



Route 7-15 Norwalk

Route 7 - 15 Interchange

State Proj. No. 102-358

Subject: 7/15 Norwalk Purpose and Need Subcommittee Meeting 2

Date/Time: September 17, 2018 05:30 PM

Location: Norwalk Inn

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company	Attended
Yolanda	Antoniak	yolanda.antoniak@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
John	Block	JWBlock@tighebond.com	Tighe & Bond	Yes
Tod	Bryant	tbryant23@optonline.net	Norwalk Preservation Trust	Yes
Tom	Doyle	Thomas.Doyle@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
John	Eberle	John.Eberle@stantec.com	Stantec	Yes
Andy	Fesenmeyer	andy.fesenmeyer@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Alan	Kibbe	akibbe@att.net	None	Yes
Paul	Stanton	pstanton@fhiplan.com	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	Yes
Peter	Viteretto	viteretto@heritagelandscares.com	Silvermine Community Association	Yes
David	Waters	dfwaters@bltooffice.com	Building and Land Technology	Yes

Meeting Items

2.1

Topic: General Comments

Status: Open

Discussion:

JE provided a brief introduction of the purpose of the meeting to review changes to the Purpose and Need Statement requested by Agencies and receive feedback from the subcommittee.

Documents provided and to be reviewed included:

Nov 6, 2017 original version with P&N edits that the subcommittee had requested

Jan 17, 2018 version where 'congestion' was moved to a 'goal' from a 'need'

June 11, 2018 version incorporating Agency comments.

2.2

Topic: General Comments

Status: Open

Discussion:

JE provided explanation for the edits that moved 'congestion' from a 'need' to a 'goal'. Given conversations internally and with FHWA, and reviewing FHWA guidance, maintaining congestion as a need, requires any alternative to 'fix' the congestion problem. In the case of 7-15, as was always stated, while the current congestion would likely be reduced and better if nothing were done, it cannot be said that congestion would be resolved. Therefore by guidance, the topic should to be a goal. JE further stated that this way, an alternate that was highly favored in all other criteria would not need to be discarded if it failed this one criteria.

All were in agreement.

2.3

Topic: General Comments

Status: Open

Discussion:

JE proceeded to highlight the changes the Agencies had requested to the P&N document namely

1. Adding a graphic and text that visually depicted the missing links in the interchange.
2. Minor text additions and clarifier's throughout
3. Under Goals and Objectives, Agencies had shifted the descriptions of the Merritt Parkway guidelines to a foot note to simplify the text under Item D. They also combined narrative into 2 paragraphs rather than 3.

JE stated that there was not a change per se in language that the subcommittee had requested but a reconfiguration.

Comments from subcommittee:

PV suggested that there should be a recognition that integrating the roadways into the natural environment (per Item D in Goals/Objectives) should be parallel with the landscape and not an after thought. He suggested adding 'Landscape' to the Item D title line (after 'Roadways'). All agreed and STN will make the edit.

Subcommittee as a whole were opposed to shifting the guiding documents descriptions to a foot note as they felt that minimized the documents. They asked that it be placed back in the main body. All agreed and STN to make edit.

Beyond the above, subcommittee had no issues with other changes.

2.4

Topic: General Comments

Status: Open

Discussion:

JE explained next steps would entail STN making the noted edits to the P&N Statement, then distributing to subcommittee and PAC to receive any final comments. Assuming no additional comments (or inclusion of any), it would then be distributed to Agencies with notes as to the requested edits and reasoning from PAC subcommittee.

Follow up Action Item(s)

Item	Description	Held By	Date Due	Status	Date Closed
------	-------------	---------	----------	--------	-------------

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.