



# Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, February 13, 2025  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Place: Selectmen's Conference Room  
Guilford Town Hall  
31 Park Street, Guilford, CT  
AND Virtual (Microsoft Teams)

Re: CTDOT Project No.: 0175-1608  
Route 146 Corridor Management Plan  
**Corridor Working Group Meeting #9**

Project No.: 42441.08

## ATTENDEES:

### Corridor Working Group Members in Attendance:

Name	Affiliation
Josh Lecar	CTDOT
Rajat Mathur ( <i>Remotely Attended</i> )	CTDOT, District 3
Janice Plaziak	Town of Guilford, Town Engineer
Anne Hartjen	Town of Guilford, Town Planner
Bill Sigmund ( <i>Remotely Attended</i> )	CT DEEP
Barbara Ricozzi	Branford Resident
John Hoefflerle ( <i>Remotely Attended</i> )	Town of Branford Town Engineer
Bob Yaro	Guilford Resident
Karyl Lee Hall	Route 146 and Route 77 Scenic Roads Advisory Committee
Catherine Labadia	CT State Historic Preservation Office
Jim Rode ( <i>for Laura Francis</i> )	SCRCOG

### Corridor Working Group Members Not Able to Attend:

Name	Affiliation
Sandy Fry	CT Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Board
Michael Calabrese	CTDOT
Harry Smith	Branford Town Planner
David Rood	Branford Historical Society

### Other Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Joe Balskus	VHB
Daniel Amstutz	VHB
Patrick Zapatka	CTDOT
Matt Hoey	Town of Guilford
Sean Cosgrove	Town of Guilford

NOTES:

- › Patrick Zapatka opened the meeting. Members and others present introduced themselves.
- › The purpose of the meeting was to go over the draft Corridor Management Plan document and discuss any comments from the Corridor Working Group members. Proposed changes to the text were returned to CTDOT to incorporate into the final document, as applicable. The group began by reviewing the changes to the CMP Strategies between the draft strategies in 2024 and the current versions for the 2025 draft CMP.
- › Daniel Amstutz and Joe Balskus of VHB overviewed a spreadsheet showing a comparison between the 2024 Draft Strategies and the 2025 Proposed Strategies.
- › In most cases, strategies did not change between 2024 and 2025. In other situations, a word was added or removed to clarify the intent or orientation of the strategy.
- › The following is an overview of the discussion of the Strategies:
  - Strategy A.4.2: Language in this strategy was changed from “Work with Amtrak” to “Review the potential for” looking at long term solutions to address low clearance/narrow railroad bridges. The second paragraph under the main strategy notes that raising the railroad bridges is “infeasible in the future.” After discussion, the CWG requested adjusting the text to say “infeasible in the **foreseeable** future” to reflect that this may change over time.
  - Strategy C.2: The word “appropriate” was added to this strategy text. CWG members debated the use of the word “appropriate” in this context, as some members were concerned the word made the strategy too proscriptive on what types of traffic calming devices would be allowed on the road. CWG members requested that the phrase “that could be considered” was added to say “Review applicability of appropriate traffic calming measures in areas of concern **that could be considered...**”
    - Bob Yaro suggested that the plan provide illustrative traffic calming measures for Route 146. Balskus noted that the FHWA Traffic Calming Primer can be added as an appendix to the document.
    - Rajat Mathur stated that District 3 is not in favor of using flexible delineators/bollards on state roads.
  - Strategy F.2: This strategy was rewritten in the 2025 version to discuss maintenance best practices and reference the CTDOT Vegetation Management Guidelines in the main text. The CWG discussed the overlap of utility company maintenance practices on CTDOT right-of-way and concerns about aggressive tree cutting around utilities. The finished CMP will be sent to utility coordinators to make them aware and community residents will continue to raise the issue in the towns. It was also noted that this may be more under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA).
  - Strategy F.4: This strategy was changed to say “Maintain mature trees within the right-of-way” and references the CTDOT Vegetation Management Guidelines, which discusses the state scenic roadway regulations and how they apply. The CWG brought up that the strategy does not say anything about replacing trees that need to be removed in the right-of-way. However, the regulations do not make mention of this. Towns may provide grants for planting trees that could be considered.
  - Refer to the attached spreadsheet for changes to the other strategies.
- › The CWG provided other comments on the draft Corridor Management Plan. A summary is below:

- A CWG member pointed out that the Route 146 vehicle speeds map (Figures 2.1 & 2.2) does not include data collected in 2024 in the locations where local police noted high speeds, i.e. near Medlyn's Farm in Branford and east of Moose Hill Road in Guilford. VHB will include these on the map.
- Barbara Ricoszi submitted comments in writing prior to the meeting. VHB will review with CTDOT and incorporate them into the document.
- Janice Plaziak submitted written comments as well. She noted that there is culvert on Boston Street near Soundview Road where it crosses over the Sluice Creek that frequently floods. Need to update the "Flood Risk" section on Page 52 to reference this location. The roadway is not out of the flood zone here.
- Plaziak also requested that several other intersections in Guilford are noted as being of concern and should be added to the list under the Intersection Safety strategy on page 78. These will be added to the document.
- Yaro commented on the need to have an implementation plan for the CMP. It is critical to be clear on what the next steps are for the public to see.
- Yaro said the speed management section should also talk about impacts of larger vehicles to the road and noise from speeding vehicles that impact resident quality of life.
- The strategy on Bicycle & Pedestrian Access and Safety mentions constraints to adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities such as wetlands, slopes, and ledge, but it should also note that there are historic homes and structures very close to the road that also prohibit new road infrastructure.
- Traffic calming and reduction of travel lane widths to reduce speeding was discussed. Yaro asked about 10' travel lanes. He also noted that the plan should say there should be a uniform speed limit on Route 146 between Branford and Guilford, as currently there is a higher speed limit in Guilford. (Ed.: This is included in the description under speed management.)
- Yaro stated that CTDOT should designate a person to oversee annual work program/commit to implementation of the plan.
- Under Strategy G. Environmental and Historic Preservation on page 81, highlight or bold the list of road changes that are limited by the state scenic road regulations, such as widening the right-of-way, changing the road grade, straightening or removal of stone walls, etc.
- Matt Hoey noted that the Town of Guilford intends to restart their Scenic Road Advisory Committee for Route 146.
- The "Crabbing bridge" should not be called a "bridge" in the plan. Call it the crabbing area, or crabbing hole, because the bridge is actually a causeway.
- Cathy Labadia notes that there is a distinction between projects started from CTDOT Headquarters and those started from the DOT District.
- Hoey said the Towns may hold a public information meeting to discuss the final CMP document.
- Print 25 hard copies of the plan for dissemination to the public libraries, town halls, and other locations or stakeholders.

Place: Guilford Town Hall and Virtual  
February 13, 2025: 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
Ref: 42441.08  
Page 4

› Next Steps

- Zapatka discussed the CTDOT project development process and how it relates to Route 146. In terms of public engagement, the PIMA unit at CTDOT has a robust public engagement process that it goes through. He also noted that the Intergovernmental Affairs unit could be a liaison/key contact about Route 146.
- The CWG discussed the revitalization of the local Scenic Roads Advisory Committee in Branford and Guilford. It needs leadership and staff support.
- The finalized document should be provided to the local CTDOT District and consulted on early in project development.

› Action Items:

- VHB will incorporate comments from the CWG into the text and send to CTDOT for review.
- VHB will put together the appendix for the document.

› The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.