

REPORT OF MEETING

Date and Time: Wednesday, August 24, 2022, from 12:30 PM – 1:15 PM

Location: Microsoft Teams Virtual Meeting Platform

Subject: Project Advisory Committee Meeting #10

1. Attendees

NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL ADDRESS / PHONE
PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Tom Altermatt	City of Danbury	t.altermatt@danbury-ct.gov
Sharon Calitro	City of Danbury	s.calitro@danbury-ct.gov
Jennifer Carrier	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	Jennifer.Carrier@dot.gov
Greg Dembowski	Town of Brookfield	gdembowski@brookfieldct.gov
Peter Frengs	Town of Brookfield	pfrengs@brookfieldct.gov
John Gentile	City of Danbury Commission for Persons with disAbilities	jmgrs1550@aol.com
Veera Karukonda	City of Danbury	v.karukonda@danbury-ct.gov
David McCollum	Town of Bethel	mccollumd@bethel-ct.gov
Ali Mohseni	New York Metropolitan Council of Governments	Ali.Mohseni@dot.ny.gov
Shay Nagarsheth	City of Danbury	s.nagarsheth@danbury-ct.gov
Katie Pearson	City of Danbury	k.pearson@danbury-ct.gov
Kurt Salmoiraghi	FHWA	Kurt.Salmoiraghi@dot.gov
Perry Salvagne	Get Downtown	prsalvagne@gmail.com
Chris Roscia	CTWeather	chris@ctweather.com

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL ADDRESS
Nilesh Patel	Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT)	Nilesh.patel@ct.gov
Kevin Burnham	CTDOT	Kevin.burnham@ct.gov
Krishalyn Macrohon	CTDOT	krishalyn.macrohon@ct.gov
Lynn Murphy	CTDOT	Lynn.Murphy@ct.gov
Mark McMillan	CTDOT	Mark.McMillan@ct.gov
CONSULTANT TEAM		
Timothy Gaffey	CDM Smith	gaffeyt@cdmsmith.com
Sharat Kalluri	CDM Smith	kallurisk@cdmsmith.com
Jeanine Armstrong Gouin	SLR Consulting	jgouin@slrconsulting.com
Joe Rubino	SLR Consulting	jrubino@slrconsulting.com
Rick Black	SLR Consulting	rblack@slrconsulting.com
Melissa Santley	CDM Smith	santleym@cdmsmith.com
Marcy Miller	FHI Studio	mmiller@fhistudio.com

2. Welcome

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) hosted its tenth Project Advisory Committee Meeting (PAC) for the I-84 Danbury Project on Wednesday, August 24, 2022, from 12:30 – 1:15 PM via the Microsoft Teams virtual meeting platform. Marcy Miller, of FHI Studio, welcomed attendees to the PAC Meeting and provided an overview of the Microsoft Teams virtual meeting platform and team members. She introduced the project team and handed the

presentation to Krishalyn Macrohon, of CTDOT. K. Macrohon reviewed the agenda and relayed that the purpose of the meeting was to provide a recap of where the project team is in the study process, continue the discussion on the concept fatal flaw and screening analysis, and provide an example of how the mainline segment, Concepts 1, 5, 8, 9, and 22, have progressed through the analysis. She added that the team would present next steps and leave ample time for discussion and questions from the PAC.

3. [Presentation](#)

K. Macrohon provided the PAC with a list of activities the project team worked on following the previous PAC Meeting, held on June 22, 2022. She stated that the team added new concepts to the project website. Currently, Concepts 1 – 14 and Concept 22 are posted online. She said that she and Sharat Kalluri, of CDM Smith attended the Leadership Meeting hosted by the Danbury Chamber of Commerce. The team attended pop up events and have been posting regularly to social media. She stated that no new PAC members have joined the committee since the last meeting.

Rick Black, of SLR Consulting, presented a summary of the screening process that was introduced in previous PAC meetings. He presented six general screening phases that the team is undertaking:

1. Develop screening criteria
2. Apply screening criteria
3. Screen concept segments
4. Combine concept segments
5. Segment combination screening
6. Reasonable range of alternatives

R. Black reviewed the project team's fatal flaw analysis as presented at the prior meeting and noted that the team is now moving forward with the concept screening process. He reiterated that the meeting would focus on the mainline segment screening examples. He added that the mainline segment runs the entire length of the corridor and is further separated into west, center, and east segments.

R. Black presented the screening matrix for the mainline concepts: Concepts 1, 5, 8, 9, and 22. He summarized that Concept 1 would add a lane on I-84 corridor; Concept 5 would change left hand ramps to right hand ramps; Concept 8 would place I-84 under a collector-distributor (CD) road; Concept 9 would add a Route 7 express lane in each direction in the median; and Concept 22 would add an I-84 express lane in each direction in the median.

R. Black first discussed Concept 5. S. Kalluri presented the concept in more detail, noting that the Route 7 ramps at Interchanges 3 and 7 would be affected. At Interchange 3, the Route 7 northbound to I-84 westbound ramp and the I-84 westbound to Route 7 southbound ramp would change from being a left-hand exit ramp to a right-hand exit ramp. Similarly, at Interchange 7, the I-84 eastbound to Route 7 northbound ramp as well as the Route 7 southbound to I-84 eastbound ramp would change from being a left-hand exit ramp to a right-hand exit ramp.

R. Black and S. Kalluri next discussed Concept 8 and displayed drawings of how it would look at three different locations. I-84 would be reconstructed below grade from Interchange 3 to an area between Interchanges 7 and 8. A CD road would be constructed on top of I-84 and collect local traffic. Route 7 would have connection to I-84 and CD road at Interchanges 3 and 7.

R. Black stated that Concepts 5 and 8 have both been removed from further analysis. Concept 5 did not pass the fatal flaw analysis because it does not meet the project purpose; it fails to reduce congestion and improve mobility. Concept 8 has numerous constructability issues including high complexity, traffic disruptions, and problematic connections with Route 7. As a result, Concepts 1, 9, and 22 all progressed forward into the concept screening and are not redundant with each other. This means the remaining concepts meet the project purpose and offer distinctive benefits to the mainline segment.

R. Black next discussed Concept 1, noting preliminary drawings that depict improvements in the west, center, and east segments. This concept would add a lane in each direction, maintain lane continuity, and eliminate the left-hand ramps. This concept was presented at an earlier PAC meeting.

R. Black next discussed Concept 9, noting preliminary drawings in improvements in the west, center, and east segments. Concept 9 would add a Route 7 express lane in the median. S. Kalluri added that all the Route 7 traffic would be in the median lanes. Route 7 would have no local road access between Interchanges 3 and 7. When compared to Concept 1, Concept 9 would require much more highway width and potential property impacts.

R. Black next discussed Concept 22, noting it would add an I-84 express lane in the median from Interchanges 3 to 7. He displayed preliminary drawings in improvements in the west, center, and east segments. S. Kalluri noted that this concept is similar to Concept 9, except that I-84 through traffic is in the median, rather than Route 7 traffic. All I-84 traffic would have no access to local roads between Interchanges 3 and 7.

R. Black next discussed the team's preliminary I-84 matrix analysis. This table lists the engineering and environmental considerations and constraints on the mainline segment. As discussed at the prior PAC meeting, the engineering considerations looked at the key aspects, such as addressing the peak hour delay and lane continuity. The concepts in each segment are evaluated with the application of rating criteria and analyzed for its degree of constraint or improvement as represented by green, yellow, or red dots, signifying good, no, or substantial impact-respectively. For example, a green dot may represent a significant improvement for a particular concept.

R. Black noted that Concept 1 does not perform well at addressing the current weaving travel issue. Concepts 9 and 22 do a better job at this. However, he emphasized that Concept 1 would likely be less expensive to construct than Concepts 9 and 22.

R. Black discussed other engineering considerations that have no differentiators (i.e., have similar benefits or constraints). For example, Concepts 1, 9, and 22 would address elimination of left-hand ramps, improve the highway geometry to address the design speed inconsistencies on I-84 corridor, stopping sight distances, vertical geometry improvements, and ability to maintain traffic flow during construction.

R. Black next discussed the environmental considerations. He noted that Concept 1 would have the smaller footprint and fewer full and partial potential property takes. He also indicated that it will be important to consider the neighborhoods that could potentially be affected from Concepts 9 or 22. He stated that the team also considered potential impacts to natural resources, including impacts to parks and historical resources and listed plant and animal species. The potential impacts of Concepts 1, 9, and 22 are similar, or within the same relative range for these resources. He discussed that Concept 9 and Concept 22 would have greater property impacts compared to Concept 1. Thus, only Concept 1 has progressed through the fatal flaw, redundancy, and matrix analyses for mainline segment.

R. Black next discussed potential concept combinations. He provided an example of how the mainline, west, center, and east concepts could potentially be combined to move forward through the screening process. He reiterated that these combined segments could become the reasonable range of alternatives, which would move forward to a detailed environmental analysis.

Finally, R. Black discussed the next steps for the project team and PAC. He stated that the study team will provide screening criteria materials for the PAC to review in the coming weeks. The team will be looking for the PAC's input on the screening criteria and results. The next PAC meeting is planned for late-September / October 2002. With the input from the PAC, the project team would be able to advance to combining concepts and screening of the concept combinations.

S. Kalluri said that Concepts 15, 16, and 26 will soon be posted to the website.

M. Miller concluded the meeting by thanking the PAC for attending.

4. Discussion

During the meeting, the project team provided several opportunities for PAC members to comment and ask questions. Below is a summary of the questions, comments, and responses.

John Gentile, of City of Danbury Commission for Persons with disAbilities, questioned what Concept 1 will do to improve highway access to and from local destinations. S. Kalluri answered that the mainline, at this point, only addresses the highway part of the analysis. Improvements to the local access are considered in other concepts in the remaining segments of the corridor: west, center and east.

5. Adjourn

M. Miller concluded the tenth PAC Meeting by stating that the project website will be updated with the meeting materials soon.