



## Route 7-15 Norwalk

---

Route 7 - 15 Interchange  
State Proj. No. 102-358

Subject: PAC Landscape-Section 106 Subcommittee Meeting #2  
Date: December 16, 2020  
Location: MS Teams Meeting  
Prepared By: Eberle, John

**The Followings Meeting Minutes have been reviewed and approved by:**

Reviewed by:  
Yolanda Antoniak January 20, 2021

Approved by:  
Andy Fesenmeyer January 20, 2021



## Route 7-15 Norwalk

---

Route 7 - 15 Interchange

State Proj. No. 102-358

Subject: PAC Section 106/Landscape Subcommittee Meeting 3

Date/Time: December 16, 2020 01:00 PM

Location: MS Teams Meeting

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company	Attended
Yolanda	Antoniak	yolanda.antoniak@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Drew	Berndlmaier	Dberndlmaier@norwalkct.org	City of Norwalk	Yes
Tod	Bryant	tbryant23@optonline.net	Norwalk Preservation Trust	Yes
Mike	Calabrese	Michael.Calabrese@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Marguerite	Carnell	MCarnell@ahs-inc.biz	Archaeological and Historical Services, Inc.	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
Wes	Haynes	wes@merrittparkway.org	Merritt Parkway Conservancy	Yes
Emilie	Holland	emilie.holland@dot.gov	FHWA	Yes
Alan	Kibbe	akibbe@att.net	NASH	Yes
Ken	Livingston	klivingston@fhiplan.com	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	Yes
JoAnn	McGrath	jmcgrath@marcuspartners.com	Marcus Properties	Yes
Mark	McMillan	Mark.McMillan@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Marcy	Miller	mmiller@fhiplan.com	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	Yes

Chris	Mojica	Christopher.Mojica@stantec.com	Stantec	Yes
Lynn	Murphy	Lynn.Murphy@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Gary	Sorge	gary.sorge@stantec.com	Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	Yes
Peter	Viteretto	viteretto@heritagelandsapes.com	CT ASLA	Yes
Chris	Wigren	cwigren@preservationct.org	Preservation Connecticut	Yes
Mike	Yeosock	myeosock@norwalkct.org	City of Norwalk	Yes

## Meeting Items

### 3.1

**Topic:** GENERAL

**Status:** Open

**Discussion:**

**Ken Livingston (FHI) provided an introduction to the meeting and reviewed controls of Microsoft Teams for attendees. He noted the purpose of the meeting as an update on Section 106 activities with a focus on reviewing mitigation of unavoidable adverse effects and the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) process.**

**Marcy Miller (FHI) provided a roll call of attendees.**

**The presentation then proceeded (presentation is posted to project website):**

**Andy Fesenmeyer (CTDOT) gave a brief recap of Section 106 activities, providing a recap from the first meeting in May 2019, incorporating comments from SHPO into the updated Public Report up to the current work in developing the MOA.**

**Marguerite Carnell (AHS) provided a review of SHPO comments on, and subsequent minor changes to, the Public Report. These focused on slight refinement of the APE boundary and evaluation of additional historic period resources (no additional adverse impacts were found).**

**Mark McMillan (CTDOT) then described the overall purpose and process for developing an MOA and stipulations to compensate for adverse effects on historic properties.**

**He continued, outlining some of the initial stipulations being considered for the 7-15 project, emphasizing that these were simply the initial thoughts and there could be changes.**

**Mark concluded his section by giving the overall next steps in the MOA process including Consulting Parties being invited to participate in the MOA process, continuing feedback from FHWA, SHPO and ending with a signed MOA that is filed with Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP).**

Andy Fesenmeyer concluded the presentation discussing next steps in EA process with an anticipated finalized EA document (and selection of the preferred alternative) in Spring/Summer of 2021.

John Eberle (Stantec) noted that today was not the only day to be a part of the process. There will be additional opportunities in the future as the process moves along.

#### PAC Subcommittee Comments/Questions

Both Todd Bryant and Chris Wigren noted that they did not see their respective organizations (Norwalk Preservation Trust and Preservation Connecticut) listed in the consulting parties slide.

Team responded that the slide was just a sampling of Consulting Parties (CP's) for graphic effect. Both organizations (and others) are on the official listing of CP's.

Peter Viteretto stated that he has been identified as part of the Silvermine neighborhood group, and while accurate, he also represents CT ASLA and suggested they should be on the list of consulting parties. He will reach out to Mark to confirm.

Chris Wigren asked that given the effects of COVID on state/federal revenues, where does this project lie in DOT's larger priorities for transportation needs around the state?

Andy Fesenmeyer responded that the project is well funded through design. Currently, it is not programmed for construction.

Wes Haynes stated that the Merritt Parkway Conservancy (MPC) board is going to meet in a week or so to review the two current alternatives again. Will this PPT be available for review at that time?

Ken Livingston responded that the presentation and full recording will be available on the project website shortly. He noted that the slide that incorrectly identified alternatives still being considered, would be edited to reflect the current alts (21D and 26).

Mark McMillan stated that it is also important to keep in mind if you (MPC) are discussing the initial stipulations, that we're very early on in the process. While these are ideas, this is not a 'set in stone' list as we identify the preferred alternative and mitigate appropriately to the specific alternative. Stipulations will also be dependent on comments from signatory parties and CPs.

Meeting adjourned at 1:40PM.

#### 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.



## Route 7-15 Norwalk

---

Route 7 - 15 Interchange

State Proj. No. 102-358

Subject: PAC Section 106/Landscape Subcommittee Meeting 3

Date/Time: December 16, 2020 01:00 PM

Location: MS Teams Meeting

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company	Attended
Yolanda	Antoniak	yolanda.antoniak@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Drew	Berndlmaier	Dberndlmaier@norwalkct.org	City of Norwalk	Yes
Tod	Bryant	tbryant23@optonline.net	Norwalk Preservation Trust	Yes
Mike	Calabrese	Michael.Calabrese@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Marguerite	Carnell	MCarnell@ahs-inc.biz	Archaeological and Historical Services, Inc.	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
Wes	Haynes	wes@merrittparkway.org	Merritt Parkway Conservancy	Yes
Emilie	Holland	emilie.holland@dot.gov	FHWA	Yes
Alan	Kibbe	akibbe@att.net	NASH	Yes
Ken	Livingston	klivingston@fhiplan.com	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	Yes
JoAnn	McGrath	jmcgrath@marcuspartners.com	Marcus Properties	Yes
Mark	McMillan	Mark.McMillan@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Marcy	Miller	mmiller@fhiplan.com	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	Yes

Chris	Mojica	Christopher.Mojica@stantec.com	Stantec	Yes
Lynn	Murphy	Lynn.Murphy@ct.gov	CTDOT	Yes
Gary	Sorge	gary.sorge@stantec.com	Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	Yes
Peter	Viteretto	viteretto@heritagelandsapes.com	CT ASLA	Yes
Chris	Wigren	cwigren@preservationct.org	Preservation Connecticut	Yes
Mike	Yeosock	myeosock@norwalkct.org	City of Norwalk	Yes

## Meeting Items

### 3.1

**Topic:** GENERAL

**Status:** Open

**Discussion:**

**Ken Livingston (FHI)** provided an introduction to the meeting and reviewed controls of Microsoft Teams for attendees. He noted the purpose of the meeting as an update on Section 106 activities with a focus on reviewing mitigation of unavoidable adverse effects and the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) process.

**Marcy Miller (FHI)** provided a roll call of attendees.

The presentation then proceeded (presentation is posted to project website):

**Andy Fesenmeyer (CTDOT)** gave a brief recap of Section 106 activities, providing a recap from the first meeting in May 2019, incorporating comments from SHPO into the updated Public Report up to the current work in developing the MOA.

**Marguerite Carnell (AHS)** provided a review of SHPO comments on, and subsequent minor changes to, the Public Report. These focused on slight refinement of the APE boundary and evaluation of additional historic period resources (no additional adverse impacts were found).

**Mark McMillan (CTDOT)** then described the overall purpose and process for developing an MOA and stipulations to compensate for adverse effects on historic properties.

He continued, outlining some of the initial stipulations being considered for the 7-15 project, emphasizing that these were simply the initial thoughts and there could be changes.

**Mark** concluded his section by giving the overall next steps in the MOA process including Consulting Parties being invited to participate in the MOA process, continuing feedback from FHWA, SHPO and ending with a signed MOA that is filed with Advisory Council of Historic Preservation (ACHP).

Andy Fesenmeyer concluded the presentation discussing next steps in EA process with an anticipated finalized EA document (and selection of the preferred alternative) in Spring/Summer of 2021.

John Eberle (Stantec) noted that today was not the only day to be a part of the process. There will be additional opportunities in the future as the process moves along.

#### PAC Subcommittee Comments/Questions

Both Todd Bryant and Chris Wigren noted that they did not see their respective organizations (Norwalk Preservation Trust and Preservation Connecticut) listed in the consulting parties slide.

Team responded that the slide was just a sampling of Consulting Parties (CP's) for graphic effect. Both organizations (and others) are on the official listing of CP's.

Peter Viteretto stated that he has been identified as part of the Silvermine neighborhood group, and while accurate, he also represents CT ASLA and suggested they should be on the list of consulting parties. He will reach out to Mark to confirm.

Chris Wigren asked that given the effects of COVID on state/federal revenues, where does this project lie in DOT's larger priorities for transportation needs around the state?

Andy Fesenmeyer responded that the project is well funded through design. Currently, it is not programmed for construction.

Wes Haynes stated that the Merritt Parkway Conservancy (MPC) board is going to meet in a week or so to review the two current alternatives again. Will this PPT be available for review at that time?

Ken Livingston responded that the presentation and full recording will be available on the project website shortly. He noted that the slide that incorrectly identified alternatives still being considered, would be edited to reflect the current alts (21D and 26).

Mark McMillan stated that it is also important to keep in mind if you (MPC) are discussing the initial stipulations, that we're very early on in the process. While these are ideas, this is not a 'set in stone' list as we identify the preferred alternative and mitigate appropriately to the specific alternative. Stipulations will also be dependent on comments from signatory parties and CPs.

Meeting adjourned at 1:40PM.

#### 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.