

**Department of Transportation  
Project No. 56-296  
Rehabilitation of Bridge No. 00017  
Lockwood Lane over Interstate Route 95  
Town of Greenwich**

**December 9, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.  
Eastern Greenwich Civic Center, Greenwich**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

**Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT or Department)**

Bartholomew P. Sweeney, Transportation Supervising Engineer  
Mary E. Baker, Transportation Engineer  
Roger Thomas, District 3 Construction  
Robert W. Ike, Rights of Way

**Close, Jensen and Miller, P.C. (CJM)**

Mark F. Levesque, Project Engineer

**Presentation:**

CTDOT's Mary Baker and CJM's Mark Levesque presented the following information:

- Mary Baker began the meeting by describing CTDOT's responsibility for initiating and implementing projects, CJM's role as Consultant Liaison Engineers, and the project goals.
- Ms. Baker summarized the existing Bridge No. 00017 and described the reasons for the project. She noted that the existing bridge is structurally deficient due to the deteriorated condition of the concrete deck. The bridge is posted for a minimum vertical clearance of 13'-11" over Interstate Route 95 (I-95), and has some evidence of previous vehicular impacts to the steel beams. The load rating of the existing bridge is below the current minimum standards. The existing approach guide railing and protective fence do not meet current safety standards.
- Mark Levesque described the proposed construction, which involves the replacement of the superstructure with shallower high strength steel beams and a reinforced concrete deck with a bituminous concrete overlay on a raised roadway profile over the bridge to increase the vertical clearance above I-95. The substructure is to remain, but will be modified to accommodate the raised superstructure. New approach guide railing and protective fence will be installed that conforms to current standards.

- Mr. Levesque described the proposed method to construct the bridge. He noted that the bridge will be constructed utilizing a full detour. The detour will redirect traffic over Riverside Avenue instead of Lockwood Lane. The benefits of using a detour versus stage construction were presented, which included shorter construction duration, reduced cost versus stage construction, better quality of construction, and more access area for the Contractor during construction.
- Mr. Levesque continued with a synopsis of project impacts with respect to Public Utilities.
- As it is anticipated that the project will require temporary and permanent easements, Mr. Robert Ike gave a brief overview of the Rights-of-Way process.
- Ms. Baker concluded the presentation with statements of the anticipated project cost, funding and schedule. The cost is currently estimated at \$6,750,000 for the entire project of which 80% will be Federal funds and 20% will be State funds. Construction is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2012 and be completed in the fall of 2013. The schedule is preliminary and predicated upon the availability of funding.

#### **Public Comments and Questions:**

Residents had some general questions about the possible property impacts as a result of the proposed construction and the Rights-of-Way process. Mr. Ike and CTDOT/CJM staff responded to these concerns and noted that impacts to private property is anticipated to be limited to temporary and permanent easements only. Other general questions about the construction duration and cost were answered by CTDOT/CJM staff. Specific questions were as follows:

A resident questioned whether an incentive clause could be added to the project in which the Contractor would earn additional money for each day the project is completed prior to the original project completion date.

*Ms. Baker noted that most Department projects contain only a disincentive clause for which a Contractor is fined for each day a project extends beyond its original project completion date. Mr. Sweeney stated that CTDOT will explore the possibility of offering incentive clauses in this project due to the desire to remove the detour as quickly as possible.*

A resident questioned why the proposed bridge rehabilitation project does not accommodate future I-95 widening.

*Mr. Sweeney responded that all projects are reviewed by the Department's Planning group to ensure there are no conflicts with other projects. There are currently no plans for widening of I-95 in this area. Mr. Levesque noted that removing and replacing piers adjacent to I-95 to accommodate future widening would cause substantial disruptions to I-95 traffic versus those caused by the minor modifications to the existing piers to accommodate the shallower beams and raised bridge roadway for the proposed project.*

A resident asked if the Riverside Avenue bridge was in similar condition to Lockwood Lane bridge since they were both constructed at the same time and if the Riverside Avenue bridge was safe to carry the increased traffic as a result of the proposed detour.

*Ms. Baker responded that she had reviewed the most recent inspection report for the Riverside Avenue bridge and all major items were rated in fair or satisfactory condition. She also checked the load rating for the bridge and it is capable of carrying all legal loads.*

A resident questioned whether more than one detour route could be utilized during construction to reduce the number of cars that would be redirected over Riverside Avenue during construction.

*Mr. Sweeney responded that the Department typically does not offer multiple detour routes and will only offer one route for each direction of traffic. He added that local residents usually find alternate routes to avoid the closed bridge, but these alternate routes are not signed by the Department.*

A resident noted that once the detour is established, residents in the Riverside neighborhood near Lockwood Lane who wish to travel east would probably use Sound Beach Avenue instead of Riverside Avenue to cross I-95. She noted that the intersection of Lockwood Road and Sound Beach Avenue is particularly dangerous for motorists that intend on taking a left turn onto Sound Beach Avenue from Lockwood Avenue. She questioned whether anything could be done to this intersection, such as installing four way stop signs to make it safer for all vehicles during construction.

*CTDOT stated that the detour route would have to be reviewed and approved by the Town of Greenwich, since the detour route uses town roads. A detour checklist that reviews many aspects of a proposed detour route, including items such as signal timing revisions to traffic signals along the detour route, a check of the roadway geometry of the roads along detour route, clearance or weight restrictions for any bridges on the detour route among others, would be completed prior to the bridge closure to ensure the detour route is safe to handle the additional traffic. Any improvements to intersections or roadways that are not along the detour route would be the responsibility of the town of Greenwich.*

A resident questioned whether a fire standpipe would be installed on the new bridge. Another resident asked what was being done with emergency vehicles since response times will increase if a detour is implemented.

*CTDOT responded that the Greenwich Fire and Police Departments will be contacted and asked to review the detour for emergency access. The Fire Department will need to formally request CTDOT to include a standpipe on the bridge.*

A resident inquired about the Leonard Avenue access from Lockwood Lane. She asked if it would be closed at all during construction. She noted that there is a daycare located across the street from Leonard Avenue on Lockwood Lane and Leonard Avenue is used for parking during drop off and pick up for the daycare. Another resident stated that it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to use Pleasant Street to access Leonard Avenue due to its geometry and width.

*CTDOT responded that it appears the Leonard Avenue access needs to be closed at least temporarily during certain construction operations. It would be beneficial to the Contractor if it could be closed throughout construction since it would allow the Contractor to utilize this section of Lockwood Lane as a staging area. In addition, since the roadway profile is being raised, this portion of Lockwood Lane and the end of Leonard Avenue may be within the limits of full depth reconstruction and may need to be closed during this phase of construction. If this Leonard Avenue access from Lockwood Lane is essential, then the Contractor can be limited to closing Leonard Avenue from Lockwood Lane only during certain operations that could be spelled out in the construction contract. At all other times, it would remain open. This will be reviewed further and subsequently discussed with the City.*

David Thompson of the town of Greenwich commented about the pedestrian access during construction. Children that live north of U.S. Route 1 that walk to school use the bridge to cross I-95 to get to the elementary and middle schools located on Hendrie Avenue. The proposed detour route would be too long for these children to walk back and forth to school. He questioned what the options were for these children during construction.

*Mr. Levesque stated that the width of the existing bridge would allow for one of the sidewalks to remain open during construction, if necessary. The roadway on the bridge is currently 30 feet wide from curb to curb and there are two 10-foot wide sidewalks on the bridge. If the bridge was closed to vehicular traffic and only one of the sidewalks was closed, the Contractor would reconstruct the closed portion, building the travelway and one of the new sidewalks. Upon completion of this portion, the bridge would be opened up to vehicular traffic and pedestrians would use the newly constructed sidewalk to cross the bridge. The other sidewalk would then be reconstructed. The construction duration would increase as well as the cost since the Contractor would have two separate work operations, including demolition, substructure modifications, steel erections, and concrete pours.*

*One other option is to close the sidewalks to block pedestrian access across the bridge during construction, and bus the students that currently walk across the bridge. The preferred option is to close the bridge to vehicles and pedestrians. Once options regarding pedestrian access are further evaluated, we will contact the Town of Greenwich Board of Education to arrange a meeting to discuss this issue.*

**Adjournment:** The Public Information Meeting ended at approximately 8:45 p.m.