	
Greater Waterbury Transit District	x
Northeast Transportation	x
Housatonic Valley Association	x
Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce	x
Country Club Neighborhood Association	
Bunker Hill Neighborhood	x
Brooklyn Neighborhood Association	
Crownbrook Neighborhood Association	
Town Plot Neighborhood Association	x
Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments	x
State Historic Preservation Officer	
Rideworks	x
Department of Public Safety	
FHWA	x
Main Street Waterbury	x
Waterbury Mayor's Office	x
NVDC	x

## Meeting/Presentation Summary:

Carmine Trotta of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) opened the meeting by welcoming members of the Advisory Committee and beginning introductions around the room. He then gave a brief description of the study including the needs and deficiencies analysis, recommended actions, public involvement, and project website. He encouraged the public and the Advisory Committee members to offer comments and opinions as the study progresses.

Mike Morehouse of Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA) began the presentation discussing the study process, scope and schedule.

Karl Smith (WSA) discussed other modes of transportation within the study area and how they can be utilized to help alleviate demand on the roadway facilities.

Sharat Kalluri (WSA) presented findings from the traffic operational analysis performed for the existing and future conditions within the study area. The analysis included freeway segments, ramps, weave sections and at-grade intersections on adjacent arterials. Mike went on to discuss safety analysis and the relationship between operations, safety, geometric deficiencies identified within the study area.

Ken Hirsch of URS outlined the structural analysis to date. As part of the existing conditions analysis, structural inspection reports were reviewed and summarized. He also explained the importance of understanding the existing structures once the alternative development phase of the study begins.

Ken Livingston of FHI discussed some of the environmental constraints identified for the existing conditions analysis; including noise, air quality, wetlands, and groundwater.

Mike Morehouse summarized some the issues identified in the existing conditions analysis and ended the formal portion of the presentation.

## Questions/Comments:

Carmine Trotta summarized the study to date and requested input from the committee.

1. Question: City Planning Department – one of the issues for the City was the interchange. Particularly, rebuilding of the interchange/greenway/transportation corridor design/development. Are there opportunities to connect locations as part of this project?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – the study will be looking at improving bicycle/pedestrian connections as a component of any interchange reconstruction alternative.

2. Comment: Peter Dorpalen – The COG is working with the City to provide a greenway. Connector road between Meadow Street and West Main Street. The objectives of the study seem to be on target. Connections to Downtown to and from I-84 are important. I-84 is a visual and mental barrier for the City. Connections south of I-84 will be beneficial.
3. Question: Will you be doing further analysis of environmental conditions? There are areas of critical concern including Brownfield areas, redevelopment areas, and open areas adjacent to redevelopment areas.

Answer: Mike Morehouse – The AC should review the environmental inventory in the Existing and Future Conditions Report and identify anything that might have been omitted or in error. If redevelopment areas are under consideration by the City or by private developers, please relate that information back to us.

4. Question: Huntington Avenue is also a major through traffic route to Waterbury. Why doesn't the study area extend to Huntington Avenue? Is it possible to redefine the study area?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – The study area was defined in coordination with the DOT, the City, and the COG. We needed to limit the study area so that it isn't too broad. Having said that, we will not ignore issues that might be contributing to the safety and operation of the interchange area if they are outside of the defined study area.

Answer #2: Jim Morrin of ConnDOT explained that the primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the Route 8/I-84 Interchange and its connections to Downtown Waterbury. The study team felt that the existing limits were appropriate for that purpose.

5. Question: What is the life span of the eastbound bridge over Naugatuck River?

Answer: Mike Morehouse/Ken Hinsch - In the next phase of this study, we will be determining how long we can cost effectively maintain the structure over the next 25 years. Bridge structures are constantly being monitored and repaired by ConnDOT and they can last a very long time; however, the cost to maintain them increases as they get older.

6. Comment: Carmine Trotta provided further clarification of the DOT widening of two lanes to three lanes. There is a project under design and underway currently to widen east of Interchange 23 to Southington. Environmental analysis is underway for the section between Interchange 18 and the New York state line.

7. Comment: One of the outcomes should be to reconfigure existing layout of ramps, particularly eliminating the left-hand ramps.

8. Question: Has there been consideration of fatigue of the bridge based on growth in traffic volumes?

Answer: Ken Hinsch – High traffic volume and truck volume does increase the fatigue cycle and that is monitored regularly by ConnDOT.

9. Question: What is the best way to provide comments?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – Please summarize your comments in a memo or email form and send to either me or Jim Morrin at ConnDOT. You can also find an email address on the project website ([www.i84wins.com](http://www.i84wins.com)) or call the toll free project number at 1-800-786-2191.

Jim Morrin summarized the studies previously completed for this area that are adjacent to the I-84/Route 8 Interchange. Interchanges 13 – 18 were studied, and several short-term recommendations are planned, including Interchanges 17/18, which are currently in design. He indicated that connection and circulation issues within Waterbury will definitely be considered as part of the alternatives development process.

# **REPORT OF MEETING**

Project: I-84/Route 8 Interchange Study

Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2006

Time: 4:00 P.M.

Location: Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce, Waterbury

**Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #2, Development of Alternatives Report Review**

In Attendance:

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Represented at April 18 Meeting</b>
Waterbury Aldermen	
Engineering Department	x
Public Works Department	x
City Hall	
U.S. Army Corps Engineers – New England District	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Department of Economic and Community Development	x
Department of Environmental Protection	x
Office of Policy and Management	
U.S. EPA, Region 1	
Federal Transit Administration	
Greater Waterbury Transit District	x
Northeast Transportation	
Housatonic Valley Association	
Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce	x
Country Club Neighborhood Association	
Bunker Hill Neighborhood	
Brooklyn Neighborhood Association	
Crownbrook Neighborhood Association	
Town Plot Neighborhood Association	
Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments	x
State Historic Preservation Officer	
Rideworks	x
Department of Public Safety	
FHWA	x
Main Street Waterbury	
Waterbury Mayor's Office	
NVDC	

## Meeting/Presentation Summary:

Jim Morrin of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) began the meeting by welcoming members of the committee. Mike Morehouse of Wilbur Smith Associates then gave a presentation on the preliminary transportation alternatives that had been developed as part of the study. In his presentation, Mike Morehouse gave a brief summary of the deficiencies within the study area and then described the five preliminary alternatives that had been developed. He then talked about the screening process used in choosing a recommended alternative for future analysis. After the presentation, Advisory Committee members offered comments and opinions.

## Questions/Comments:

1. Question: John Lawlor – Were local trips considered as part of this study? What impact would the preliminary alternatives have on local traffic?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – Yes, the percentage of total trips that are local trips were obtained from the travel demand model. The ConnDOT diverted traffic to local roads as part of traffic diversion analysis for each of the preliminary transportation alternatives.

Answer #2: Jim Morrin – Traffic was assigned to local roads when developing the preliminary alternatives.

2. Question: Katharine Zatkowski– Whenever there is an accident on I-84 and I have had to use local roads to get to my destination, I end up encountering more traffic congestion on the local roads. Can the signals on the local roads be programmed such they would be able to handle the influx of traffic in the event of an accident on I-84?

Answer: Jim Morrin – Yes, it can be done but it would be more difficult if you have to consider traffic signals in different towns along the local road.

3. Question: - What are the sources of funding particularly for the transit/bus circulator system?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – We will show the sources of funding in the next phase of this study.

4. Comment: John Lawlor – We should really look at enhancing connections for local traffic so that people living in Waterbury would not have to get on the highway in order to get to the downtown area.

# REPORT OF MEETING

Project: I-84/Route 8 Waterbury Interchange Study

Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2007

Time: 4:00 P.M.

Location: Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce, Waterbury

**Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #3, Refinement of Alternatives**

In Attendance:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Present at Meeting</b>
J. Paul Vance, Jr.,	Waterbury Aldermen	
Mr. John Lawlor	Engineering Department	x
Mr. James A. Sequin	Engineering Department	
Colonel Thomas Koning	U.S. Army Corps Engineers – New England District	
Mr. Greg Mannesto	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
Mr. Chet Camarata	Department of Economic and Community Development	x
Honorable Jane Stahl	U.S. EPA, Region 1	
Mr. Philip Smith	Office of Policy and Management	
Mr. Robert Varney	U.S. EPA, Region I	
Mr. Richard H. Doyle	Federal Transit Administration	
Mrs. Yvonne Smith-Isaac	Greater Waterbury Transit District	x
Joseph Spina	Northeast Transportation	
Ms. Elaine LaBella	Housatonic Valley Association	
Mr. Steve Sasala	Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce	
Mr. Carl Breiner	Country Club Neighborhood Association	
Ms. Kathleen McNamara	Waterbury Development Corporation	x
Ms. Lisa Velez	Brooklyn Community Club	
Mr. Joe Savoy	Town Plot Neighborhood Association	
Mr. Peter Dorpalen	Central Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (COGNV)	x
Mr. Paul Loether,	State Historic Preservation	
Ms. Katharine Zatkowski	Rideworks	x
Lt. Edward Gould	Department of Public Safety	
Robert W. Turner	FHWA, CT-DIV	
Carl Rosa	Main Street Waterbury	x
Ms. Sheila O'Malley	Waterbury Mayor's Office	
Lieutenant Thomas Begert	U.S. Army Corps Engineers – New England District	

## **Meeting/Presentation Summary:**

Carmine Trotta of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) opened the meeting by welcoming members of the Advisory Committee and introduced Mr. Morehouse.

Mr. Morehouse of Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA) began the presentation by giving a progress report of the study to date. He gave a brief history of the steps that had been undertaken in developing the three conceptual alternatives (Alternatives 6, 7 and 8). He also talked about the need to further refine the three conceptual alternatives into a final preferred alternative.

Mr. Morehouse gave an overview of the three conceptual alternatives highlighting their differences and similarities. He then went on to discuss the criteria used in evaluating the three conceptual alternatives. Mike explained that the three alternatives were assessed and ranked in terms of traffic operations, travel paths, highway standards, environmental impacts, cost and constructability.

Mr. Morehouse then said that based on the evaluation of the three conceptual alternatives, it was recommended that Conceptual Alternative 6 be advanced to the next phase of the project as a near term, low impact/cost, improvement while Conceptual Alternative 8 be advanced as a long term full-build improvement. Mike Morehouse then opened the meeting for comments and questions from the committee.

## **Questions/Comments:**

1. Comment: Did the study include economic impact to the City of Waterbury in the Cost/Benefit analysis? It is important that economic impact be included in the Cost/Benefit Analysis. 2.75% inflation seems too low, do not know what should be used but a higher percentage would be more appropriate.

Answer: Mike Morehouse – No, the study did not look at that.

2. Comment: It should be considered that some of the benefits in Alternative 7 were higher than Alternative 8.
3. Question: What is the potential for building either of the Full Build Alternatives? What is the percent of funding Federal versus State? Where does project rank with other projects in terms of priority?

Answer: Carmen Trotta – There is potential for the project to be built. It may take at least five years to see any step in that direction since there are a number of steps that have to be undertaken such as a CEPA and NEPA

processes. About 80 percent of project may be funded by the Federal Government and 20 percent by the State.

4. Comment: It is important to distinguish cost/benefits and factor in economic impact. Bridges should be wide enough to encourage pedestrian activity. Existing bridges are too narrow and dark.
5. Comment: I would be in support of Conceptual Alternative 8 provided the Connecticut Department of Transportation considers buying that whole parcel of land to be impacted by Alternative 8.
6. Comment: It seems that St. Anne's Church is referred to in a flippant manner in this study. There should be careful consideration on how St. Anne's Church is referred to in order to avoid negative attention.

Response: Mike Morehouse – The reference was made to identify the Church as a resource to be preserved.

7. Comment: There is a need for an Economic Impact Study between the alternatives before a choice can be made on a final preferred alternative.

Response: Michael Morehouse – Is that something that the City would undertake?

8. Comment: Highlight new Transportation Center as a high priority and incorporate into transit schemes.
9. Comment: For Alternative 8, it is important to know what land is left for development and how land would be secured for development. An agreement between the City and State should be in place that spells out how eminent domain and relocations would be accomplished.
10. Question: What portions of 6 will be incorporated in Alternatives 7 and 8?

Answer: Michael Morehouse – Alternative 6 is seen as a near term improvement and so would be incorporated in Alternatives 7 and 8 with as little throwaway as possible.

11. Comment: It will not be easy to relocate industrial uses under Alternative 8. Could an economic study be preliminarily considered?
12. Comment: Consider widening South Main to facilitate local traffic flow.
13. Question: Who are the potential stakeholders missing from this meeting? A final preferred alternative should not be chosen until a public informational meeting is held.

Answer: Mike Morehouse – That was not the intention of this meeting.

14. Comment: It would be important to show a schematic staging of the construction of Alternatives 7 and 8 to assess their impact.
15. Question: Were delays to local traffic during construction of alternatives factored into the cost estimates?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – That was not considered.

16. Question: What is the best way to provide comments?

Answer: Mike Morehouse – Comments can be sent to either me or Jim Morrin at ConnDOT. You can also find an email address on the project website ([www.i84wins.com](http://www.i84wins.com))

# **REPORT OF MEETING**

Project: I-84/Route 8 Waterbury Interchange Study  
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2009  
Time: 4:00 P.M.  
Location: Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce, Waterbury  
**Subject: Advisory Committee Meeting #4**

---

## **In Attendance:**

Samuel Gold	- COGCNV
Carmine Trotta	- CTDOT-Planning
Judy Raymond	- CTDOT-Planning
Carl Rosa	- Main Street Waterbury
Jeffrey Rouleau	- Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce
Kathy McNamara	- Waterbury Development Corporation
Sgt. Brian Van Ness	- Connecticut State Police
Frederick Riese	- Department of Environmental Protection
Ron Sacchi	- URS Corporation
Katherine Zatkowski	- RIDEWORKS
James Morrin	- CTDOT-Planning
Edwin Rodriguez	- Loyola Development
Terry Caldarone	- Mayor's Office
Peter Dorpalen	- COGCNV
Ken Livingston	- Fitzgerald & Haddiday, Inc.
J. Paul Vance Jr.	- Board of Alderman
Jim Sequin	- City of Waterbury Planning
Stan McMillen	- DECD
Dave Stahnke	- Wilbur Smith Associates
Kwesi Brown	- Wilbur Smith Associates

## **Meeting/Presentation Summary:**

Jim Morrin of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) opened the meeting by welcoming members of the Advisory Committee. He introduced Dave Stahnke from Wilbur Smith Associates and Stan McMillen from the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) as fellow presenters for the evening.

Mr. Morrin outlined the meeting agenda and detailed the background of the study as well as the work that has been done to date. He briefly described the five preliminary alternatives that were initially developed during the study screening process and used in developing the three conceptual improvement alternatives that remain.

Dave Stahnke then provided an overview of the three conceptual improvement alternatives (Alternatives 6, 7 and 8), highlighting their differences as well as their similarities. He explained the ranking exercise that had been undertaken during the refinement of conceptual alternatives stage of the study. He indicated that Alternative 8 obtained the highest score, based on the results of the ranking exercise. He stated that the preliminary recommendation from the refinement of alternatives stage of the study was to advance Alternative 6 as the near term improvement and Alternative 8 as the long term improvement. He highlighted the need to choose a preferred alternative to advance to the next phase of the study.

Stan McMillen from the DECD then gave an overview of the approach used in the economic development study. He discussed the REMI model that was used in the analysis and then presented the fiscal and economic results of the study. Dr. McMillen indicated that the results of the study showed that both the fiscal and economic benefits of Alternative 6/8 are expected to be better than Alternative 6/7.

Dave Stahnke then concluded the presentation by making the point that the DECD study supported WSA's preliminary recommendation to advance Alternative 6 as the near term improvement and Alternative 8 as the preferred long term improvement. He discussed the next steps for the study, as detailed in the presentation, and requested that comments be submitted by February 20, 2009. He then opened the floor for discussion.

### **Questions and Comments:**

- 1) Question: If constructability was not included as a ranking criteria, would Alternative 8 still be the preferred alternative?

Response - Dave Stahnke: Yes, the other ranking criteria show that Alternative 8 is a better option.

- 2) Question: Alternative 8 is ranked higher than Alternative 7 but the cost of the two is about the same. Why is this so?

Response - Dave Stahnke: The cost estimates of the alternatives are very preliminary and have changed considerably since they were originally compiled. The relative difference between the two is not substantial.

- 3) Question: Will the alternatives be refined before a decision on a preferred alternative is made?

Response - Dave Stahnke: We are hoping that the committee and stakeholders can support a decision on an Alternative before refinement is undertaken.

Response - Jim Morrin: It may seem as if both Alternative 7 and 8 are comparable, but we feel from a constructability and traffic maintenance perspective, Alternative 8 is the better option.

- 4) Question: Why is the highway footprint illustrated in the DECD report for Alternative 8 smaller than Alternative 7?

Response - Stan McMillen: That was the footprint that was obtained from the CADD plans of the conceptual alternatives.

- 5) Question: Under Alternative 8, do you think that people will be reluctant to undertake any development in the area where the new Route 8 highway is proposed knowing that a highway will be coming through that area?

Response - Stan McMillen: People should not have to wait. Under Alternative 8, there are other parcels that will be available for development prior to highway construction.

- 6) Question: If we go with Alternative 8, how long will it take for the land where the Route 8 currently passes be available for development?

Response - Dave Stahnke: You will have to wait for the new Route 8 to be built and the old Route 8 removed, before that land becomes available.

Response - Stan McMillen: There are properties on the east side that can be developed during construction so developers do not have to wait.

- 7) Question: Is it for sure that the Maloney Magnet School will not be impacted?

Response - Stan McMillen: From the plans it seems that the Magnet School will not be touched.

Response - Jim Morrin: That is going to be part of the refinement process to make sure that the Magnet School is not impacted.

- 8) Question: Why does the Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) have a positive impact on employment on New Haven County but a negative impact on the State?

Response - Stan McMillen: Providing more access attracts more people who may not be employed or fully employed (economic migrants), which leads to increased population and increased demand on public services. Therefore for the State, the ITC will have a small but negative differential impact on public sector employment. Also, the debt service that will be incurred by the State in bonding for the ITC accounts for the small but negative differential impact on public service.

- 9) Question: For Alternative 6-7 No Build (Scenario 1), you are gaining jobs from 1,589 jobs to 1,632 jobs. I take it that those gained jobs will be outside the developable land area?

Response - Stan McMillen: Yes, there is no buildout, so jobs will be gained in the surrounding towns in New Haven County but not the City of Waterbury.

10) Question: Will it make any difference if you run the model for other Connecticut Counties?

Response - Stan McMillen: We ran the model for 8 other counties, but the impact on those other counties was minimal.

11) Question: Is the difference in GRP with and without the ITC because of the capital improvements made?

Response - Stan McMillen: Yes, because you are providing increased access to the area.

12) Question: What level of service did you consider for the ITC?

Response - Stan McMillen: We assumed there would be three (3) to 4 trains during rush hour. Each train will have about 7 to 8 cars.

13) Comment: The fact that Alternative 8 provides increased access to the highway and downtown is in itself an economic benefit but this point is not emphasized enough in the report.

14) Question: Did you conduct a no-build economic analysis for Alternative 8 as in Alternative 7 so you can compare apples to apples?

Response - Stan McMillen: You will not be comparing apples to apples if you do that, since in Alternative 8, you will be losing land under a no-build scenario.

15) Question: Did you consider environmental remediation in the economic study?

Response - Stan McMillen: Yes, \$150 million was used as a placeholder.

16) Question: Will the EIS include an economic impact component?

Response - Carmine Trotta: Yes, an EIS can include an economic component.

17) Question: If a decision is made for a preferred alternative, when does all the work get started?

Response - Carmine Trotta: It is going to take a while. The EIS phase will last say, 3 years. The environment design phase will last for about 5 years and actual construction about 10-15 years.

18) Question: Is it possible that Alternative 6 can be broken up into smaller projects so that you will not require an EIS?

Response - Dave Stahnke: Yes, parts of Alternative 6 such as the signal timing and signage improvements will not require an EIS.

19) Question: Will funding for Alternative 6 components outside the highway be funded by the Federal Highway Authority?

Response - Carmine Trotta: I am hoping that FHWA will finance it but I can't tell you for sure. I believe that if it can be demonstrated that Alternative 6 would highway operations or be a component to a Traffic management strategy during construction, FHWA may support financing. It would have to be discussed as the recommendation is further developed.

20) Question: Are the new local streets going to be State or City Streets?

Response - Jim Morrin: They would be City Streets.

21) Question: So the way things stand now on this study, who are you waiting for a response from to move the study to the next phase?

Response - Carmine Trotta: The Advisory Committee.

22) Question: How what it determined that 1,500 jobs would be created with the build scenarios?

Response – Stan McMillen: The number is based upon my judgment. There are a number of unknowns, so assumptions had to be made in order to make a relative comparison between the alternatives. This number can be changed given additional information.

22) Question: What is the timeline for the completion of this study?

Response – Jim Morrin: We would like to begin refinement of a preferred alternative as soon as possible. It will help if we receive feedback from the Committee and City on the preferred alternative.

Response - Carmine Trotta: We hope to complete this study by the summer of 2009.

23) Question: What is the next step if the Advisory Committee or City does not respond with a preferred alternative?

Response – Carmine Trotta: The Department plans to continue towards completing this study with a preferred recommendation.