

# Flip Chart Notes Recorded at Public Information Meetings

Meeting Date: Tuesday November 15, 2005

Location: Richmond Town Hall Meeting Room, 203 Bridge Street

Time: 6:30 - 8:30 PM

## Rte 2A Improvement Alternatives:

- Design of Route 2A underneath I-89 Bridge needs more room.
- How do Rte 2A Alternatives solve problem at Five Corners?
- How can roundabout handle large commercial vehicles? (Reference was made to Brattleboro roundabout and FHWA guidelines)
- Pedestrian crossings, railroad crossings must be accommodated.
- Essex Junction is working to make Five Corners more pedestrian friendly – 4-Lanes of traffic and roundabouts would wipe out these efforts.
- Original mission of Circ was to improve Five Corners.
- Impacts to Veterans Park would be **very** seriously regarded.
- What are costs and time to implement these alternatives?
  - A: This will be addressed in the DEIS.
- Brattleboro roundabout required modification.
- Expect more growth in future.
- How much time and money are needed to come up with an answer?
  - A: By regulation, an EIS needs to consider a range of alternatives.

## Circ A/B Alternatives:

- Circ A/B should have connection at US 2.
- Will pedestrians and bikes be accommodated (alongside and crossing new roadways)?
  - A: This will be looked at in step 3.
- It appear that there is room for roundabouts to fit in Alternative 17 [Circ A/B Boulevard at Mountain View and Williston Road crossings].
- Alternative 17 [with intersection at Mountain View] doesn't directly address landfill site access.
- Would curb cuts be allowed on new roadway in Circ A right of way in Alternative 17?
  - A: It needs to be considered.
- IBM access is very important – Alternative 17 may not be adequate.
- How many vehicles would use the Redmond interchange?
  - A: This will be answered in the traffic analysis.
- State already performed wetlands mitigation for Circ A/B and this needs to be considered.
- What consideration was given to public transportation?

- A: Alternative 1 was a very extensive package of services but had minimal effect on Rte 2A traffic volumes, congestion, and safety.
- How do Alternatives 16 and 17 affect Five Corners traffic?
  - A: Modeling and analysis was used in screening. It indicated a reduction in traffic.
- Would Circ A/B remove most of the commercial traffic from Five Corners?
  - A: Some but not all.
- Can origins/destinations be identified in travel demand model?
  - A: Yes, this will be explored at level of traffic analysis zones.
- Why was the Brownell Road Alternative dropped?
  - A: Limited transportation benefits and many wetland and residential impacts. .

**Hybrid Alternatives:**

- Circ segment “A” does not stop at Mountain View Road; it actually extends to the previously proposed interchange north of Mountain View.
- Hybrid alternative doesn’t seem to make sense – for instance access to Essex or Jericho is not improved.
- Was congestion considered at I-89 Exit 14?
  - A: Will look at it in the next step; screening focused on the project area.
- Full Circ to I-89 Exit 16 would be best overall.

**Other Comments:**

- How wide is the area that will be studied in the EIS?
  - A: It varies by category, 500-800 feet for air and noise. Beyond county limits for indirect and cumulative impacts (ICI).
- Both safety and travel time affect people’s choices of which community to live in.
- It is very important to minimize impacts – leave Five Corners alone.
- Essex Junction is the only walk-to-school community in the county. One cannot imagine how children will cross at a roundabout, even with a guard.
- Any alternative other than Circ A/B will take 8-10 years longer to complete and environmental benefits will be delayed– e.g. air quality improvement.
- Is the study really necessary?
  - A: It makes sense to examine alternatives’ impacts before making decisions.
- Is it possible to come out with Circ A/B plus improvements on 2A as well?
  - A: yes if supported by the analysis.
- Including Rte 2A improvements could hold up construction of the Circ.
- Will all 8 alternatives need to be fully assessed? – Yes.
- Has there been any conclusion about which of the 8 Alternatives are superior?
  - A: No, the “non-starters” have been screened out and all are treated equally.
- Questions the projections made in the 1990s – the population projection was significantly too high.
- Basis of projections: will the effect of gas prices be considered? Should look at weekly gas tax receipts over the period of price rise
  - A: The study will look at the potential effect of gas prices.
- Should look at areawide network rather than one corridor.

- Concerns about carbon monoxide levels on neighborhood.
- Will future use of state-owned land in the Right of Way be considered in the EIS?
  - A: No, that is not a consideration in choosing an alternative.
- Noise from I-89 is audible a mile away where ambient noise is low; an 800' noise study area may be too narrow.
- Does previous expenditure come into consideration?
  - A: No.
- Is consistency with local plans considered?
  - A: Yes.
- Can roadway improvements be shown on an oblique aerial photo?
  - A: Yes, this will be done.
- Location of meetings – why no meeting in Essex Junction this time?
  - A: We are rotating locations among Essex Junction, Essex, and Williston. June meetings were at the Expo, September at Essex High School; next meeting will be in the Village.
- It was noted that material from Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation (GBIC) was made available- a disclaimer is appropriate.
  - Rich Ranaldo noted that it is the policy to make information provided by organizations such as GBIC and the Smart Growth Collaborative available at meetings if they request. VTrans does not endorse any of the statements made in material distributed by these organizations.
- Meetings should be better advertised.
- How is final decision on an alternative made?
  - A: The EIS is a Federal document, and the decision will be made by FHWA with input from VTrans and cooperating federal, state, and regional agencies and the public.