

Appendix 1.1

Summary of May/June 2010 Public Information Meetings

Summary of December 2011 Public Information Meetings

Summary of June 2012 Public Information Meetings

Summary of May/June 2010 Public Information Meetings

May 13, 2010 and June 29, 2010

Meeting Date and Location:

Thursday, May 13, 2010 at 7 p.m.
Andover Community Room, 17 School Road
Andover, CT

- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Jennifer Carrier.
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker, Casey Hardin.
- Meeting Format: The meeting was a combined public meeting for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor *Planning Project* (administered by REDC) and *Transportation Study* (administered by CRCOG). This meeting was the first of two public meetings that compose the first of three rounds of public meetings for the Transportation Study and the last round of meetings for the Planning Project.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on draft recommendations developed by LADA, P.C. for the Planning Project. The secondary purpose of the meeting was to introduce the public to the Transportation Study; present preliminary findings relative to safety, traffic operations, and traffic speeds in the corridor; and obtain input on public concerns relative to existing problem areas and safety issues.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by LADA and CRCOG/CHA was preceded and followed by an open house review of large-scale meeting exhibits that were designed to obtain specific public input.

- Summary of exhibits and presentation content for the Transportation Study:
 - Exhibits: *Aerial Mapping of Corridor – Where is safety an issue?; Route 6 Study Corridor Improvement History; Comparison of Accident Trends in Route 6 Study Corridor; 2006 – 2008 Accident History; Traffic Speeds; AM and PM Intersection Operations.*
- Presentation Content: *Transportation Study Overview; Study Findings to Date*, which included: summary of corridor improvement history and resulting reduction in average annual accidents post-improvements; summary of pre and post-improvement accident trends; preliminary areas of concern based on 2006 – 2008 accident data; summary of existing traffic speed data; summary of AM weekday traffic operations. Next Steps.

- Summary of public comments and questions received by Transportation Study team members during open house and formal presentation:
 - An attendee noted dangerous conditions at Route 6 intersections with Notch Road/Route 44 and with Route 66.
 - An attendee noted that the area of Bolton between Route 44, Route 6 and South Road/Stony Road is isolated from Bolton Center (site of Bolton's town hall/downtown/schools) due to poor road network circulation, mainly caused by the incomplete interchange of Route 6 and Route 44.
 - An attendee questioned what caused the changes in the most common accident types pre and post-improvement. Mr. Parker explained that widened shoulders and improved roadway design likely factored into the reduction of fixed object collisions. The fact that rear end collisions are more frequent than fixed object collisions post-improvement does not indicate that the number of rear end collisions has increased; the number of rear end collisions just has not decreased as much as the number of fixed object collisions.
 - An attendee questioned whether the accident data presented factors in changes in traffic volumes over the years. Mr. Parker responded that the percent changes in accidents are based on the average numbers of annual collisions pre and post-improvement, not rates of collisions (which would account for changes in traffic volumes). Mr. Parker also stated that the study team has verified that traffic volumes have increased over time as accident occurrences have decreased, so the actual accident rates would reflect a post-improvement decrease as well.
- Summary of public comments and questions received by Planning Project team members during the formal presentation relative to transportation issues and concerns:
 - Upon hearing of the recommendation of installing sidewalk through the Historic Andover Center area, an attendee stated that despite the vehicular safety improvements recently done to Route 6, she still felt pedestrians would not feel safe walking along Route 6. In response, LADA said that sidewalk was not being recommended throughout the corridor, only at selected development nodes where it would be most appropriate.
 - Attendees appeared to provide a mixed response on recommendations that incorporated the installation of a roundabout at the Route 6/66 intersection.
 - An attendee asked who would be responsible for paying to power any ornamental street lights installed in the corridor, indicating they felt it would potentially be money better spent elsewhere.

Meeting Date and Location:

Tuesday, June 29, 2010 at 7 p.m.
Beckish Senior Center, 188 Route 66
Columbia, CT

- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Basilia Huang.
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker.
- Meeting Format: The meeting was a combined public meeting for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor *Planning Project* (administered by REDC) and *Transportation Study* (administered by CRCOG). This meeting was the second of two public meetings that compose the first of three rounds of public meetings for the Transportation Study and the last round of meetings for the Planning Project.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on draft recommendations developed by LADA, P.C. for the Planning Project. The secondary purpose of the meeting was to introduce the public to the Transportation Study; present preliminary findings relative to safety, traffic operations, and traffic speeds in the corridor; and obtain input on public concerns relative to existing problem areas and safety issues.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by LADA and CRCOG/CHA was preceded and followed by an open house review of large-scale meeting exhibits that were designed to obtain specific public input.

- Summary of exhibits and presentation content for the Transportation Study:
 - Exhibits: *Aerial Mapping of Corridor – Where is safety an issue?; Route 6 Study Corridor Improvement History; Comparison of Accident Trends in Route 6 Study Corridor; 2006 – 2008 Accident History; Traffic Speeds; AM and PM Intersection Operations.*
 - Presentation Content: *Transportation Study Overview; Study Findings to Date*, which included: summary of corridor improvement history and resulting reduction in average annual accidents post-improvements; summary of pre and post-improvement accident trends; preliminary areas of concern based on 2006 – 2008 accident data; summary of existing traffic speed data; summary of AM weekday traffic operations. *Next Steps.*
- Summary of public comments and questions received by Transportation Study team members during open house and formal presentation:
 - An attendee noted that the Route 6 corridor is “better” since major improvements were completed.
 - The above attendee also noted that high traffic volumes are a concern and make turning to or from Route 6 difficult in both directions.
- Summary of public comments and questions received by Transportation Study team members during open house and formal presentation (continued):

- An attendee/corridor resident commented that the suggested roundabout at the Route 6/66 intersection is a concern because people generally do not know how to drive them.
- The above attendee also questioned what the difference in accident experience has been in converting an unsignalized intersection to a signalized intersection. It was noted that Long Hill Road was recently signalized and could be researched.
- The above attendee also noted that he could count on his fingers how many times Route 6 has been closed due to accidents in the last few years. Mr. Parker noted that a component of the Transportation Study involves assessing incident management plans for the corridor.
- Summary of public comments and questions received by Planning Project team members during the formal presentation relative to transportation issues and concerns:
 - An attendee expressed concern about sidewalk suggested for Andover Center and the affect that narrowing the roadway to provide it would have on safety in an area that is already a concern. The attendee suggested that wider shoulders provide some area for motorists approaching an intersection to decelerate if they are traveling too fast approaching a traffic queue at the signal.
 - The above attendee questioned whether the sidewalk suggested for Andover Center could be moved closer to the existing buildings to minimize impacts on Route 6 widths. Terri-Ann Hahn (LADA) noted that the sidewalks are not shown closer to the buildings due to topographical constraints in that area.
 - The above attendee questioned whether pedestrians should use the Hop River Trail on the south side of Route 6 to walk through Andover Center rather than new sidewalks. Ms. Hahn noted that she has observed pedestrians using the north side of Route 6 in the area where sidewalk is suggested.
 - An attendee stated her feeling that sidewalks shown in the plans are not consistent with the heritage of New England and further noted that proposed sidewalks along Route 87 were recently defeated by the public and that, by her observations, new sidewalks in Brooklyn, CT are not used by pedestrians or bicyclists.
 - John Pagini (REDC member) stated that alternative sidewalk surfaces, colors, and materials are available to provide more context-sensitive pedestrian accommodations.
 - Ms. Hahn noted that sidewalks are only being suggested in select areas where pedestrian use is most likely to occur, such as between Long Hill Road and the post office on Route 6 in Andover.
 - An attendee questioned whether alternative crosswalk treatments, such as cobbles or other texture, have been explored.
 - An attendee noted that more needs to be done in Andover Center to encourage slower speeds.

- Summary of public comments and questions received by Planning Project team members during the formal presentation relative to transportation issues and concerns (continued):
 - An attendee suggested that sidewalks are very important. It was noted that the Senior Home in Andover center should be considered in proposing sidewalk connections.
 - An attendee noted that speeding is a big issue and that better patrolling is needed.
 - An attendee expressed desire to see more/better defined rail trail connections to Route 6 in the plan.
 - When questioned whether there was anything shown during the presentation that attendees liked, responses included underground utilities, gateway signage/landmarks, median treatments, landscaping, and façade improvements.
 - An attendee expressed concerns about the suggested roundabout at the intersection of Route 6/66, specifically: what are approaching speeds; can fire trucks turn through the roundabout; can a roundabout handle the traffic volumes.
 - An attendee suggested that the study needs to reflect more than accommodating future traffic demands.
 - An attendee questioned whether bike lanes could be added along Route 6.

Summary of December 2011 Public Information Meetings

December 14, 2011 and December 15, 2011

Meeting Date and Location:

Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at 7 p.m.

Beckish Senior Center, 188 Route 66

Columbia, CT

- Number of Public Attendees (excluding Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) and study team members): 7
- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Basilia Huang, Rob Aloise.
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker, Casey Hardin.
- Meeting Overview and Format: This meeting was the first of two public meetings that compose the second of three rounds of public meetings for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor Transportation Study.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on preliminary recommendations that have been developed with input from the REDC and participating stakeholders.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by CHA was preceded by a brief open house for public review of large-scale exhibits and informational boards. A public question and comment period followed the presentation.

- Summary of public questions and comments:
 - An attendee questioned why the concept for Lighthouse Corners (roundabout with village) retains a slip lane despite the noted issue of the existing high speed slip lanes. CHA replied that the slip lane from westbound Route 6 expressway to westbound Route 6 is required to maintain acceptable operation of the roundabout due to the high traffic volume. CHA noted that this slip lane will be designed with a smaller radius to encourage slower speeds.
 - An attendee questioned whether transverse rumble strips had been considered on the Route 6 expressway approach to the Route 6/66 intersection to encourage slower speeds. CHA replied that rumble strips had not been evaluated and noted that noise generated by the rumble strips could be an issue considering the desire to create a village node in this area.
 - An attendee suggested that there should be a slip lane for traffic turning right from Route 66 to Route 66 East since this is a high volume movement. CHA replied that the traffic volumes do not require a slip lane for the roundabout to operate acceptably and noted that the right turning movement would be fairly free-flowing through the roundabout at most times.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Columbia Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee suggested that high traffic volumes in the afternoon from approximately 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. will cause excessive delays at the roundabout. CHA replied that the two-lane roundabout operates comparably to a signalized intersection in terms of average delay and levels of service.
 - An attendee inquired where there is a two-lane roundabout in operation similar to the one presented. CHA replied that there is a similar two-lane roundabout in Keene, NH and noted that there are no two-lane roundabouts in Connecticut.
 - An attendee questioned who has the right-of-way at a roundabout. CHA replied that circulating traffic has the right-of-way and entering traffic is required to yield to circulating traffic.
 - Attendees questioned whether a roundabout can accommodate the passage of large vehicles. CHA replied that roundabouts can be designed to accommodate large vehicles and noted that the two-lane roundabout, as shown in the concept, can accommodate a large truck side-by-side with a passenger vehicle within the roundabout.
 - An attendee noted that the realignment of Route 6 on the eastbound approach to the intersection and the development opportunities shown north of Route 6 in that area are within the floodplain of the Hop River and will be difficult to develop due to existing flooding issues. CHA replied that the concept was developed to minimize floodplain impacts and noted that floodplain impacts would have to be mitigated. Potential floodplain impacts are being evaluated and documented as part of this study.
 - An attendee noted that there is currently no left turn arrow for vehicles turning left from eastbound Route 6 to Route 6 expressway. CHA replied that a near-term need for signal modifications will be evaluated.
 - An attendee noted concern about the occasional traveler not knowing how to drive through a roundabout, particularly a two-lane roundabout at this location. CHA replied that the concept with the two-lane roundabout is understood to be a long-term project and noted that driver experience, in general, will be much greater in the future as more roundabouts are implemented in the state and region.
 - An attendee questioned what the general feedback from the public is regarding roundabouts. CHA replied that public opinion is generally favorable once a new roundabout is in operation, though initial opposition or apprehension to the proposition of a roundabout is typical.
 - An attendee suggested that the Route 6/66 intersection be improved with a flyover from eastbound Route 6 to Route 6 expressway to benefit through traffic. CHA replied that a flyover had not been considered. A flyover is not warranted to provide acceptable operations and is not consistent with the desired context for this area.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Columbia Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee questioned whether a traffic analysis has been performed for the roundabout and a traffic signal. CHA replied that a traffic analysis of the afternoon peak hour traffic conditions for the future study year (2030) shows that a two-lane roundabout will operate at level of service (LOS) C; a comparable signalized intersection with some capacity improvements will operate at LOS D or better (Note – LOS values range from A to F with A reflecting the best operations with lowest delay).
 - An attendee suggested that the study leaves out recommendations for access improvements to the Hop River. CHA replied that access improvements to the river are part of the concept in Historic Andover and that opportunities exist for improved river access from Route 66 in Columbia near the Windham town line.
 - An attendee noted concern about the realignment of Route 6 reducing the visibility of existing businesses near the intersection of Route 6/66. CHA indicated that there are opportunities that can be explored to maximize or enhance the visibility of businesses in the area. It was also noted that the village development desired for this area is intended to benefit both existing and future businesses by creating a destination that will overall attract more patrons to the area.
 - An attendee suggested that the Hop River Trail trailhead parking area in Columbia be constructed of gravel or other environmentally-sensitive material, not bituminous pavement.

Meeting Date and Location:

Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 7 p.m.
Andover Community Room, 17 School Road
Andover, CT

- Number of Public Attendees (excluding Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) and study team members): 25 (approximately)
- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Basilia Huang, Rob Aloise, Jennifer Carrier.
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker, Casey Hardin.
- Meeting Overview and Format: This meeting was the second of two public meetings that compose the second of three rounds of public meetings for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor Transportation Study.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on preliminary recommendations that have been developed with input from the REDC and participating stakeholders.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by CHA was preceded by a brief open house for public review of large-scale exhibits and informational boards. A public question and comment period followed the presentation.

- Summary of public questions and comments:
 - An attendee questioned how the recommendations would be funded. CHA replied that anticipated costs, potential funding opportunities, and other implementation considerations will be evaluated as the next step in this study.
 - An attendee expressed concern about the installation of raised medians throughout the corridor and potentially blocking driveway access. CHA replied that the intent is to provide landscaped medians in select locations where they will provide aesthetic and speed mitigation benefits without limiting access to existing businesses and driveways. It is also the intent to utilize medians to manage access to new local streets in the future, as necessary to promote safety and maintain through traffic operations.
 - An attendee noted that streetscape improvements that were recommended under the REDC's previous Land Use Study appear to be absent. CHA replied that streetscape improvements consistent with those proposed in the Land Use Study are incorporated into the concepts though they are not fully detailed on the preliminary graphics at this time.
 - An attendee expressed concerns over environmental impacts associated with the concept presented for Historic Andover, particularly floodplain impacts. CHA replied that floodplain and wetland impacts would have to be mitigated. Potential floodplain and wetland impacts are being evaluated and documented as part of this study.
 - An attendee noted that the Historic Andover concept will include a large amount of new impervious area which could require a new closed drainage system and noted that the system should be designed to be environmentally friendly and not discharge directly to the Hop River. CHA replied that drainage system design is not part of the study, but potential drainage issues and concerns for the area will be identified and documented. John Pagini of the REDC added that low impact development strategies will be utilized in sensitive areas.
 - An attendee suggested that lowering the elevation of the Hop River Trail along Route 6 in Historic Andover may not be possible due to site constraints. CHA replied that a relatively short distance would be required at each end to transition to and from a lower trail elevation.
 - An attendee suggested that it would be preferred to maintain the elevation of the existing trail, which is further from traffic and avoids conflicts between vehicle and bicyclist headlights.
 - An attendee noted that CTDEEP and CTDOT might need to approve changes to the elevation and grades of the trail because it is a state park and there might be future opportunity to restore rail service along the line. CHA noted that coordination with CTDOT is on-going and coordination with CTDEEP is likely.
 - An attendee suggested that the trail could be split to bring one section down to the elevation of Route 6 for a crossing at Long Hill Road, leaving a continuous section of the path at its existing elevation.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Andover Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee suggested that there should be a truck climbing lane for westbound Route 6 approaching the junction with Route 44 in Bolton Notch. CHA replied that the need and feasibility of a climbing lane is would be investigated.
 - An attendee suggested that there should be near term improvements for access to the Hop River Trail trailhead in Bolton, off the Route 6/44 overlap. The existing driveway requires motorists to slow in traffic and turn approximately 180 degrees from the high speed expressway. CHA replied that opportunities to improve access to the trailhead would be investigated.
 - An attendee noted that speeds on the Route 6/44 overlap are an issue and that measures should be included in the study to address speeding on the eastbound approach to the Route 6 and Route 44 split in Bolton Notch. CHA replied that opportunities to provide speed mitigation on this approach are being considered as part of this study.

Summary of June 2012 Public Information Meetings

June 7 and June 12, 2012

Meeting Date and Location:

Thursday, June 7, 2012 at 7 p.m.

Beckish Senior Center, 188 Route 66

Columbia, CT

- Number of Public Attendees (excluding Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) and study team members): 13 (approximately)
- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Basilia Huang, Rob Aloise, Jennifer Carrier
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker, Casey Hardin.
- Meeting Overview and Format: This meeting was the first of two public meetings that compose the third of three rounds of public meetings for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor Transportation Study.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on the final recommendations and implementation plan that have been developed with input from the REDC and participating stakeholders.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by CRCOG and CHA was preceded by a brief open house for public review of large-scale exhibits and informational boards. A public question and comment period followed the presentation.

- Summary of public questions and comments:
 - An attendee suggested that vehicles traveling “110 mph” off the Route 6 expressway may have trouble slowing to enter the roundabout.
 - An attendee questioned how the proposed node at Lighthouse Corners would be developed, and who owns the existing property. CHA replied that a large portion of the land located south of the proposed Route 6 alignment is owned by CTDOT (the existing Route 6 right-of-way (ROW)); a private entity owns the parcel located north of the Route 6 alignment. CTDOT would have to acquire the necessary land from the private entity to realign the roadway. CTDOT could sell the existing ROW or relinquish it to the Town. The development itself would be undertaken by a private developer, potentially with assistance from the Town.
 - An attendee suggested that there are impacts shown to the existing parcel occupied by the Lighthouse building. CHA responded that it is not the intent of the plan to impact this parcel and that the property line and ROW information being used for the study is approximate. CHA noted that with establishment of the actual property bounds and detailed design of the planned roadway and intersection, it is anticipated that direct impacts to the Lighthouse parcel could be avoided.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Columbia Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee suggested that backups and congestion may occur on Route 6 from slowing traffic speeds at the roundabout. CHA replied that traffic analysis of the proposed roundabout shows it operates acceptably during peak hour conditions.
 - An attendee asked if the desired 35 mph speeds in the corridor would negatively affect traffic. CHA replied that measures to mitigate speeds for the purpose of improving safety are proposed within existing reduced speed areas (where speed limits are 40 or 45 mph) and within the proposed discrete village areas; speed limits throughout the rest of the corridor would not be changed. It is anticipated that measures to mitigate speeds will not reduce traffic capacity.
 - An attendee asked if the proposed medians were raised or depressed, and questioned the risk of curbs to vehicles approaching at high speed from the Route 6 expressway. CHA replied that the medians in the vicinity of the roundabout would be raised and the roundabout approaches would be designed to encourage slower speeds. Slower speeds reduce the risks posed by vehicles striking curbs. It was noted that the right turn bypass lane to westbound Route 6 would be designed to accommodate slower vehicle speeds than the existing slip lane.
 - An attendee noted that the footprint of the proposed development may create environmental impacts with wetland areas.
 - An attendee noted that the Lighthouse building would no longer be at the corner and questioned whether the name “Lighthouse Corners” would remain an appropriate description of the area. CHA replied that the development concept shown is just one of many possibilities.
 - An attendee requested an explanation for how the roundabout at the intersection of Route 6 and 66 became the preferred recommendation. CHA explained that a number of alternatives, including a signalized intersection, had been evaluated and reviewed with the public (including workshops in June and July 2011) and the REDC. The REDC selected the roundabout as the preferred alternative on the basis of safety benefits – in terms of reduced accident severity and frequency; traffic operations; gateway opportunities created by the roundabout; and consistency of the roundabout with the future village character that has been envisioned for this area.
 - An attendee noted that people who do not have experience driving through roundabouts often perceive them as dangerous. CHA replied that safety data shows roundabouts can reduce accident severity and frequency at intersections. CHA noted that educational materials and resources for roundabouts have been compiled as part of this study and that this information is available on CRCOG’s website (www.crcog.org). CHA also noted that modern roundabouts are becoming more common in Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, among other places, and that motorists’ experience with roundabouts will increase over time.
 - An attendee asked if the roundabout would pose a restriction to commercial truck traffic. CHA replied that the roundabout would be designed to accommodate large trucks and there would be no restriction to commercial traffic.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Columbia Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee questioned whether the existing topography of the Route 6/66 area had been taken into account during the preparation of the Lighthouse Corners concept, specifically whether the downgrade from Route 6 expressway to the proposed roundabout presented issues. CHA indicated that existing and proposed grades were evaluated and that grades within acceptable limits for an approach to a roundabout (approximately 3% maximum) could be provided. Further evaluation could be done during subsequent design phases to minimize the grades to the greatest extent practical to minimize the effect of the grade on approach speeds.
 - An attendee asked how new vehicular movements were accommodated in the recommendation for the Bolton Notch focus area. CHA described the subject movements.
 - Several attendees drew attention to unsafe conditions on Route 66 East. They reported that high vehicular speeds and left turns to several of the commercial driveways on Route 66 East are safety issues. Additionally, they reported that this area is heavily used by cyclists. The attendees suggested that slowing traffic in this area would create a safer environment and an additional benefit is a positive impact for area businesses.
 - An attendee suggested that Willimantic residents should have been involved in the study outreach given their proximity to the corridor.
 - An attendee asked what the projected traffic growth for the corridor over 20 years was. CHA replied that growth varies along the corridor, but generally growth is forecasted to be approximately 30%.
 - An attendee stated that he thought the study had done a good job.
 - An attendee asked how bicyclists and pedestrians would navigate the proposed two lane roundabout. CHA replied that bicyclists would be relocated to a shared use path outside of the vehicular travel lanes in the roundabout and that pedestrian crossings could be provided. CHA noted that more specific pedestrian and bicycle accommodations would be detailed during subsequent design phases.
 - An attendee mentioned long delays while making left turns from Hendee Road and questioned what could be done to alleviate these delays. CHA replied that the study had evaluated providing indirect left turn/u-turn areas, where vehicles could turn right out of a side road on to Route 6, then make a u-turn somewhere on Route 6 to head in the opposite direction. CHA noted that provisions for these u-turns were determined to be impractical given the lack of space on Route 6 to provide u-turns without significant impacts to properties, and given the potential distance between possible u-turn locations and the locations of the existing side roads that they could serve. CHA noted that the study contains recommendations for accommodating concurrent left and right turns at some locations to reduce delays; improving sightlines; and providing intersection warning sign improvements to increase the safety for motorists accessing Route 6 from side roads.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Columbia Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee questioned whether side road access could be improved by providing traffic signals at additional intersections that could be coordinated to create gaps in through traffic. CHA noted that although signal systems can be designed for this purpose, the spacing of the signals in the Route 6 corridor makes it difficult to maintain platoons of vehicles and large gaps over distances. Additionally, none of the unsignalized intersections are expected to meet warrants for signalization in the future and providing unnecessary signals would have an adverse affect on through traffic operations.

Meeting Date and Location:

Tuesday, June 12, 2012 at 7 p.m.

Andover Community Room, 17 School Road

Andover, CT

- Number of Public Attendees (excluding Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) and study team members): 6 (approximately)
- Representing Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) – Basilia Huang, Rob Aloise.
- Representing CHA (CRCOG’s consultant) – Jeff Parker, Casey Hardin.
- Meeting Overview and Format: This meeting was the second of two public meetings that compose the third of three rounds of public meetings for the Route 6 Hop River Corridor Transportation Study.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to present and obtain public input on the final recommendations and implementation plan that have been developed with input from the REDC and participating stakeholders.

A formal PowerPoint® presentation by CRCOG and CHA was preceded by a brief open house for public review of large-scale exhibits and informational boards. A public question and comment period followed the presentation.

- Summary of public questions and comments:
 - An attendee questioned whether the study had any specific recommendations for maintaining open space. CHA replied that the 2010 Land Use Study completed previously by the REDC, includes recommendations for a new “corridor zone” that is intended to maintain conservation areas and preserve open space by way of allowing for more concentrated development with defined nodes in the corridor.
 - An attendee noted that she liked the retention of some of the existing buildings in Andover while creating the development node.
 - An attendee asked what comments were discussed at the Columbia meeting. CHA noted there was a good dialogue about the proposed roundabout at Route 6/66 and new input regarding potential safety issues on Route 66 East.

- Summary of public questions and comments, Andover Meeting (continued):
 - An attendee stated that this was an award winning project and hoped that monies would become available to fund the recommendations.
 - An attendee asked how funding could be obtained for the recommendations in Bolton including changing the end point of I-384. CHA replied that many of the projects in the corridor could be eligible for funding through various state and federal programs. It was noted that funding opportunities are outlined in the Implementation Plan.
 - An attendee stated that this is a very nice plan, but questioned how it will be implemented. CRCOG replied that a key to implementing projects is to have local officials and state representatives champion the projects that their communities identify as priority projects in an effort to secure public funding.