

Public Comment Summary - Silver Lane Corridor Study Draft Final Report

Comment Date	Chapter	Page	Comments	Commentator	Response
1/15/2020	Section 5.1.5	83	The report carries forward a recommendation from the "CTfastrak East Expansion report" to remove stops at Clement and Forbes. We support stop reductions in general but want any changes considered forwarded to CTtransit staff for the Service Review process. Service Review is done several times per year and looks at all stop additions, deletions and consolidations as well as route changes.	Maureen Lawrence, CTDOT Bureau of Public Transportation	We have added a comment to that first bullet to speak to process.
		83	The report recommends bus shelters at all bus stops in the corridor. We do not support this blanket suggestion. Currently, there are 22 bus stops on Silver Lane between the Route 5/15 interchange and Forbes Street. Four 4 of them have shelters, all of which are in the section closest to Forbes Street. There are too many and they are located too close together to suggest that they all need shelters. Instead, the study should use the standards established in the Statewide Bus Study to determine which stops meet the threshold for upgraded amenities. Priority for installation of benches should be given to stops with 50 daily boardings or more while priority for the installation of shelters should be given to stops with 100 daily boardings or more. Priority should also be given to areas that serve a large number of elderly and disabled patrons, and areas that are located near major passenger trip generators. It is also important to address the issue of maintenance of shelters and stops. This activity falls to the municipality and includes things like snow removal, trash removal, and shelter maintenance.		<i>We have revised the bullet to say:</i> "Bus shelters and amenities will be provided at all bus stops within the corridor according to the standards established in the Statewide Bus Study to determine which stops meet the threshold for such amenities. It is also important to note that shelters and stops will require the Town of East Hartford to assume maintenance responsibilities."
		83	The report recommends CTfastrak style amenities at Applegate Lane and Charter Oak Mall. We agree that if this area is redeveloped and it is appropriate then we suggest the study review the improvements currently being designed for Route 121 stops near the Spencer Street Park and Ride lot for possible implementation here.		Noted, we added some commentary about this possibility and stated that the Town should coordinate with Cctransit and CTDOT.
		83	The report recommends full bus pullouts be installed for bus stops on Silver Lane near the Rt 5/15 Interchange on and off ramps. We agree that this feature could be preferable to our operator and also help traffic flow especially since the road diet that was implemented last summer during re paving. Although the report acknowledges that the final draft of the report was prepared before the road diet was implemented. it does not take into account how the roadway changes have impacted the area. Therefore if the pullouts are pursued Transit & Ridesharing would like to be involved in the design process.		Noted.
	4.1.2	51	RE pedestrian path: total proposed cross-section has a width of 60 feet which will require acquisition of ROW through corridor. This ROW cost may significantly increase the overall project costs and it may be critical to provide this costs along with the estimated construction cost.		An appendix has been added documenting the expected ROW-acquisition needs. As the Department's Cost Estimating Guidelines do not currently include guidance on estimating Rights-of-Way, the unit price for the concrete and bituminous sections of the side path were inflated to reflect the consistent need for small partial acquisitions throughout the corridor.
		51	RE pedestrian path: the total proposed cross-section of 60 feet may not be possible throughout the entire corridor due to existing buildings. Was this considered/documents?		Yes, Appendix 3 documents ROW needs.
		51	RE pedestrian path: proposed cross-section has a 2 foot wide "buffer" on both sides of the road which may not be sufficient for snow shelf.		Yes, the plans show 2' to the west of Warren Drive, but increased to 3' the east as space allows per a prior comment by DOT. The need for additional space was balanced with potential impacts to residential structures located near the roadway.
	4.2.2	59	RE the roundabout: the estimated Construction cost for this roundabout installation is significantly lower than what would be expected at \$250,000. What estimation factors were used to develop this construction cost?		The \$250,000 was a typo and been revised to say \$2,500,000.
		59	RE the roundabout: while it is understood that the proposal/graphic is a preliminary concept, the roundabout does not appear to be ideally configured given its positioning, approach angles, and impact to the slope supporting CT-15. Discussion of these elements, and how they impact the feasibility and cost of a roundabout proposal, should be included in the narrative for this recommendation.		A sentence has been added noting these considerations.
		59	RE the roundabout: it is unclear if the increased efficiency of the roundabout (vs. stop control or traffic signal) was considered in the evaluation of the neighboring intersection immediately to the east. The proposed improvements to the Route 15 off-ramp may quickly be nullified/metered by the signal at the intersection of Silver Lane and HOV ramps.		Analyses of the Route 15 exit ramp intersection were conducted using signal control. Because the ramp is located less than 500 feet west of the HOV ramp intersection, signalization at this location would not meet the CT DOT design requirement of 500 feet spacing between signals. The close spacing would require that the two signals be coordinated, and the resultant signal timing would create 95 percentile queue of 627 feet during the PM Peak hour for eastbound traffic, extending from Mercer Street into the Exit ramp intersection. Using the roundabout reduces this queue to 455 feet, which will fit within the available storage distance.

Comment Date	Chapter	Page	Comments	Commentator	Response
1/23/2020		59	RE the roundabout: were any other physical improvements considered for this intersection or the surrounding roadway? It is assumed that very little traffic would exit CT-15 at this ramp only to utilize the EB HOV lane via the adjacent traffic signal. As such, little weaving would be anticipated through this ~400' section. Perhaps an exclusive lane for the off-ramp was considered?	Marrissa Pfaffinger, CTDOT Highway Management Unit	Installation of a channelized right turn outside of the roundabout would require extension of a second lane eastbound through the HOV intersections, which would then be merged back to a single lane beyond the HOV intersection. This would require additional widening through this section of Silver Lane, and would impact several residential and commercial properties. The increase in the Level of Service for right turning exit ramp traffic did not seem significant enough to warrant this impact.
	4.2.3	60	RE Mercer Ave/HOV Ramp: as mentioned above, was increased traffic from the proposed roundabout improvement taken into consideration in the analyses of this intersection? Both the existing stop-control and traffic signal options would meter the flow of traffic from the ramp to the Mercer Avenue signal. Given the close proximity of the proposed roundabout, it is likely that an increase in efficiency for the ramp traffic could overload the single eastbound through lane.		The capacity analyses at this intersection indicate LOS B for eastbound traffic during both the PM Peak and Saturday Peak hours.
		60	RE Mercer Ave/HOV Ramp: based on a high-level traffic analysis review conducted the HMU, futures volumes (especially AM peak) caused queues at this intersection and contrary to the report, they extended to adjacent intersection. A second EB through lane (with widening in a small section) appeared to be the best improvement as there was two eastbound lanes just east of this location (prior to installation of TWLTL).		No AM Peak analysis was completed for this project, as the area is predominantly developed with retail land uses, which typically have greater impact on the roadway network during the PM and Saturday peak hours. Queuing for the eastbound traffic, as noted above, is calculated to be less than the available storage distance between the Route 15 exit ramp and the HOV ramp. Addition of a second eastbound lane would have a significant impact on several residential and commercial properties in order to extend this lane to Roberts Street.
	4.2.5	61	RE Carl's BBQ near Whitney Street: was back in angled parking considered?		A sentence has been added noting that back-in angle parking could be a viable alternative.
		61	RE Carl's BBQ near Whitney Street: if private property is to be acquired for the proposed angled parking/pedestrian path, will it be in conflict with any ROW setbacks to the existing properties? Figure 39 shows the pedestrian path to be almost at the edge of the building and doesn't provide adequate snow shelf for maintenance purposes.		A sentence has been added referencing the impacts to the property's front yard depth.
		61	RE Carl's BBQ near Whitney Street: if property is to be acquired for the pedestrian path, would that place the existing private parking within the state ROW and require it to be public parking?		A sentence has been added noting the potential ramifications in terms of parking usage.
		61	RE Warren Drive: Figure 40 shows callout: "Ped. Crossing with and Flush Refuge Island RRFB". A flush island cannot be considered a refuge island. Please revise wording to not call it a refuge island OR call out raised island around the "refuge" IF it doesn't conflict with appropriate design vehicle making left from Warren Driven		The figure has been revised.