

**Connecticut Department of Transportation  
State Project No. 0106-0108  
Federal-Aid Project No. 0001(309) PE**

**US Route 1 Operational Lane  
Town of Orange**

**Minutes of Virtual Public Information Meeting  
Thursday, December 15, 2022 – 7:00 pm  
Virtually via Zoom**

**REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:**

Michelle Saldana, CTDOT, [Michelle.Saldana@ct.gov](mailto:Michelle.Saldana@ct.gov)  
Michael S. Cherpak, CTDOT, [Michael.Cherpak@ct.gov](mailto:Michael.Cherpak@ct.gov)  
Brian J. Natwick, CTDOT, [Brian.Natwick@ct.gov](mailto:Brian.Natwick@ct.gov)  
Zachary Guarino, CTDOT, [Zachary.Guarino@ct.gov](mailto:Zachary.Guarino@ct.gov)  
Dominick J. Celtruda, BL Companies, [dceltruda@blcompanies.com](mailto:dceltruda@blcompanies.com)  
Robert Gomez, VN Engineers, [rgomez@vnengineers.com](mailto:rgomez@vnengineers.com)  
Chris Van Zanten, VN Engineers, [cvanzanten@vnengineers.com](mailto:cvanzanten@vnengineers.com)  
Robert F. Smoko, STV Inc., [Robert.Smoko@stvinc.com](mailto:Robert.Smoko@stvinc.com)  
Timothy J. Kennedy, STV Inc., [Timothy.Kennedy@stvinc.com](mailto:Timothy.Kennedy@stvinc.com)  
Michael J. Oliver, STV Inc., [Michael.Oliver@stvinc.com](mailto:Michael.Oliver@stvinc.com)

**PURPOSE OF THE MEETING:**

A public informational meeting was held on Thursday December 15, 2022, virtually on Zoom with the purpose of providing the public an opportunity to learn about the proposed project and allow for comments concerning the proposed improvements.

The purpose of the project is to provide a center two-way left-turn lane along US Route 1, from the vicinity of Lambert Road to the Milford town line, to provide better traffic flow, reduce crashes and improve business access. The meeting was kicked off by Dominick Celtruda, BL Companies, who introduced the project to be presented by the design team and provided instructions and discussed the virtual meeting housekeeping items.

Michael Oliver, STV Inc., followed up by introducing the design team, identifying the project limits, purpose and need of the project, and a brief description of the project history.

Robert Gomez, VN Engineers, presented the existing traffic conditions including traffic volumes, typical vehicle speeds, and crash history within the project limits. Mr. Gomez proceeded to present a detailed walkthrough of the proposed roadway configuration and discuss the various improvements within the project limits. Some of the improvements noted include the addition of a center operational lane, driveway connections, widening of shoulders to 4-feet, new traffic signals at the intersections of Peck Lane and Orange Center Road, installation four new bus shelters, and sidewalks connecting the shelters to the nearby intersections.

Timothy Kennedy, STV Inc., presented the rehabilitation of existing culvert, Bridge No. 1881, within the project limits near the Michael's Jewelers and Exxon Mobil properties, and discussed the proposed rehabilitation measures. These measures include the addition of retaining walls and moment slabs to facilitate the roadway widening.

Mr. Kennedy also discussed the existing utilities within the project limits and the measures being taken during the design phase to eliminate any potential utility conflicts during construction. Subsequently, the Right-Of-Way (ROW) impacts associated with the proposed work was discussed.

Zachary Guarino, CTDOT, followed up by presenting the Connecticut Department of Transportation's ROW acquisition process for property owners.

Mr. Gomez, then presented the staged construction sequence for the project, consisting of three lanes of traffic during construction, one lane northbound, one lane southbound, and a center operational (left-turning) lane. He stated construction will be completed in three stages, Stage 1 shifts traffic to the East Side of Route 1 to construct the West Side, Stage 2 flips the traffic to the West Side to construct the East Side, and finally Stage 3 will resurface the remaining existing roadway throughout single lane night closures.

Mr. Oliver discussed the project schedule with design completion in Spring of 2023, construction starting Spring of 2024, with a construction duration of 2 years.

To conclude the presentation, Mr. Oliver in combination with Michael Cherpak, CTDOT, discussed the level of bicycle and pedestrian improvements proposed within the project limits. The discussion included mentioning the project history, where the original design was undertaken in the mid-1990's where installation of sidewalks was not a part of the CTDOT standard practice. Generally speaking, the CTDOT has since changed its design approach for pedestrian facilities. It was mentioned that an investigation was performed to determine the cost, ROW, utility, and schedule impacts associated with the installation of the sidewalks. Mr. Cherpak concluded the presentation stating that CTDOT is actively looking for the public's feedback on whether or not the level of bicycle and pedestrian improvements included under this project is sufficient.

### **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION:**

There were approximately 17 attendees present on the Zoom live event. A live Question and Answer (Q&A) session followed the presentation. The YouTube livestream was not functioning, but the Zoom meeting was recorded and posted to YouTube subsequent to the meeting for viewing by the public.

The following questions were asked in the live Q&A session:

#### **1. Question No 1. – Chat Question**

- a. **Question:** An early slide shows 2 lanes exiting Peck Lane on the North side to Rte. 1. A later slide shows 3 lanes. Which is correct? I hope the 3 lanes.
- b. **Response:** Robert Gomez, VN Engineers, explained that Peck Lane will be widened and repaved with the proposed lane configuration adding one additional lane on the north and south sides of Peck Lane at the intersection of Route 1. On the south side of Peck Lane the lane configuration will consist of one left turn lane, one through lane, and a right turn lane traveling north and one lane traveling south, with the northern side consisting of one left turn lane and one through lane traveling south and one through lane traveling north.
- c. **Follow up Question:** The right side showed 3 lanes from Peck in a later slide I believe. Am I wrong?
- d. **Response:** Robert Gomez stated what is shown within the presentation is what is in the model of the roadway, which maintains two lanes heading in both directions on Peck

Lane but transitions wider at the intersection of Peck Lane and Route 1 to accommodate turning lanes. Mr. Gomez then stated that they may have been confused on what was shown on the screen as the image was rotated. Mr. Oliver proceeded to present the slide that shows the unrotated image and Mr. Gomez reiterated the lane configuration as noted above in section b.

- e. **Follow up Question:** Can you get 3 lanes from Peck Lane coming from the North as well as from the south? This is the source of significant congestion and 3 lanes (looks like there is room) would be a significant help.
- f. **Response:** Robert Gomez stated since that we are not 100% complete with design VN Engineers can look into this area and see if it's possible to add an additional lane and what the pros and cons may be with doing so.

## 2. **Question No. 2 – Chat Question**

- a. **Question:** Good evening and thank you for the presentation. Though the cost has been disclosed as ranging between \$15 and \$20 million, I assume that there must have been significant costs to get to this point. Are you able to disclose the accumulated costs?
- b. **Response:** The current design budget is \$4.35 million. This budget includes Department review and oversight expenses, and consultant engineering design fees dating back approximately fifteen years. Additionally, the budget includes the Department and consultant expenses for the design of breakout Project 106-122, the replacement of the U.S. Route 1 culvert at Silver Brook and the installation of the two-way left turn operation lane between the Lambert Road and Racebrook Road intersections.

## 3. **Question No. 3 – Chat Question**

- a. **Question:** Tim Kennedy, STV spoke about utility work, specifically the utility poles. It is my understanding UI is significantly behind with regard to their utility work. How will their backlog impact the project?
- b. **Response:** Michael Oliver responded that since the design began for Project No. 106-108, STV has engaged all of the utility companies within the project limits, and even more so with UI. We've had numerous coordination calls and field meeting with UI to coordinate the proposed pole relocations and we have their attention in regards to this project. The work required by UI to relocate these poles will be extensive with approximately 55 poles requiring relocation to accommodate the widening. Mr. Oliver also stated that the design team has gone through a robust test pit program to provide additional data for the relocation of the utility poles and have been actively communicating with UI. Timothy Kennedy, STV, added that we have been coordinating with UI extensively, and have been working with them closely to determine which poles do and do not require relocation. He stated that the design team developed a set of utility pole relocation plans, which have been reviewed by UI, that are used to determine proposed pole locations and identify any secondary conflicts that may arise when relocating poles. And in doing so, the design team has been working to mitigate any conflicts that may arise when relocating poles.

## 4. **Question No. 4 - Chat Question**

- a. **Question:** Are the UI poles scheduled to be relocated before the project starts?

- b. Response:* Michael Oliver stated that at this time there is no plan for a utility breakout for this project, but we have considered this option. Robert Gomez added that due the existing poles being very close to the edge of road, the first construction activity of this job will be relocating utility poles. Michael Oliver also added that an option being considered is to construct the northern side of Route 1 first, as this side contains far less utility poles, which allows UI to relocate poles on the south side of Route 1 while simultaneously constructing the north side of the project.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The attendees were encouraged to submit comments, pointing participants to the website (<https://portal.ct.gov/DOTOrange106-108>) which explains various methods of submittal. The comment period is open until January 11, 2023.

The project was generally well received by the attendees. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 pm.

Submitted By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 12/29/2022  
Michael Oliver, P.E.  
Project Manager  
STV, Inc.

Reviewed By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle Saldana  
Project Engineer  
Department of Transportation

Approved By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Brian J. Natwick  
Project Manager  
Department of Transportation