



**The I-84 Hartford Project
Public Advisory Committee Meeting #1
Wednesday, October 16, 2013
8:30 – 10:15 AM
Conference of Churches Collaboration Centre
224 Farmington Avenue, Hartford**

The first Public Advisory Committee (PAC) for the I-84 Hartford Project was held on Wednesday, October 16, 2013 at Conference of Churches Collaboration Centre in Hartford. The purpose of this meeting was to acquaint the PAC members with the project team and each other, clarify the PAC's role and process, and provide an overview and discussion of the project.

Each PAC member was given a project binder that included the meeting agenda, a copy of the presentation, lists of the project team and PAC members, a summary of stakeholder themes that were voiced at approximately 30 stakeholder interview sessions, and a draft Purpose and Need Statement. At each PAC meeting, additional materials will be provided as they are developed.

The meeting began with introductions by all present after which CTDOT and the project team made a presentation [http://www.i84hartford.com/project_reports.html] about the project. The I-84 Hartford Project is led by a partnership of the Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) and Federal Highway Administration in cooperation with the Capitol Region Council of Governments, City of Hartford, Town of East Hartford and Town of West Hartford. It is managed by a consultant team led by TranSystems and assisted by Parsons Brinckerhoff, Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc., Goody Clancy and A. DiCesare Associates.

The Public Advisory Committee is comprised of representatives of neighborhood organizations, institutions, major employers, municipalities, transportation providers and agencies and interest groups. Its role is to provide viewpoints and ideas with the project team, serve and a conduit for two-way communication between the project team and its constituent group and help reach consensus on project alternatives.

The project team reviewed with the PAC the results of the previous HUB of Hartford in which three alternatives were identified for further study and acknowledged the important foundation it laid for the I-84 Hartford Project. The project team identified the mission of this project is to evaluate all reasonable options for the replacement of I-84 through Hartford and to construct the selected alternative. This project will address three major concerns -bridge structure deficiencies, traffic operations, and safety deficiencies as well as addressing other opportunities such as economic development, neighborhood connectivity, and enhanced



mobility for people – whether they drive, walk, bike, or use transit. This I-84 project will also capitalize on synergies with other regional, state, and local projects.

The project, expected to take 14 years to complete, is very complex. There are many interrelated transportation facilities, it will be expensive to finance, will need to undergo thorough environmental documentation and the selected alternative will have to balance the needs of many.

A draft Purpose and Need Statement was distributed for the PAC to review and comment on in future meetings. This statement describes the problem that needs to be solved and is the foundation for the selection of an alternative.

The range of public outreach methods that will be used was described to the PAC. Besides the PAC, they include stakeholder interviews, a project website: www.I84Hartford.com, social media (Facebook, Twitter), newsletters, E-bulletins and public meetings.

Throughout the meeting PAC members asked questions, made comments and offered opinions. Below is a summary of questions or comments raised by members of the PAC, with some remarks followed by responses by the project team:

The linkage between downtown and Asylum Hill is critical. Any project must address that. (Oz Griebel)

What is the linkage between the DOT & the legislative delegation? Has the team met with the legislators? This is very important. It would be a good idea for someone from Congressman Larson's staff to be on this committee. (Oz Griebel)

[CTDOT response: Legislators have not yet been briefed, but will be brought into the discussion once the project reaches the environmental phase.]

The HUB Study took the financial aspects of each alternative into strong consideration. The reason that Concept 2 was chosen as the most beneficial was a matter of the cost evaluation of the alternatives. I recall the study concluded that a good portion of the highway could be brought down to grade thereby saving money to offset the increased costs of burying other portions of the highway. (Mike Marshall)

The sooner the public understands the cost of no build (continually making repairs vs. building new) the better for getting support. The message should be, we need to pay so what are we going to get for our money? What's the cost of doing nothing? (Oz Griebel)

[CTDOT response: The governor has directed DOT to move faster on this project]

We are going to need to start tolling to generate money for I-84 – (Jackie McKinney)



[Response from CTDOT] Right now the DOT is looking at strategic planning to develop a vision for transportation in CT in the future. The department is studying tolling. Currently DOT is evaluating three locations – Route 11, I-84 Hartford and I-95 from New Haven to New York. Only overhead electronic tolling will be considered.]

How do you change the culture of people so that they use transit? (Jackie McKinney)

[CTDOT response: The State is building a busway (CTFastrak) and implementing commuter rail, both of which will serve Hartford. Providing convenient and comfortable transportation choices for our customers will influence whether transit is used more]

When will there be alternatives ready to discuss? (Oz Griebel)

It's not clear to me what the goals of this project are. What are the priorities? That's where we started with the HUB project and worked from there. (Bob Painter)

There should be a list of incontrovertible goals (such as safety) as well as others.

Transportation is not the first priority of a lot of people at this table. We want to see critical goals of the HUB (e.g. economic development, neighborhood impacts) as important, not just as other opportunities. Specifically, the designation of neighborhood connections, economic development, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements as "opportunities" implied that those elements would not be a focus of the project. (Toni Gold)

Will the timing of the environmental document be aligned with developing the alternatives or will it slow down the project?

[Response by project team: These two processes will be concurrent—the NEPA process will not be "behind" the rest of the project]

The project's Purpose & Need is critical. How will the PAC be able to evaluate it? More discussion on Purpose & Need is needed. How can we get written comments to the team?

(Toni Gold)

[Response by project team: Written comments can be delivered via the website or directly to a member of the project team by email.]

I'd want to know more about the analysis of deficiencies before P&N is developed. Do you know what percentage of I-84 traffic is local? (David Morin)

How often will meetings be held? How long will they last? (Jennifer Cassidy)

About half of the PAC indicated that 8:30 AM is a good starting time. One person commented that 2 hours is long for a PAC meeting and it would be better to keep meetings to 1.5 hours if possible. The project team responded to the questions as follows:



1. The team will try to arrange for 90 minute meeting if the material can be covered in that time
2. PAC meetings will likely be held about every 2-3 months, but meetings may be more frequent during the very important first few years of the project when the alternatives will be developed.
3. Meeting locations may change but will be equally convenient and accessible venues in or near the project area.

Agenda for next meeting: PAC members identified three topics that it would like on the agenda for the next meeting – Purpose & Need, cost of doing nothing to I-84, and a review of the traffic analysis conducted.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

In attendance:

Public Advisory Committee

Aaron Kupick, Public Relations, AAA

Michael Marshall, Head of Global Asset Management, Aetna

Jackie McKinney, ArtSpace Resident Association

Jennifer Cassidy, President, Asylum Hill Neighborhood Association

Thomas Deller, Director, Department of Development Services, City of Hartford

Lynn Ferrari, Chair, Coalition to Strengthen the Sheldon/Charter Oak Neighborhood

Jennifer Carrier, Director of Transportation Planning, Capitol Region Council of Governments

Richard Armstrong, Principal Engineer, Connecticut Department of Transportation

David Nardone, Engineering Team Leader, Federal Highway Administration

David Corrigan, President, Frog Hollow Neighborhood Revitalization Zone and Northside
Institutions Neighborhood Alliance

Vicki Shotland, Executive Director, Greater Hartford Transit District

Hans Keck, Safety & Security Manager, Hartford Courant

David Fichalder, in place of Bimal Patel, Vice President of Operations, Hartford Hospital

Frank Hagaman, Executive Director, Hartford Preservation Alliance

Robert Painter, Chair, HUB of Hartford

Oz Griebel, Executive Director, Metro Hartford Alliance

David Morin, President, Parkville Revitalization Association

Doug Moore, Bureau of Properties and Facilities Management, State of Connecticut
Department of Administrative Services

Robert Benzinger, Assistant Vice President of Global Assets, The Hartford

Mayor Marcia A. Leclerc, Town of East Hartford

Ron Van Winkle, Town Manager, Town of West Hartford

Anne Hayes for James Scannell, Senior Vice President, Administrative Services, The Travelers

Jason Rojas for Paul Mutone, Vice President for Finance and Operations, Trinity College



Toni Gold, West End Civic Association
Project team members:

Connecticut Department of Transportation

Tom Maziarz, CTDOT

Tim Wilson, CTDOT

Brian Natwick, CTDOT

John Dudzinski, CTDOT

Consultant Team

Dave Stahnke, TranSystems

Tim Ryan, TranSystems

Mohammed Ammad, TranSystems

Christine Tiernan, AECOM

Deborah Howes, AECOM

Mike Morehouse, FHI

Ruth Fitzgerald, FHI

Rachel Gary, FHI

Jill Barrett, FHI