

Route 156 Bike Way and Sound View Improvements Committee
Unapproved Minutes from Meeting of March 2, 2015 4:30PM
Memorial Town Hall, Old Lyme, CT

Members Present (v-voting): Frank Pappalardo (v), Jim Lamos (v), Skip Sibley (v), Mary Jo Nosal (v), John MacDonald (v), Bonnie Reemsnyder (v), and Jean Davies from RiverCOG. Excused: Angelo Faenza. Guests: David Head of VHB; Kurt Prochorena of BSC Group, Nina Peck and Brian Ross for Nina Cuccio Peck Architecture and Interiors. Community members: included Lenny Cordo, Stephanie Livesey, Sandra Ziemba, Joann Lishing, and Michaelle Pierson.

Welcome

A quorum was present and the meeting was called to order at 4:34 PM

Approval of Minutes

Motion: To approve the minutes of 2/3/15 by Bonnie and seconded by Frank was amended by Bonnie and seconded by Frank to include David Head as present as noted by skip. Motion passed unanimously 6-0-0.

Parking-Safety Study

- Mary Jo briefed the attendees on the history of the parking-safety study concern. Kurt noted that a beach capacity study is too limiting to address some of the concerns and has provided a list of data needs. However, efforts should be made to collect what data and not delay the project time frame.
- Frank pointed out:
 - 1) This is a public safety study and safety is our priority.
 - 2) There are three dead end streets at Sound View and we have limited real estate.
 - 3) The minutes of the VHB and bar owners meeting regarding parking concerns remain outstanding.
- David has draft minutes to provide the committee. He indicated that the DOT would look favorably on a study that addressed a community concern and would probably fund it. This scope addition would require notification to VHB and approval by CTDOT which he would manage. He added that DOT will pay for transportation improvements at the 80/20 split. The work would be part of our extra work budget allowance.
- Bonnie asked if this would affect our 10% restroom construction set aside and David said no, this study would be part of the 10% extra work agreement or as Skip noted, the contingency fund.
- Mary Jo asked for assurance that the study would be reimbursed. David said he could not guarantee this but that he would manage the discussion with DOT traffic and felt comfortable that it would be.

Study Purpose and Budget:

- Frank pointed out that a lot of information had been sent to BSC including: parking records from Don Bugbee of Park and Rec, Sound View Commission meeting minutes and memos, kiosk parking records and a detailed memo from Officer Heinssen. Kurt felt there was enough available to draft a scope of work and budget for the committee.
- Jim and John asked David if the BSC list would suffice for DOT. David said yes, that DOT traffic will look at everything and doesn't advise us to "short sell" the analysis. Traffic may recommend improvements such as gates and will pay for the improvements at the 80/20 split.
- Jim noted the past competition between the town lot and private parking owners pricing. Frank stated that the town lot rates and kiosk parking rates are set.
- John noted that a study cannot be designed for the holiday crowding situation. Any reduction in parking may benefit the private owners.
- Mary Jo noted that our engineers analyzed our program needs and made recommendations. Frank added that now we are assessing the public safety aspects of the project area.
- Mary Jo added that the private businesses have parking. The Old Lyme Zoning Official has not located a zoning agreement between the Town and Lenny's, although Lenny indicated last summer that he may have it. The committee acknowledges that it is not the town's responsibility to provide parking to private business.

- Jean asked for clarification:

- 1) Who is asking the questions and why? Frank responded that the area is overcrowded but two bar owners have met with VHB requesting more parking and that no one from the committee was part of the meeting.
- 2) Is this an engineered study or a simple parking analysis?
- 3) Why isn't land use on the list of needs?

Kurt responded that this is not an engineered study but a data analysis driven by the concerns the committee is addressing. Land use zoning is part of the list. Local and applicable State requirements can be included.

- Jean offered that the questions to examine are:

- 1) Is the project improving conditions? Assumedly the DOT would not have approved a project that was not.
- 2) Is the project aggravating the pre-existing conditions?
- 3) If the pre-existing conditions are aggravated by the project, how can these be mitigated?

There was consensus among the committee for this focus.

The BSC Parking-Safety Study need list review:

- Jean asked David if this was really a Complete Streets analysis vs. parking study. David felt it was a complete streets analysis as it addressed parking, transportation, sidewalks.
- Bonnie observed if that was the case, then the committee has already done this through the engineering process. Problems or area concerns and needs have been expressed to the engineers, e.g. garbage cans and narrow sidewalks, and they have recommended solutions.
- Dave agreed and asked is there any negative impact from the project? Jean said, is the project creating problems?
- Jean asked David if any other enhancement projects are facing this. Dave said this project is unique due to the decreased parking and the destination point enhancement.
- Jean noted that this was part of the DOT review and approval and asked if DOT agrees that this is a late stage request? Dave said DOT does see this as a late request, but the committee agreed to a parking study and it does not have to be a big project.
- Jean wondered why off street parking was being analyzed and if the scope should be scaled back. There have been pre-existing problems in the area. The end goal is to analyze if the project is creating any problems.
- Dave noted that DOT likes this and it addresses public concerns.
- Mary Jo offered to help fill in the blanks for Kurt with the information provided from Frank and Tom Heinszen but asked the committee to provide anything within 48 hours. The goal would be to be able to vote on next steps at the next meeting.

BSC Group-Preliminary Design Plans

- The third invoice was presented. It was noted that a credit was included for the required DOT 10% hold-back not recognized on the previous two invoices.
- The project schedule was presented. The Public Informational meeting is recommended to be held in early June. The parking-safety study will take about 4 weeks and will be added to the schedule following the approval of a scope of work and budget. Project construction will begin in the first quarter of 2016.
- Frank asked about the storm water meetings with CTDOT which have been deferred since November. David said he hopes to set up the meeting for next week. Mary Jo suggested that someone from the committee could attend. Kurt explained to the committee that the meeting is important to assure that any regulatory refinements can be made to the preliminary design.

Restroom:

- Nina's substructure engineer, Christopher Zajda, is reviewing the geotech report. She stated that helical piles would be needed. Mary Jo read an email she forwarded to the committee from Chris indicating his experience in Milford on a similar post Storm Sandy project. Each pile cost \$1000-\$1500. Additionally, each pile required a pile cap, and cast-in-place reinforced grade beams. The slab would need to be reinforced and there would be special inspection requirements.

- Nina and Brian discussed the above foundation restroom plans which are per the project program. There is a planned male, female and family area, all will meet ADA requirements.
- Costs need to be worked up. An estimate of \$200 per sq. ft. for the approx. 820 sq. ft. restroom was mentioned. The design will be modified so the 9x10 ft. office faces the parking lot. Frank will confer with Tom Heinszen about this. The roof is suggested to be green to match other buildings in town. The facility recommendation is a split face concrete base and with a polished wall for easy maintenance.

Scope:

- Jean asked if BSC considered reverse angle parking. Kurt said the feeling was that in this area, it would be a traffic hazard. Bonnie added that following the parking-safety study, that might be something to review. Jim indicated that the line will be helped with the bump-outs.
- Kurt provided the requested analysis of the Hartford Avenue sidewalk widths. The proposed 8 ft. sidewalks on both sides of the street would require excessive grading and concrete work due to the crowning of Hartford Avenue. The new analyses included a graphic with an auto, bike and pedestrian on a sidewalk. Option A1- 6 ft. sidewalks on both sides or Option A- 8 ft. sidewalk on the east side and 6 ft. on the west side. The symmetry of equal foot sidewalks was discussed.

Motion: To approve option A1, 6 ft. sidewalks on both sides of the street, to the preliminary design was made by Frank and seconded by Bonnie. No further discussion and motion passed 6-0-0

Public Comment

Lenny asked the following questions that the Committee chose to address:

- 1) Does the restroom foundation have to meet FEMA regulations? The engineering firm will ensure regulatory compliance.
- 2) Will the restroom have outside running water? The plan is to have a foot wash.
- 3) Who will maintain the restroom? The will as it is a town asset. It will be maintained as the other public restroom facilities in town are.
- 4) Is there a contingency plan if the sewer plan does not happen? The restroom construction approval will require a means to remove the waste. The current feeling is that the restroom will be connected to a sewer beach community. Committee members noted the relevance of the sewer plans for this project. John will provide some photos of other bathroom facilities. Bonnie noted that the cost of the restroom is of great significance.

Adjourn

Motion: Motion to adjourn at 6:32PM made by Skip, seconded by John. Motion passed without discussion 6-0-0.

Next meeting

March 24, 2015 at 4:30PM in Memorial Town Hall