

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Client: | Southeast Connecticut Council of Governments (SCCOG) | Date: | May 23, 2023 |
| Meeting Date: | May 23, 2023 | Prepared By: | Joe Rimiller, PE, PTOE |
| Meeting Location: | Microsoft Teams | Job Number: | 10369 |
| Meeting Topic: | Route 161 Corridor Study – Advisory Committee Meeting #10 | | |

ATTENDEES:

| NAME | ADDRESS / AFFILIATION |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Joe Rimiller | BETA Group |
| James Butler | SCCOG |
| Amanda Kennedy | SCCOG |
| Kate Rattan | SCCOG |
| Fred Kulakowski | CTDOT, Traffic Engineering Operations |
| Kevin McKernan | CTDOT PDU |
| Gary Sojka | CTDOT Planning |
| Kevin Seery | Town of East Lyme 1 st Selectman |

RECORD OF MEETING MINUTES:

The Route 161 Corridor Study Advisory Committee convened for a meeting via Microsoft Teams. The following items were discussed:

1. Recap of Public Meeting #2
 - a. Feedback from public meeting participants (and subsequent requests received through the project website):
 - i. Conflicting comments were received pertaining to the bike lanes at the south end of the corridor. One comment suggested rerouting the bike lane down Hope Street to avoid conflicts with on-street parking whereas another highlighted the importance of keeping bikes on the Route 161 corridor with access to businesses. It is anticipated that the recommendation will remain to continue the bike lanes all the way to Route 156. There is a recommendation to install additional on-street parking spaces on Hope Street. Hope Street would not be able to accommodate both bike lanes and on-street parking due to geometric constraints.
 - ii. Multiple residents requested that additional traffic calming measures be provided between Roxbury Road and Society Road. A recommendation for speed feedback signs is already included. Incorporating additional traffic calming measures is challenging due to the roadway being a State-owned arterial, limited right-of-way, challenging terrain, and utility conflicts. BETA suggested an additional recommendation be incorporated to replace existing 4" wide shoulder markings with 6" wide markings. A 2013 FHWA study indicated that this treatment had a high cost/benefit ratio on two-lane highways in rural

- areas. It could also help reduce bike/ped crashes and crashes involving older drivers. DOT has tested this treatment on Routes 53 and 57 in Weston and didn't see an issue with including the recommendation in the plan.
- iii. Residents who live near the East Pattagansett Road intersection expressed concern that converting the signalized intersection to a roundabout would eliminate some of the gaps in traffic that they rely on to make left turns out of driveways. Voting on the proposed roundabout versus signal improvement alternatives was tied at 19 votes apiece. BETA indicated that the elimination of gaps is a legitimate concern for residents who live south of the intersection but those north of the intersection would still benefit from gaps at the Roxbury Road signal which would remain. BETA suggested that the signal improvement alternative be advanced as the preferred option but the roundabout be included in the draft report as a potential alternative. SCCOG suggested highlighting the traffic calming benefit of the roundabout as slower speeds would help facilitate turns from driveways.
 - iv. Bicyclists who attended the meeting indicated that they would not be likely to utilize the proposed alternative bike route along Roxbury Road, Riverview Road, and Society Road as the terrain is challenging and it is too far out of the way. Providing bike lanes or a shared use path between Roxbury Road and Society Road does not appear to be feasible due to various constraints. BETA is examining recommending a 6' wide sidewalk in this area rather than the standard 5' wide sidewalk. A wider sidewalk could better accommodate bicyclists. Mr. Seery indicated that Town regulations do permit bicyclists to use the sidewalk.
 - v. Residents expressed concern with relocating the Cartier Optical driveway to Chapman Woods Road because the roadway is privately owned. Rather than remove the recommendation it will be noted as an improvement that would require an agreement between the Town and residential association. Mr. Goeschel commented that a similar recommendation had been voted on in the past and the relocation was narrowly voted down.
 - vi. Residents expressed concern that the proposed bus shelter on the east side of the corridor at Chapman Woods Road would obstruct sight distances. Sight distance restrictions can be avoided. Regrading and new sidewalk to be reconstructed under the Interchange 74 project will help with implementation of the shelter.
- b. Voting for preferred alternatives – Residents were asked to vote on a preferred alternative at four locations where multiple alternatives were presented. Results of the voting (including in person voting and votes received through the online survey) are summarized below:
- i. Route 161/East Pattagansett Road
 - 1. Roundabout – 19 (5 meeting, 14 online survey)
 - 2. Traffic Signal Replacement – 19 (2 meeting, 17 online survey)
 - ii. Gorton Pond

1. Concrete Sidewalk - 26 votes (19 meeting, 7 online survey)
 2. Timber Boardwalk – 9 votes (0 meeting, 9 online survey)
 - iii. Society Road to Industrial Park Road
 1. Shared Use Path – 22 votes (8 meeting, 14 online survey)
 2. Buffered Bike Lanes – 7 votes (5 meeting, 2 online survey)
 - iv. U.S. Route 1 to East Lyme High School
 1. Shared Use Path – 18 votes (5 meeting, 13 online survey)
 2. Buffered Bike Lanes – 5 votes (2 meeting, 3 online survey)
2. Draft Final Report Outline
 - a. Introduction
 - i. Project Background
 - ii. Definition of Segments
 - iii. Implementation (Short/Medium/Long Term)
 - b. Recommendations
 - i. Summarized by segment with corresponding maps
 - ii. Include discussion of potential impacts and constraints
 - c. Permitting Analysis
 - d. Access Management Plan
 - i. General discuss of access management strategies with maps
 - e. Construction Cost Estimates
 - f. Implementation/Funding Sources
3. Next Steps – Target Dates for Draft Final Report
 - a. June 19th – Submit draft report to SCCOG
 - b. June 21st – Distribute draft report to Advisory Committee
 - c. June 30th – Advisory Committee comments on draft report due
 - d. July 12th – Incorporate comments and post updated draft report online. Issue press release and e-mail contacts with notification that 30 day comment period has begun.
 - e. August 11th – 30 day public comments period closes
 - f. August 30th – Incorporate public comments as appropriate and submit final report
4. Next/Final Advisory Committee Meeting – June 27th