

## **D. Matrix of Comments and Responses**

- I. Agency Comments and Responses
- II. Public Comments and Responses

i. Agency Comments and Responses

**I-84 Hartford Project - Scoping  
Summary of Agency Comments and Responses  
10/21/15**

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
1	CTDEEP	Environmental	Impacts	<i>The Department concurs with the following statement from the SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 Agency Coordination Plan that summarizes the types of environmental impacts anticipated for this project: "Due to the nature of the project corridor and surrounding areas, the impact parameters of most importance will be those related to the built environment such as air quality, noise, vibration, contamination of soils or water from historic activities, visual resources, cultural resources, economic conditions, and construction activities."</i>	Comment acknowledged.
1.1	CTDEEP	Environmental	Hydrologic/ Water Resources	<i>The Natural Resources Conservation Service's Soil Survey depicts the entire I-84 corridor as urban land and various types of udorthents. It is highly unlikely that there are any wetlands within the immediate project corridor that would be directly impacted by construction. There are unpaved areas, such as under the Sisson Avenue interchange, where drainage from the highway may have resulted in a watercourse as defined by section 22a-38 (16) of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS). It is recommended that a certified soil scientist perform a reconnaissance of the corridor in order to determine whether there are any areas which would be regulated as wetlands or watercourses. If the reconnaissance identifies regulated areas, they should be delineated.</i>	The project corridor will be evaluated for potential wetland areas or watercourses and, if present, will be delineated by a certified soil scientist.
1.2	CTDEEP	Environmental	Hydrologic/ Water Resources	<i>As depicted on the Flood Insurance Rate Map, the eastbound I-84 lanes span the 500-year flood zone near the Flatbush Avenue entrance ramp and are adjacent to the 500-year flood zone up to the entrance of the South Branch Park River conduit. The 100-year flood zone is confined to the South Branch Park River channel through this stretch upstream of the conduit. Flood management certification pursuant to section 25-68d of the CGS would not be required unless project encroaches into the 100-year flood zone. The FIRM also contains a note that this area includes "required flood storage area below elevation 51.02 NAVD as noted in formal agreement between the Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Hartford." The Greater Hartford Flood Control Commission should be contacted concerning potential requirements.</i>	CTDOT will contact The Greater Hartford Flood Control Commission to discuss potential requirements, and they will be documented in the NEPA/CEPA document.
1.3	CTDEEP	Environmental	Hydrologic/ Water Resources	<i>It is assumed that the stormwater runoff from the existing highway is directed to the collection system in the local roadways and/or the Park River conduit without pretreatment. In either case, it would ultimately discharge to the Connecticut River. The opportunity to introduce treatment measures to the stormwater collection system during reconstruction of the highway should be explored. Constraints involved in this urban location, including soil suitability, space limitations, conflicts with existing utilities, and maintenance requirements, are recognized. However, emerging technologies may provide workable solutions. Because construction will not begin for five years, it is not expected that specific mitigation measures would be identified in the NEPA document; ConnDOT should make a commitment to further explore this issue as design proceeds.</i>	The NEPA/CEPA document will describe potential stormwater management technologies which will be further explored and developed during final design.
1.4	CTDEEP	Environmental	Air Quality	<i>As noted above, air quality impacts will be an important parameter of the environmental assessment for this project. Connecticut is nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone and attainment/maintenance for both fine particulate matter and carbon dioxide. Connecticut has little recourse for remediating a shortfall in emissions reductions that could be precipitated by an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). As such, Connecticut should be looking for ways to get any reductions possible from projects involving mobile sources in order to meet NAAQS requirements. Measures, such as interchange improvements or providing adequate shoulders, that reduce congestion could also yield air quality benefits. The Department recommends that ConnDOT consult with the Air Planning &amp; Standards Division in developing the modeling for air quality impacts of the projected future traffic flow within and through the corridor. The analysis should include how any additional emissions from increased VMTs will be offset.</i>	As part of the NEPA/CEPA document, a technical air quality analysis will be conducted to determine project generated air quality emissions and assess the need for mitigation as warranted. CTDOT will be working with CTDEEP's Bureau of Air Management, Air Planning and Standards Division, as well as USEPA, to obtain concurrence on appropriate modeling methodologies and required inputs for the MOVES2014 model.
1.5	CTDEEP	Environmental	Air Quality	<i>In order to mitigate potential air quality impacts from construction activities, the Department typically recommends the following measures. Again, since construction will not begin for 5 years, it would be premature for ConnDOT to commit to a specific strategy during this NEPA review, as technology will likely evolve in the interim. These recommendations are provided for your information. It is expected that ConnDOT would commit to a strategy utilizing appropriate mitigation technology available at the time of construction. This may change during the multi-year construction period, a situation similar to the Connecticut Clean Air Initiative implemented for the I-95 New Haven Harbor Crossing Corridor Improvement Program. (See original letter which recommended specific measures for reducing emissions on large construction projects.)</i>	Comment acknowledged. The Project Team will review the initiatives implemented in the mitigation strategy of the I-95 New Haven Harbor Crossing Corridor when developing a strategy for this project.
1.6	CTDEEP	Traffic and Transportation	Parking	<i>In keeping with the Department's interest in furthering the use of alternate fuels for transportation purposes, we recommend that charging/fueling stations be included at any parking lots that are rebuilt as a result of the project. Increasing the availability of public charging stations will facilitate the introduction of the alternate fuels technology into the state and serve to alleviate the present energy dependence on petroleum and improve air quality.</i>	CTDOT will take this comment into consideration as the project develops.

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
1.7	CTDEEP	Environmental	Contamination and Hazardous Materials	<i>As construction commences, the discovery of hazardous materials, hazardous waste and/or contaminated soils would be a potential throughout the project corridor. Those alternatives that involve more excavation would obviously increase the likelihood of encountering contamination. It is assumed that ConnDOT's standard procedures, such as preparing Land Use Evaluation reports (Task 110) and Preliminary Evaluation reports (Task 120), would be employed to evaluate the potential to encounter contamination. A site-specific hazardous materials management plan should be developed prior to commencement of construction and a health and safety plan for construction workers should also be prepared. The Department's standard comments concerning construction projects in urban areas are submitted for your information: (See original letter which recommended specific measures for hazmat and safe waste disposal.)</i>	CTDOT will conduct its standard screening evaluations to identify potential Hazardous Materials, Waste, and Contaminated Soils prior to construction. The overall Project Management Plan will address how these contaminated materials from soils and/or the demolition of buildings are handled and disposed of in accordance with state and federal regulations. In addition, the Project Management Plan will contain requirements to be followed to ensure the safety and security of those working on this project during construction.
1.8	CTDEEP	Environmental	Communities and Socioeconomic Conditions	<i>The DEEP Office of Environmental Justice is aware that previous extensive construction projects in urban environments have resulted in displacement of rodents that result in problem infestations in neighboring areas. Prior to construction, a comprehensive survey of the project area should be conducted to identify rodent nesting/feeding areas. An extermination plan should be developed in coordination with municipal health officials to be implemented before construction activities commence. The project site and surrounding areas should be monitored to confirm the success of the extermination efforts and investigate any reports of rodents. Additional extermination efforts should be implemented, as necessary.</i>	Prior to construction, CTDOT will coordinate with the City of Hartford's Department of Health and Human Services regarding the issue of rodents being disturbed during construction and causing unwanted nuisances.
1.9	CTDEEP	Environmental	Biological Resources	<i>The Natural Diversity Data Base has no records of extant species of species listed by the State, pursuant to section 26-306 of the CGS, as endangered, threatened or special concern, that occur within the project corridor. The Natural Diversity Data Base response includes all information regarding critical biological resources available at the time of the request. This information is a compilation of data collected over the years by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's Natural History Survey and cooperating units of DEEP, private conservation groups and the scientific community. This information is not necessarily the result of comprehensive or site-specific field investigations. Consultations with the Data Base should not be substitutes for on-site surveys required for environmental assessments. Current research projects and new contributors continue to identify additional populations of species and locations of habitats of concern, as well as, enhance existing data. Such new information is incorporated into the Data Base as it becomes available. The result of this review does not preclude the possibility that listed species may be encountered on site and that additional action may be necessary to remain in compliance with certain state permits.</i>	The project corridor will be evaluated for signs of state or federally protected species, or their suitable habitat. If protected species are found, coordination will occur with CTDEEP and/or the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). CTDOT will stay informed of updates to the lists of state and federally protected species as the project progresses.  It is important to note that the USFWS has declined an invitation to become a Participating Agency for the I-84 Hartford Project due to "limited concerns" and "no interest" in such a role.
2	SHPO	Environmental	Historic Resources	<i>The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the referenced project in response to your request for our comments regarding potential effects to historic properties, dated December 12, 2014. The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) is considering the rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement of Interstate 84 (I-84) through downtown Hartford. This office recognizes the purpose and need of the proposed project and we accept the invitation to be a cooperating agency during the life of the project because of the potential impacts to historic properties. SHPO understands that four preliminary design alternatives are under consideration and that public outreach has been initiated. This office appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed project at this early stage of planning.</i>	Comment acknowledged.
2.1	SHPO	Environmental	Historic Resources	<i>The Study Area identified in the Scoping document contains at least two previously recorded archeological sites, more than 40 properties individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and 18 historic districts listed on the NRHP. Because the final project plans are not known, it is not possible to determine the direct or indirect effects of the proposed project on historic properties. Of the build alternatives, SHPO considers Preliminary Alternative 2 to have the fewest foreseeable impacts to historic resources. However, Preliminary Alternatives 3 and 4 may offer expanded opportunities for building use and potential preservation. As a result, this office looks forward to additional consultation regarding this project as it moves forward.</i>	The Project Team will continue consultation with SHPO as the project moves forward, and will compare the historic, architectural, and archaeological impacts of all alternatives being investigated.
3	EPA	Purpose and Need	Mobility	<i>Our comments are based on information from FHWA and CTDOT from a number of sources including a Scoping Initiation Packet, an Agency Coordination Plan, a January 20, 2015 Scoping meeting and conversations with staff at FHWA. According to this information, the objective of the I-84 Hartford Project is to "address the structural deficiencies of the existing highway, improve traffic operations and safety conditions, and reduce congestion on the I-84 mainline in Hartford and its interchanges...." The project information also highlights proposed enhancements to "access, safety and mobility for vehicular traffic, bicycles and pedestrians within the project area." The need for the project is not in question as the bridge spans over the two mile stretch of I-84 in the project area have deteriorated to the point that they require replacement. The state of the roadway infrastructure in combination with the heavy daily vehicle use (the highest of any highway in Connecticut), its location in the heart of Hartford adjacent to environmental justice communities, and the presence of existing rail and CTfastrak corridors makes the project challenging. It also presents a great opportunity, already recognized by both FHWA and CTDOT, to not only improve the functional capacity of I-84, but also to better integrate the highway into the urban environment.</i>	Comment acknowledged.

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.1	EPA	Environmental	Impacts	<i>The construction and operation of the I-84 Project could result in a wide range of direct, indirect (secondary) and cumulative impacts to resources that are within EPA's areas of jurisdiction and expertise. Based on our review of available information, we believe the scoping materials identified many of the major environmental concerns that should be fully examined during the NEPA process. The potential for community level impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project is great. In recognition of this, FHWA and CTDOT have embarked on an outreach program to attempt to engage the local community in discussions about the project. EPA believes these efforts will be important throughout the life of the project.</i>	Comment acknowledged.
3.2	EPA	Environmental	Project Classification	<i>Based on project information provided in the scoping package, a recent interagency meeting, and a project area tour hosted by FHWA, we believe that consideration of a number of project factors collectively suggests an EIS as an appropriate NEPA vehicle for the environmental review of the proposed project. EPA does not question the need for the project and, like FHWA and CTDOT, recognizes that likely remedies for the failing infrastructure will be complicated to design, review and implement. In our view, the major factors that signal the need for an EIS include the local and regional importance of this stretch of I-84; implementing a build alternative for a roadway that currently carries 175,000 cars a day without causing significant negative impacts to the local and regional transportation network; project complexity and design challenges/constraints presented by existing rail and busway facilities in the project corridor; and the likelihood of significant impacts on the human environment along the entire two-mile corridor. The project will certainly affect the lives of persons living or working there, including a significant environmental justice population. The scope of interest in the project from local citizens and the business community in the Hartford area may well end up being one of the strongest reasons to prepare an EIS. EPA looks forward to ongoing conversations with FHWA and CTDOT on this issue as the scoping comments are analyzed and preliminary environmental analysis of impacts begins. We appreciate the opportunity to offer scoping comments and preliminary process recommendations early to help the project avoid delays.</i>	Due to the unknown significance of impacts at the beginning of the scoping process, the FHWA decided that the appropriate class of action was an Environmental Assessment for this project, in accordance with 23 CFR §771.115(c). As this project progresses, if it is found that there is potential for significant impacts from the reasonable alternatives, a Notice of Intent will be prepared by FHWA and an Environmental Impact Statement will be developed. To avoid potential delays and have early and continued dialogues with resource and regulatory agencies, FHWA and CTDOT decided to implement the SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 Agency Coordination requirements. The FHWA and CTDOT appreciate that the USEPA has agreed to be a Participating Agency in the process and will continue to have ongoing discussions regarding the types and significance of impacts to the natural and built environment as a result of this project.
3.3	EPA	Traffic and Transportation	Multimodal	<i>EPA supports the preliminary list of alternatives and that each alternative will need to be developed in a collaborative fashion to make sure that the future I-84 alignment works in harmony with the rail and busway through the corridor. EPA also suggests that each alternative be considered in conjunction with other measures to reduce congestion on I-84 and to serve the Hartford area such as mass transit options to remove cars from the roads in the project area and Transportation System Management options (high-occupancy vehicle lanes, ridesharing, etc.). As the alternatives are developed and more is learned about the potential for impacts, it may be advantageous to consider hybrid alternatives. EPA also believes that FHWA and CTDOT should design each alternative with a focus not only on transportation and safety, but also on increased community connections across I-84 and whatever other major goals local citizens establish for the project. Finally, EPA supports elimination of the bypass concept from consideration, since it would not address the project purpose and need, and would provide little traffic relief given that the majority of peak hour trips begin or end in Hartford.</i>	CTfastrak is a dedicated mass transit facility within the project corridor that opened March 2015. This project was constructed with the purpose of alleviating congestion on I-84 by offering commuters another modal choice. Thus, the Alternatives Analysis is accommodating this mass transit facility in all designs, but no new mass transit options are being evaluated at this time. The Alternatives Analysis process is considering other measures such as TSM (Transportation System Management). CTDOT is in the process of finishing a Value Pricing Pilot Program study, which evaluated congestion pricing in the I-84 Hartford area. Pertinent information from this study will be incorporated in the alternatives analysis for this project, where applicable. Addressing community connections is a project goal identified in the Draft Purpose and Need Statement.

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.4	EPA	Environmental	Construction	<p><i>Because the construction and staging of the project will be complicated and is likely to cause significant disruption, we suggest that the EIS also contain a comprehensive discussion of Construction Period Alternatives. That analysis should explain how the project will be implemented and measures that can be taken to address potentially significant local impacts and the amount of time the regional transportation network will be compromised. The EIS should draw upon the experience and lessons learned by the FHWA and other DOTs from other major infrastructure replacement projects.</i></p> <p><i>EPA requests the opportunity to remain actively involved in the development, screening and evaluation of alternatives for the project.</i></p>	<p>Due to the project being located within a highly urbanized area, CTDOT and FHWA are aware that the project is likely to have temporary impacts during the construction period. These will be analyzed in the NEPA/CEPA documentation based on the best available information at the time. The CTDOT will consider staging and accelerated construction technologies (ACT) for all the alternatives. EPA will be kept up-to-date during the Alternatives Analysis process.</p> <p>A Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MP&amp;T) Plan is being developed to address the maintenance of traffic through or near this section of I-84 and to assess various traffic management scenarios and their impact on the traveling public (vehicles and pedestrians). This MP&amp;T Plan will thoroughly address the extent of the traveling public's use of other transportation modes during construction to determine the feasibility of partial or full closure of I-84 in an effort to shorten construction duration, thus minimizing construction related impacts.</p>
3.5	EPA	Environmental	Environmental Justice	<p><i>EPA strongly supports the project goal of better integrating the I-84 project corridor with the urban environment, particularly given the significant environmental justice populations living in close proximity. As noted in our Environmental Justice comments below, we encourage FHWA and CTDOT to explore methods to most effectively involve local residents who may not respond to usual public outreach methods such as newsletters, public meetings, and neighborhood organizations. Much experience has been gained in non-traditional outreach by entities that received HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning or Community Challenge Grants, and we suggest consulting with HUD's Connecticut Field Office and the Capitol Region Council of Governments for suggestions on approaches that have been effective in the region. These extra efforts are important and can help ensure that project input is representative of the populations that will be most affected by the project.</i></p> <p><i>The environmental analysis should address the potential for impacts to adjacent communities and the environment through a comparison of the proposed design and construction alternatives to the No Build. In addition, the analysis should discuss how best to take advantage of opportunities presented by the project to: reduce the physical separation I-84 represents between communities; reconnect neighborhoods; and, reduce noise, air (including particulate pollution), visual and aesthetic impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Successful community outreach and engagement will likely require extensive public meetings and design charrettes to allow the public and business community to identify important issues. FHWA and CTDOT have already begun this process in earnest and a sustained effort will be essential over the course of the project.</i></p>	<p>CTDOT meets monthly with the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) and the City of Hartford to discuss the project. In addition, HUD is a Participating Agency for this project. CTDOT has initiated alternative outreach methods and will consult with Cooperating and Participating Agencies to further focus outreach to EJ (Environmental Justice) communities.</p> <p>CTDOT has also reached out to local community groups and organizations that advocate for EJ communities, such as the Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice and the Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance. The environmental justice outreach efforts will be documented in the NEPA/CEPA document.</p> <p>A comparison of impacts to EJ communities and discussion of opportunities to improve conditions will be part of the NEPA/CEPA document.</p>
3.6	EPA	Environmental	Green Infrastructure	<p><i>As part of this process, EPA recommends exploration of opportunities to create "green and complete" street networks in and adjacent to the I-84 corridor as part of the project design. A green and complete street is defined as a street that is safe for all users including pedestrians and bicyclists that also incorporates green infrastructure strategies to manage and treat polluted stormwater runoff. Successful street design can positively impact neighborhoods and promote, rather than hinder, private investment. We also recommend that the alternatives be evaluated for their effectiveness in supporting urban development in the corridor, rather than more suburban growth patterns such as extensive surface parking lots, which currently occupy a significant amount of land area in the corridor.</i></p>	<p>On October 23, 2014, CTDOT Commissioner James Redeker signed a new Complete Streets policy. The policy is designed to promote safe access for all users by providing a comprehensive, integrated, connected multimodal network of transportation options. A green and complete streets network will be considered for the I-84 Hartford Project as it relates to local streets impacted by the project.</p>

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.7	EPA	Environmental	Green Infrastructure	<i>We encourage FHWA to take advantage of national experience with Green Infrastructure to fully consider opportunities to design the project with underlying Green Infrastructure principles in mind. The analysis should discuss opportunities to improve upon the existing I-84 stormwater management infrastructure with a focus on opportunities for water quality improvement. We recommend that approaches to 'greening' the project not stop with stormwater, but extend to use of construction materials or operations and maintenance practices that produce less waste or consume less energy in production. Use of FHWA's INVEST Sustainable Highways Self-Evaluation Tool could help guide these analyses. Extensive information on Green Infrastructure is also available on EPA's homepage.</i>	The Project Team will look at FHWA's INVEST tool and Green Infrastructure information on EPA's website and consider incorporating green infrastructure during final design, where feasible.
3.8	EPA	Environmental	Hydrologic/ Water Resources	<i>Hartford is under a Federal Consent Decree and a State Consent Order for addressing discharges from Combined Sewer Overflows to the Connecticut River. These sanitary sewer overflows are caused by excess stormwater entering the combined stormwater/sewer system. The environmental analysis should address combined sewer overflows and whether the project design can reduce stormwater flows from the entire project area. As noted above, in addition to traditional stormwater management techniques, we encourage FHWA and CTDOT to explore whether portions of the project, especially improvements at the community and street level associated with the project, can utilize Green Infrastructure and recently developed stormwater best management practices, including structural and nonstructural approaches.</i>	The NEPA/CEPA document will adequately address stormwater management impacts and mitigation in accordance with applicable regulations. During final design, a Stormwater Management Plan inclusive of hydrologic and hydraulic analyses will be completed to ensure the adequacy of the stormwater control methods for the project. Green infrastructure will be considered, where feasible, when designing the stormwater controls for this project.
3.9	EPA	Environmental	Hydrologic/ Water Resources	<i>The EIS should provide a comprehensive discussion of how the project could affect rivers and streams that traverse the project corridor underground and how the project will be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to these resources. The analysis should also discuss whether opportunities exist for daylighting and restoration of culverted water resources in the project area. Close coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will be essential for the portions of the project that will be in proximity to the Park River conduit, a structure under the Corps' jurisdiction.</i>	USACE is a Participating Agency on the I-84 Hartford Project and CTDOT will seek their input and guidance during the environmental analysis. Impacts to rivers and streams will be analyzed and mitigated appropriately in the NEPA/CEPA document, as will the opportunity to daylight or restore culverted water resources, particularly the Park River Conduit. Prior to construction, all necessary permits will be secured.
3.10	EPA	Environmental	Contamination and Hazardous Materials	<i>The analysis should include a description of measures to be used to avoid, minimize and address spills during construction and operation of the project. Any Spill Prevention, Containment and Countermeasure Plans (SPCC) developed for the project should include provisions for notification of emergency personnel as appropriate in the event of spills during project construction or operation.</i>	Comment acknowledged. Developing a SPCC is standard procedure and will be followed for the I-84 Hartford Project.
3.11	EPA	Environmental	Air Quality	<i>This corridor is located within the "Greater Connecticut, CT" marginal ozone nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone standard, thus triggering transportation conformity requirements established at 40 CFR Part 93. A major transportation conformity requirement is that the regional emission analysis for the ozone nonattainment area [performed for the long range transportation plan and transportation improvement program, which includes the final design and scope of the I-84 Hartford Project] demonstrate that both volatile organic compounds (VOCs) emissions and nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions are less than or equal to the motor vehicle emissions budget(s) established in the applicable implementation plan or implementation plan submission.</i>  <i>In addition, the project corridor falls within the "Hartford-New Britain-Middletown Area" carbon monoxide (CO) attainment area with a limited maintenance plan in place which also triggers transportation conformity requirements, including a carbon monoxide hot spot analysis found at 40 CFR Section 93.116. We recommend that the project level carbon monoxide hot spot project analysis be completed as part of the NEPA evaluation.</i>	The project will be reviewed for conformity prior to being included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Air quality modeling will be completed for the project. CTDOT will coordinate with EPA and CTDEEP on the proper methodologies for modeling. The CO limited maintenance plan for the Hartford-New Britain-Middletown Area will be completed by the end of 2015. The Hartford CO Area maintenance period sunsets at the end of the calendar year 2015. A project level CO hot spot will not be required at that point. However, Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) considerations will need to be addressed.
3.12	EPA	Technology	ITS	<i>We encourage the project sponsors to explore the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) for all of the build alternatives, especially the Tunneled Highway, to establish a network of data collection points to manage traffic and incidents, as well as such things as ventilation, lighting, security, and air quality. This data collection and closed circuit television monitoring could assess traffic speed, vehicle volume, congestion, and air quality levels to feed back to a central traffic monitoring center. This data would assist in managing tunnel ventilation system, traffic flow, and incident management to protect the public and ensure best traffic flow on I-84 in downtown Hartford. (See original letter which included detailed information on Air Quality and Ventilation of Subsurface and Tunnel Roadways; experience from other projects in the Northeast.)</i>	CTDOT will consider incorporating ITS into the I-84 Hartford Project where appropriate. This will be determined during final design of the project.

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.13	EPA	Environmental	Air Quality	<p>On October 7, 2014, (70 FR 60343), EPA published the notice of availability for the MOVES2014 (Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator Model) for SIPs and Transportation Conformity. <a href="http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-10-07/pdf/201423258.pdf">http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-10-07/pdf/201423258.pdf</a>. MOVES2014 is the latest state-of-the art upgrade to EPA's modeling tools for estimating emissions from cars, trucks, buses, and motorcycles, based on the latest data and regulations. Air quality modeling not substantially underway for the project should use the MOVES2014 model. There is currently a two-year transportation conformity grace period that ends on October 7, 2016, after which MOVES2014 is required to be used for new transportation conformity analyses. Additional guidance is available in "EPA's Policy Guidance on the Use of MOVES2014 and Subsequent Minor Revisions for State Implementation Plan Development, Transportation Conformity, and Other Purposes," (EPA-420-B-14008, July 2014). <a href="http://www.epa.gov/otag/models/moves/documents/420b14008.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/otag/models/moves/documents/420b14008.pdf</a>. This document describes how and when to use the MOVES2014 for SIP development, transportation conformity, general conformity, and other purposes.</p> <p>The recently released "MOVES2014 Technical Guidance: Using MOVES to Prepare Emission Inventories for State Implementation Plans and Transportation Conformity," (EPA-420-B-15-007, January 2015) provides guidance on appropriate input assumptions and sources of data for the use of MOVES2014 in regional emissions analyses for transportation conformity purposes. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/otag/models/moves/documents/420b15007.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/otag/models/moves/documents/420b15007.pdf</a>.</p>	CTDOT will use MOVES2014 in the air quality analysis for the I-84 Hartford Project. CTDOT will coordinate with EPA and CTDEEP on the methodologies and parameters used in the model.
3.14	EPA	Environmental	Air Quality	<p>Reducing emissions from diesel engines is one of the most important public health challenges facing the country. EPA has finalized a number of clean fuel and vehicle emissions standards that will lead to dramatic emission reductions in new diesel-powered engines. Included within these rulemakings are cleaner fuel requirements, such as the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel, which will provide immediate emissions reductions in both new and older diesel engines. However, even with more stringent heavy-duty highway and nonroad engine standards set to take effect over the next decade, millions of diesel engines already in use will continue to emit excessive amounts of diesel exhaust and contribute to serious public health problems.</p> <p>Potential emissions from older diesel engines include high levels of particulate matter, hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. These emissions can be controlled through 1) strategies and technologies that reduce unnecessary idling, including auxiliary power units, the use of electric equipment; and 2) the use of advanced pollution control technology such as diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters that can be installed on the exhaust of the diesel engine. Retrofits are cost effective and efficient means to control emissions and they have been successfully applied to many diesel engines across the country.</p> <p>Retrofit technologies may include EPA verified emission control technologies and fuels and CARE-verified emission control technologies. Lists of these diesel exhaust control technologies can be accessed at <a href="http://epa.gov/cleandiesellverification/verif-list.htm">http://epa.gov/cleandiesellverification/verif-list.htm</a>. In addition, the Northeast Diesel Collaborative has prepared model construction specifications to assist in developing contract specifications that would require construction equipment to be retrofitted with control devices and use clean fuels in order to reduce diesel emissions. The model construction specifications can be found on the Northeast Diesel Collaborative web site at: <a href="http://northeastdiesel.org/pdf/NEDC-Construction-Contract-Spec.pdf">http://northeastdiesel.org/pdf/NEDC-Construction-Contract-Spec.pdf</a>.</p> <p>We encourage FHWA and CTDOT to use the environmental analysis in the EIS to discuss how a firm commitment to implementing these and other measures can help reduce and minimize the air quality impacts to the local community from construction of the proposed project. EPA is willing to assist in that effort.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact Donald Cooke of EPA's Office of Ecosystem Air Quality Unit at 617-918-1668 for more information regarding the air quality analysis for the project.</p>	<p>CTDEEP began phasing in EPA's Clean Air Highway Diesel Rule, which requires the production and distribution of Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) fuel and cleaner heavy-duty diesel engines in the summer of 2006. The changeover to ultra-low sulphur diesel for non-road vehicles in the use of construction was complete in 2010.</p> <p>CTDOT will review the model construction specifications on the Northeast Diesel Collaborative's website and contact Donald Cooke.</p> <p>Since construction is not expected to begin for a few years, technologies and equipment may improve between now and then. Thus, a commitment will be made to look into methods for reduction of diesel emissions during construction, but no specific measures will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document. This will allow for CTDOT to have greater flexibility in evaluating the newest technologies and methods prior to construction of this project.</p>
3.15	EPA	Environmental	Climate Change	<p>On December 18, 2014, the Council on Environmental Quality released revised draft guidance for public comment that describes how Federal departments and agencies should consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their National Environmental Policy Act reviews. The revised draft guidance supersedes the draft greenhouse gas and climate change guidance released by CEQ in February 2010. This guidance explains that agencies should consider both the potential effects of a proposed action on climate change, as indicated by its estimated greenhouse gas emissions, and the implications of climate change for the environmental effects of a proposed action.</p> <p>The revised draft guidance suggests that, if an agency determines that evaluating the effects of GHG emissions would not be useful in the decision making process and to the public in the process of distinguishing between the proposed action, alternatives and mitigations, the agency should document the rationale for that determination.</p> <p>FHWA and CTDOT efforts to consider climate change should also include efforts to describe how the proposed project alternatives are designed to be resilient in the context of potential climate change related impacts in the project area. The 2014 DOT Climate Adaptation Plan commits US DOT to a series of planning and asset management actions to ensure: (See Letter.)</p> <p>In addition, FHWA has developed an Adaptation Framework to assist with the consideration of climate change impacts during decision-making and has recently released FHWA Order 5520 titled, "Transportation System Preparedness and Resilience to Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events," which provides further direction regarding analysis of climate change related impacts (<a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/climate_change/adaptation/adaptation_framework">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/climate_change/adaptation/adaptation_framework</a>) (<a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm</a>).</p>	FHWA and CTDOT are aware that this guidance is likely to be finalized by the CEQ within the next year. The Project Team will incorporate this final guidance and its suggestions into the NEPA/CEPA document.



ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.16	EPA	Environmental	Environmental Justice	<p>EPA New England has a strong commitment to promote the principles of environmental justice that are outlined in Executive Order 12898 -Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations. According to the Executive Order, "Each Federal Agency shall analyze the environmental effects, including human health, economic and social effects, of Federal actions, including effects on minority communities and low-income communities, when such analysis is required by NEPA. Mitigation measures outlined or analyzed in an environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, or record of decision, whenever feasible, should address significant and adverse environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions on minority communities and low-income communities."</p> <p>Given that the project corridor goes through the heart of a number of communities with low income and minority populations, it will be important for FHWA and CTDOT to fully consider environmental justice issues as it works to prepare the EA/EIS for the project. EPA defines environmental justice to mean the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws and policies, and their meaningful involvement in the decision-making process of the government. Based on our informal coordination with FHWA since the start of project scoping, we learned that CTDOT has already initiated comprehensive outreach efforts to engage EJ communities in the project area. That work has included efforts to: make the project website bilingual; produce all newsletters, fact sheets and e-bulletins in English and Spanish; provide translator services for public information meetings/hearings; advertise meetings in a local Spanish weekly newsletter; invite local neighborhood groups and other relevant groups to project meetings and to use those groups to disseminate project information more broadly. It is our understanding that the outreach also includes provisions to make the website accessible for the visually impaired. We applaud these measures and note that the combination of these traditional and non-traditional communication techniques should help better connect the project to the impacted communities in the project corridor. We also recommend that FHWA and CTDOT consider the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) "Environmental Justice Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act" (December 1997) and consult CEQ's posting of Federal agency resources on environmental justice on its website at: <a href="http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa_information/agency_resources.html">http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa_information/agency_resources.html</a>.</p> <p>The environmental analysis should also specifically discuss how the project will be designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to the communities bordering the I-84 project corridor during both construction and operation. Engagement with the local community will be an important part of the development of that part of the analysis.</p> <p>EPA is willing to assist FHWA and CTDOT to help improve the outreach to affected EJ populations along the project alignment. Please contact Deborah Brown of EPA's Environmental Justice program at 617-918-1706 for additional assistance with this outreach.</p>	<p>CTDOT is committed to Environmental Justice as noted by the outreach steps taken to date and will continue to do so as the project progresses. FHWA and CTDOT have compiled a list of outreach efforts as of March 31, 2015, and they have been sent to EPA for review and input. FHWA and CTDOT plan on updating the project outreach efforts quarterly, and have many outreach activities scheduled for the remainder of 2015, including a week-long design charrette and having a pop-up display and project team members at numerous cultural festivals and events. FHWA and CTDOT appreciate any ideas or suggestions to provide for effective outreach to these underserved communities.</p> <p>The NEPA/CEPA document will address measures taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to EJ communities.</p> <p>Ms. Brown will be contacted.</p>
3.17	EPA	Environmental	Noise	<p>The environmental analysis should identify traffic noise impacts to surrounding communities for each alternative and identify design and mitigation measures to address those impacts.</p>	<p>Noise will be analyzed as part of the NEPA/CEPA document and will include both construction-related noise and long-term operational noise impacts.</p>
3.18	EPA	Environmental	Communities and Socioeconomic Conditions	<p>Based on current EPA policy and guidance, an analysis of impacts to children from construction and operation of the proposed project should be included in a NEPA analysis if there is a possibility of disproportionate impact on children related to the proposed action. <sup>2</sup> In this case the comparison of the project alternatives to a baseline will be helpful, as it may show opportunities for improvements to traffic flow through the city and resulting air quality benefits that could also protect the health of children. EPA views childhood as a sequence of lifestages. Therefore, exposures to children at each lifestage, as well as pregnant and nursing women, are relevant and should be considered when addressing health and safety risks for children.</p> <p>Because children can be more susceptible to noise levels, mobile source air pollution, construction dust, and the chemicals associated with building and construction materials, we recommend that the NEPA analysis specifically address the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project on children's health, including consideration of prenatal exposures (exposures that may be experienced by pregnant women).</p> <p>The analysis should characterize and address children's exposures and susceptibilities to pollutants of concern, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of pollutants and sources of concern</li> <li>• Exposure Assessment: Describe demographics of affected neighborhoods/populations/communities and focus exposure assessments on schools, recreation areas, childcare centers, parks, and residential areas in close proximity to the proposed project, and other areas of apparent frequent and/or prolonged exposure.</li> <li>• Baseline health conditions: Consider obtaining and including available relevant health data/records for the neighborhoods/populations/communities of concern.</li> <li>• Respiratory Impacts/Asthma: Consider data on existing asthma rates and asthma severity among children and the general community living, working, playing, and attending school and daycare near the project site. To the extent feasible, identify impacts of the project on asthma rates and severity in children near the project site and quantify associated costs.</li> <li>• Noise Impacts: Consider impacts from noise on health and learning, especially near homes, schools and daycare centers.</li> <li>• Impacts Regarding Obesity Factors: Consider potential impacts that could influence childhood obesity factors, such as impacts on school commutes, and on the accessibility of neighborhood parks, green spaces, and recreation areas.</li> <li>• Impacts from Air Pollutant Emissions: Consider exposure and impacts to children from mobile source air pollutants, including proximity to transportation corridors, transportation hubs, and ports, and project construction emissions. Combine these with other area sources/baseline air quality.</li> <li>• Impacts from Other Chemical or Physical Exposures: Consider impacts to children from other site activities, such as pesticide application, dust caused by construction, increased exposure to contaminated soils, demolition, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Please contact Kathleen Nagle of EPA New England's Children's Environmental Health Coordinator at 617-918-1985 with any questions regarding the consideration of Children's Health issues.</p>	<p>The environmental analysis will include comparison of impacts to air, noise, and other resources that may affect children's health both during construction and long-term operation of the project.</p> <p>Ms. Nagle will be contacted.</p>

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
3.19	EPA	Environmental	Secondary and Cumulative Impacts	<i>The Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) NEPA regulations require EISs to evaluate growth-inducing changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems that result from the proposed action and alternatives. The regulations define indirect (sometimes called 'secondary') effects as those "which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable." The regulations state that impacts include ecological, aesthetic, historical, cultural, economic, social, or health impacts, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. The CEQ NEPA regulations define cumulative impacts as "...the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." We are willing to assist FHWA and CTDOT to develop a strategy to address the cumulative impacts of the proposed project.</i>	Analyzing secondary and cumulative impacts will be part of the NEPA/CEPA document. CTDOT appreciates EPA's offer to assist in developing a strategy that addresses cumulative impacts for the I-84 Hartford Project. A methodology for analyzing secondary and cumulative impacts will be developed by CTDOT and FHWA and will incorporate input from Cooperating and Participating Agencies. The Project Team envisions an Agency Coordination meeting in late 2015/early 2016 to focus more intensely on this specific, but broad reaching issue.
4	HUD	Environmental	Impacts	<i>We have some preliminary comments on the scoping package which are right now in two programmatic areas at HUD – Environmental and Fair Housing &amp; Equal Opportunity. As the scope becomes more defined other program areas may be included in the review.</i>  <i>Environmental</i> <i>Until the specific scope/alternatives are provided including identification of impacted properties we cannot determine the level of environmental impact but will continue to comment as plans become better defined</i>	Comment acknowledged.
4.1	HUD	Environmental	Environmental Justice	<i>Fair Housing &amp; Equal Opportunity (FH &amp;EO)</i> <i>HUD is committed to ensuring that the largely minority population of the City is not adversely affected by the project. As you may be aware, the City of Hartford is a minority-majority City, with a population of 124,000 people consisting of 29.8% White Non-Hispanic, 38.7% African American, and 43.4% Hispanic residents. The project corridor spans the entire width of the City, from East to West, and the highway itself cuts through or abuts seven low-mod income census tracts (5021, 5029, 5031, 5041, 5043, 5049, and 5246). With the exception of census tract 5021, each of the census tracts are majority-minority, comprised mostly of African-American, Hispanic, and Asian residents. That means the proposed construction could directly affect nearly 22,000 Hartford residents, most of whom are minorities.</i>  <i>Because of its location, the changes to I-84 will have a much greater effect on the low-income minority populations of the City.</i>  <i>HUD is concerned that the potential for the project to adversely affect the already limited affordable housing options for minorities is concerning.</i>  <i>HUD's Division of FHEO will provide assistance and guidance as this project moves closer to fruition and the scope and impacted properties are determined</i>  <i>We look forward to working with you on this project. Please let us know if you need anything additional</i>	The Alternatives Analysis is considering impacts to EJ communities and affordable housing resources. CTDOT appreciates HUD's input as the project progresses.
5	NITHPO	Environmental	Historic Resources	<i>Please be advised that the Narragansett Indian Tribal Historic Preservation Office (NITHPO) requests consultation regarding original Tribal cultural land surfaces within this undertaking's APE. These land surfaces may lie beneath fill layers that may have been added within the past three hundred years. NITHPO looks forward to working with you and the CT-SHPO in developing protocols for addressing this concern.</i>	CTDOT and FHWA will consult with the Tribal Nations in the development of protocols and methodologies for addressing cultural resource impacts, for inclusion in the NEPA/CEPA document.
6	HUD	Environmental	Noise	<i>1. As a subsidiary of HUD's 24 CFR Part 58 environmental regulations, there exists "HUD Environmental Standards", under 24 CFR Part 51 B [a HUD "Noise abatement and Control" Env Standard], noise sensitive uses/projects [certain HUD funded projects, such as SF and MF housing] requires that a Noise Assessment Study (NAS) in accordance with our on-line Noise Calculator be performed for noise generating sources [i.e. - rail and roadway] within a certain set-back distance to HUD funded noise sensitive projects to determine noise levels. HUD recommends that a NAS be performed as a component of this project that addresses the 24 CFR Part 51 B Standard. The NAS should incorporate present and project future noise impacts once an alternative or alternatives to the I-84 scoping project are adopted.</i>	HUD Environmental Standards for noise assessment of present and future noise impacts will be met using the results from FHWA's Traffic Noise Model (TNM). Compliance with HUD's Noise Abatement and Control Standard will be demonstrated in the NEPA/CEPA document.
6.1	HUD	Design	Parks/Open Space	<i>2. Enhancements such as widening of shoulders, improvements to line of sight hazards, and potential tunneling or elevating I-84 could leave room for passive or recreational park developments and/or Open Space preservation projects. HUD funded projects are well served by neighborhood local or state community parks and open spaces. HUD would like to be included in these panel discussions.</i>	The Project Team is considering the use of land within the project corridor and the potential to incorporate parks and/or open space into the design. As a Participating Agency, HUD will be included in Agency Coordination meetings.
6.2	HUD	Environmental	Impacts	<i>3. While the core environmental areas for which HUD should be participating in the consultation and review process would be with Section 106 of the NHPA, site contamination impacts and potential clean-up stages, environmental justice (EJ) and air quality per the CAA. There may be other areas of concern that may surface (impacts to floodplains, etc.) once the project becomes whole. Environmental Reviews as performed by our Grantees may need to be amended accordingly based on potential impacts via I-84 improvements and HUD may need to inform our Grantees accordingly.</i>	Comment acknowledged.

ID#	Agency	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
7	FRA	Design	Union Station	<p>FRA is concerned that FHWA and Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) give careful consideration in the development of alternatives to critical functional aspects of the rail line and station in Hartford. Any alternative that would involve relocation of the existing railroad alignment, including relocation of railroad structures such as Hartford Union Station, must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How the relocated station will maintain connectivity with the downtown area;</li> <li>- The speed(s) at which trains could operate along the new railroad alignment;</li> <li>- Whether the realigned railroad and station will be constructed at-grade or as elevated structures;</li> <li>- The appropriate number of new tracks and new platforms to meet future rail service needs;</li> <li>- The track alignment geometry through the relocated station;</li> <li>- The platform configuration that can be accommodated by the relocated station (e.g., side platforms or an island platform);</li> <li>- How the appropriate platform height, length, and width can be accommodated at the relocated station;</li> <li>- How sufficient transit and pedestrian access will be provided at the relocated station (e.g., passenger drop-off/pick-up, taxicab access, local bus service, sidewalks);</li> <li>- How sufficient parking will be available at the relocated station; and</li> <li>- How the realigned railroad and relocated station preserves the Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET) designation issued by the Department of Defense for this rail line (i.e., the requirement that the railroad be able to accommodate oversized loads); this also includes ensuring no highway infrastructure impacts STRACNET clearance requirements along the rail line.</li> </ul>	All issues identified in FRA's letter dated January 7, 2015, will be addressed as the Project Team progresses through the Alternatives Analysis process and further develops the reasonable range of alternatives.
7.1	FRA	Design	Union Station	<p>For any alternative in which Hartford Union Station would not be relocated, consideration must be given to how the I-84 Hartford Project will allow for the eventual replacement of the viaduct that currently supports the station, which is nearing the end of its useful life. The involvement of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), as the owner of the railroad through Hartford, will be important for the project planning and decision-making process, including the development of alternatives and consideration of the disposition of the existing viaduct and station.</p>	As the Project Team develops alternatives which do not relocate the railroad, efforts will be made so as not to preclude future replacement of the station viaduct as needed.
7.2	FRA	Environmental	Historic Resources	<p>Finally, consideration must be given to potential impacts to historic properties pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act. Hartford Union Station was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1975, and the Connecticut portion of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield rail corridor, including numerous contributing bridges and culverts, was determined eligible for listing on NRHP as a linear historic district in 2012 as part of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Project.</p>	In accordance with state and federal regulations including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), potential adverse impacts to listed or eligible resources will be evaluated and mitigated, if necessary. Re-use of Union Station is being considered by the Project Team. Coordination with the SHPO and other consulting parties is underway and will be documented in the NEPA/CEPA document.
<p>Comment received from an Agency not identified as a Cooperating or Participating Agency</p>					
1	CT Department of Health	Environmental	Hydrologic/Water Resources	<p>The Department of Public Health Drinking Water Section's (DWS) Source Assessment and Protection Unit has reviewed the above Notice of Scoping. The subject project is not in a public drinking water supply source water area, but it is within the public water supply service area of The Metropolitan District Commission (MDC, PWSID #CT0640011). The Department of Transportation should consult with the MDC on the locations of water distribution mains and coordinate with the MDC on potential relocation or replacement of water distribution mains within the project area.</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call Pat Bisacky of this office at (860) 509-7333.</p>	The Project Team will consult with the Metropolitan District Commission on the issue of water mains distribution within the study area and project corridor.

ii. Public Comments and Responses

I-84 Hartford Project - Scoping  
Summary of Public Comments and Responses  
10/21/15

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
1	Alternatives	Options	<i>I saw the presentation at the CSS/CON NRZ meeting last night -thank you. I saw this video the other day and wanted to forward it to you. I know you are several years away from rebuilding the highway but I would love to see us be a leader in innovation and use a material that will make 84 an easy road to drive on. Its worth the watch. <a href="https://www.ted.com/talks/erik_schlangen_a_self_healing_asphalt?language=en">https://www.ted.com/talks/erik_schlangen_a_self_healing_asphalt?language=en</a></i>	The concept of new technologies is always of interest, but the goal of the Project Team during this Alternatives Analysis phase is to identify the alternative that best meets the project Purpose and Need, while minimizing social, economic, and environmental impacts. The types of materials to be used during construction will not be determined until Final Design.
1.1	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>Another comment - its really important that the state push on the city of hartford to fix the street traffic lights/flow as part of this project ( or in advance). For example - if the light at the signory street exit was fixed to last a lot longer in the morning - it would avoid a long queue at that exit.</i>	The Project Team will work with the City of Hartford (the "City") as well as the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CROG) to incorporate this project into the local roadway network as seamlessly as possible. This effort will include coordinating signal timing and phasing, both during construction as well as after the project is completed.
2	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>Given that the alternatives proposed are still in the very preliminary stages, it is hard to choose between all of them. Nevertheless, I am concerned about the placement of the exit/on-ramps in the end. Eliminating some and straightening the remainder, I believe, will be very important to improving safety conditions and help reduce the congestion caused by people changing lanes to reach them.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating the location of interchanges and entrance and exit ramps as part of the Alternatives Analysis, taking into account safety, access, and congestion. Once that evaluation is complete, detailed information about the potential locations of ramps and interchanges will be available to the public for review and comment.
2.1	Traffic & Transportation	Freight	<i>With the elevated option, rising higher than the current structure, the ramps are going to have to be longer if they are to reach the tallest spans (for those trucks that don't accelerate well at steep grades).</i>	Any reasonable alternatives will be required to meet certain design criteria, including providing the correct grades for trucks on the highway and entrance/exit ramps.
2.2	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>I guess I am just worried that this will end up being quite disruptive and detract from some of the historical assets of downtown. I wish Asylum Hill had a better view of the capitol building and all that and it makes me sad that the Bushnell, the park, and the gold dome, are all blocked. So, maybe, I prefer the trench alternative where the highway is below grade, like I-676 in Philly. I-84 carries much much more traffic volume than that road (and it is disruptive there to as a psych barrier), so it's basically inconceivable to me that an at-grade option is being considered.</i>	The Project Team is working with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the City of Hartford to avoid and minimize impacts to historic resources, where possible, throughout the project corridor. The visual and aesthetic impacts to the project corridor from the reasonable alternatives will be evaluated in the NEPA/CEPA document. Where needed, context sensitive solutions will be incorporated into the final design of the project to minimize visual and aesthetic impacts.
3	Public Involvement	Venue	<i>Re:the next scoping meeting. You want input from the Public. however, the Public I is more than just Hartford people. When are you going to hold these meetings at outlying towns? Surely there are meetings places where the parking is more convenient than going to Hartford library!! At the first meeting last Fall that I attended, I asked this same question! You are "time considerate " of the workers in Hartford, please be "place considerate "of the people who also use I -84 , but do not live or work in Hartford!</i>	The Project Team will be holding public meetings in locations outside of the City of Hartford in October 2015. Such venues will be more convenient for people living outside of the City and will have more accommodating parking facilities. In addition, the Project Team is conducting one-day Open Planning Studio Workshops throughout the City of Hartford on a monthly basis to provide alternative venues for the public to attend. Information about these is posted on the project website ( <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a> ).
4	Public Involvement	Nonprofits	<i>I am representing Connecticut Association of Nonprofits. Ron Cretaro has been our main contact with you. He is no longer with our organization, so I would like to join your group and to represent CT Nonprofits, now that Ron is no longer here.</i>	Thank you for this information. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a> .
5	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>I use the Sigourney Street exit and entrance at I-84 daily. Shutting either or both down will have a very negative impact to my daily commute to and from work. My experience is that both are used extensively each day. The Sigourney Street (Exit 47) ramp from I-84 has a traffic back up every day I go to work. Shutting down Exit 47 will impact many commuters. Keep in mind that Exit 48 is also very congested every morning. Closing Exit 47 will increase the demand on Exit 48 and the back up will go back to the I-91/I-84 interchange. The other alternative is to take the Sisson Ave exit. This makes no sense. Taking the Sisson Avenue exit will add at least 25 minutes to my daily commute given the fact that it is further to drive as well as fighting the increased city traffic caused by the closure of Exit 47. Please do NOT close exit 47.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
6	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>RE I-84 Viaduct Project Scoping - I drive from Meriden to Hartford everyday and take the Sigourney Street exit to my job. This exit is already clogged because of the crosswalk at the end of the exit ramp. If you close this exit you will cause a nightmare for the 5000+ people who work right off the exit at Aetna. I also understand that there are thousands who work for the state of CT right off this ramp. If you close the Sigourney Street ramp, you will have a nightmare on Farmington Avenue with cars having to back track from Sisson to Sigourney Street just to get to work. There is no alternative in my opinion but to leave this exit ramp open during any projects you plan to start in the area. Unfortunately I can not make the meeting tonight but wanted to voice my opinion in this very important matter. Thank you.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
7	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>AS A TRUCK DRIVER USING ALL OF THE CORRIDORS I-84 IS THE WORST.THE MERGE GOIN EASTBOUND WITH TRAFFIC TRYING TO MERGE FROM 3 LANES TO ONE IS HORRIFIC. THERE SHOULD BE A DIVISION AFTER A CERTAIN POINT THAT CANT BE CROSS. BECAUSE OF The lack DIVISION this is what causes most of the backup along with the volume</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while minimizing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. These efforts will reduce the amount of merging and cross traffic in this area. The Project Team will take your comment into consideration during the Alternatives Analysis process, particularly your suggestion of a "division."
8	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>I work at Aetna and use the Sigourney St. exit and entrance ramp every day. I used to be able to go down Flower and cut over to the Capitol entrance but that is shut off now. Using Broad is out of the question as where I park is not near it. That works for mostly employees of The Hartford and DSS/DRS at 55 Farmington.</i>  <i>Since the traffic pattern change at Sigourney and Hawthorn there are already new delays down Sigourney towards Farmington backs up in the afternoon and in the morning cars are lined up onto 84 where they never were before.</i>  <i>From these observations of a person that is here every day, I cannot imagine limiting access further. You could create traffic issues when trying to fix one and I don't mean small issues. The last thing we need is more money going after problems that don't wind up being solutions.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
8.1	Financing	Tolls	<i>Also, when I pulled up your page, I saw the first article listed in your "in the new section" being about roads not being free and that we need tolls. Before you go that route or the route of any new revenue which is a nicer word for tax, please be sure all of the money that was set aside from prior years for roads/bridges is not going into the general fund. The promise by the Gov. before the election of no new taxes is being watched closely by the actual tax payers of both parties. A toll is a tax. Any new tax is not acceptable unless you are only taxing out of state plates and letting us ride on our roads with no additional cost. We pay enough already and it is up to you, the state to make due with what you have. We all have to and as people leave, salary increase stay low and taxes go up it is getting more difficult. Don't let the disconnect get bigger.</i>  <i>You appear to be flirting with paying more to not help a problem and beyond that, making us pay again for what we already paid for.</i>  <i>If you would like to constructively discuss this further, please contact me.</i> <i>Thank you</i>	The article the commenter is referring to was an opinion letter in the <i>Hartford Courant</i> and does not reflect the views of CTDOT or FHWA regarding tolling.  CTDOT will develop a financial plan for the project that will identify potential funding sources for construction. The Project Team is considering several funding sources, including the potential of tolling. CTDOT is conducting a separate study investigating the feasibility of tolling, specifically congestion pricing tolling, on I-84 in the Hartford area (refer to the project's website for more information: <a href="http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/">http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/</a> ). CTDOT anticipates completing this study in late 2015, and any pertinent recommendations from this report will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document for this project. In addition, the Governor has appointed a panel to examine funding options and develop recommendations for financing a long-term transportation plan. See this website for further details: <a href="http://www.governor.ct.gov/malloy/cwp/view.asp?a=3997&amp;q=563282">http://www.governor.ct.gov/malloy/cwp/view.asp?a=3997&amp;q=563282</a> .



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
9	Alternatives	Bypass	<i>I have read that rerouting around Hartford has been deemed "too expensive". I think that that view is shortsighted. I say do it right. Find an appropriate point, west of Hartford, to route I84 north and east to the Bissell bridge and re-connect in Manchester. A follow-on project should be to reroute I91 over the Charter Oak bridge to re-connect at the Bissell bridge. This would have the greatest benefit to Hartford and have a much lesser impact on surrounding towns. The major requirement for this plan would be a few politicians with cajones.</i>	Before CTDOT considers whether the cost of the bypass (or any other alternative) is feasible, the Project Team needs to evaluate the alternative relative to a series of other factors including the Purpose and Need. The Project Team is currently developing an "I-84 Hartford Project Alternate Routes White Paper" (the "Bypass White Paper"), which evaluates a series of historic potential bypass routes, as well as others that have recently been proposed. Some of these historic bypass routes were completed; others cancelled for a variety of reasons. The Project Team determined that the recently proposed Hartford bypass routes were not feasible for three overarching reasons. First, and primary to the Purpose and Need for the I-84 Hartford Project, is the need to address the structural deficiencies of the viaduct, which would not be achieved with any bypass route. Secondly, the majority of the I-84 traffic on the project corridor during the morning and evening peak hours is not through traffic, but local traffic that gets on and/or off the highway in Hartford, such that a bypass route would not provide measurable congestion relief to I-84. Lastly, the bypass routes evaluated have been associated with significant environmental and right-of-way impacts. Given these issues, CTDOT has determined that none of the bypass routes warrant further consideration. Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
10	Purpose and Need	Operations	<i>I commute daily from Plainville to Windsor, driving on I84 throughout my commute. It was the worse part of my day until finally changing my schedule to avoid "Rush Hour" completely.  In fact before my schedule change, some mornings it was very difficult to forecast travel times, until I got stuck in New Britain and had to ride a bumper for the next 10 miles. What is worse is leaving work and getting home 75 minutes later, when it should only take me 30 minutes. As you can tell, the I84 reconstruction is an emotional project for myself and thousands of others.  I would like to provide some observations and recommendations for your team to consider.  The most important observation I have is the amount of "thru traffic". Greater Hartford does not work solely in Hartford. The only reason we drive though Hartford is to get to surrounding towns. The new highway should be fluid for travelers not using Hartford as a destination.</i>	It is important to note that 60% of the traffic on the I-84 Hartford corridor is local traffic: traffic that gets on the highway in Hartford and gets off the highway in Hartford. The remaining 40% is through traffic. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps. These efforts should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
10.1	Alternatives	Options	<i>That is why I would recommend an "Express Hwy" (possibly 4 lanes) in addition to a "Local Hwy" (possibly 2-3 lanes). The Express Lane will only have exits for I91N-S. The local will have exits for Hartford commuters. Preferably, two separate highways, not just lanes with a white line dividing. Maybe totally avoid Hartford all together.</i>	The Project Team has studied additional lanes separate from the mainline to service the interchange ramps. This concept is generally a very efficient way of removing the friction on the mainline caused by traffic entering and exiting the highway. However, the mix of traffic within the I-84 Hartford corridor does not lend itself to this type of solution. There is approximately a 60/40 split between ramp traffic and mainline through traffic. During peak hours, this unusual distribution of traffic means the service roads would require more travel lanes than the mainline, which is not feasible in this spatially constrained corridor. In addition, the closely spaced interchanges would result in significant traffic congestion on the service roads.
10.2	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>Another recommendation is to eliminate left hand exits and entrances, as well as multiple merging lanes. This confuses drivers and leads to bottlenecks. I84 is full of useless left exits/entrances.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which will likely improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline and address some of the issues regarding merging and weaving traffic. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
10.3	Environmental	Historic Resources	<i>Lastly, please don't preserve anything because of age. If something needs to be removed, please remove it to accommodate a highway which will be used for the next 100 years or more.</i>	Both state and federal laws require protection of historic sites that are eligible for, or listed on, the State or National Registers of Historic Places. The alternatives will attempt to avoid and/or minimize impacts to these sites to the extent practicable. However, if a site is impacted, CTDOT will need to mitigate for this impact. State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and other consulting party coordination is currently underway and the Project Team will document the process in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
11	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>Hello, I wanted to provide my input into the I-84 scoping process. Of the alternatives presented at your recent meeting, I am most in favor of Alternative 3 (Lowered Highway), with some reservations and questions. This seems to be the best way to achieve the objective of reconnecting local roadways and pedestrian pathways while keeping costs in check.</i>	The scoping process elicited many similar statements in favor of the Lowered Highway Alternative, currently being studied by the Project Team. Further information on the alternatives will be provided later when the range of reasonable alternatives are fully developed and evaluated in the NEPA/CEPA document. The public will have an opportunity to review and comment on them at that time.
11.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>However, I am concerned about the expected relocation of the train station and busway that this alternative might necessitate. Union Station is already on the western/northern fringe of downtown; moving it farther from the city's center would isolate it from business and cultural destinations. I have the same concern about relocating the busway, and wonder if there would be any way to keep these functions where they are or perhaps take the opportunity to move them closer to the center of downtown (i.e., closer to the Old State House). Subject to these questions and concerns, I believe the third alternative would help to reconnect downtown with surrounding neighborhoods at an acceptable financial cost.</i>	Union Station will remain in its current location for all of the alternatives being considered. There could be several options/alternatives for its use if the railroad tracks are relocated north of the highway. Moving the rail station, or an annex to Union Station, farther away from downtown could be mitigated with local bus service and/or enhanced pedestrian walkways. In terms of the busway, several alternatives are being considered including terminating at the existing Union Station or at the potential relocated station. The Project Team is still early in the Alternatives Analysis process and has much to study. One of the project's goals is to increase mobility and integrate transit - including CTfastrak - into all the design alternatives. The Project Team will present more comprehensive solutions to these issues as the Alternatives Analysis phase progresses.
12	Public Involvement	Venue	<i>WHY CANT YOU HAVE THE MEETINGS SOMEPLACE WHERE WE DO NOT HAVE TO GO TO HARTFORD AT NIGHT. THERE IS NO CONVENIENT PARKING AND NOT THE SAFEST PLACE TO BE AT NIGHT. SEVERAL PEOPLE HAVE STATED THIS SAME THING AND, OF COURSE, YOU DONT LISTEN. SOUNDS LIKE YOU DONT WANT TOO MANY IN ATTENDANCE .</i>	The Project Team is identifying alternative locations for public meetings in the future, including meetings in West Hartford and Manchester planned for October 2015. The venues will be more convenient for people living outside of the City and will have more accommodating parking facilities.
13	Public Involvement	Venue	<i>Your paying big \$\$ to those presenting their views/wares at these meetings, why don't they pay for someplace convenient to all bordering towns concerned. Have a good day</i>	The Project Team is identifying alternative locations for public meetings in the future, including meetings in West Hartford and Manchester planned for October 2015. The venues will be more convenient for people living outside of the City and will have more accommodating parking facilities.
14	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>Regarding the I-84 Viaduct Project Scoping, I would just like to recommend that any changes to the current configuration of the roadway, does not include elimination of on and off ramps at Sigourney Street. Access to the highway at Sigourney provides the greatest convenience for thousands that commute to this area daily.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
15	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>RE I-84 Viaduct Project Scoping I am writing to you with concern for the proposal to remove the Sigourney Street exit and on ramp to I-84 in Hartford. I believe this will be an inconvenience to commuters and re-routing to the already busy Asylum/Sisson Ave exits will cause more traffic and longer commutes. As a working mom, time is of the essence, I value the convenience of these on/off ramps and feel that they are detrimental to arriving home the soonest and safest.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
16	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>Please do not remove the Sigourney street ramps as this will negatively impact traffic in and out of the campus for employees coming in from both the east and west of hartford</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
17	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>RE: I-84 Viaduct Project Scoping Elimination of the Sigourney Street on/off ramps is extremely undesirable based on the alternatives for accessing the area. The Asylum Street alternative is already congested and the Sisson St. option is too far from the Capital St. area and Sigourney St.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
18	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>Please straighten out Rt. 84 and add wide breakdown lanes on both sides.</i>	The reasonable Build Alternatives will be required to meet certain design criteria, including wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from travel lanes and reducing delay.
18.1	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>Also get rid of the left exit lanes and the exit-only lanes. This will eliminate the dangerous cross over traffic and keep the traffic flowing when there's an accident. Also people don't have to guess where an exit is going to be. They can just drive in the right lane and know that eventually they will reach their exit.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline and address some of the issues regarding merging and weaving traffic. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
19	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<i>To close the Sigourney Street exit would be "AWFUL". I work at the Aetna building and getting on and off at Sigourney Street is great. To actual shut this down and make us travel longer distance to the Sisson Street Exit, then have to back track towards Aetna is just ridiculous. If your considering to shut down an exit you should consider shutting the "Asylum Street" exit, as this causes such a traffic jam/nightmare. PLEASE DO NOT SHUT THE SIGOURNEY STREET EXIT. Thank You</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
20	Purpose and Need	Safety	<i>I think it would be good if you got an estimate of the economic cost of accidents in this stretch of highway - damage to vehicles, medical bills, cost of back ups, etc. this is an important cost to understand when selling people on the significant investment that this project will take.</i>	The economic impact related to the accident rate (four times the state average) on this stretch of I-84 will be addressed in the NEPA/CEPA document.
21	Alternatives	Options	<i>If the I-84 project happens, please make it a minimum of 3 thru lanes through Hartford each way with exits and on ramps adding to the 3 thru lanes.</i>	While the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes, the safety, operational, and mobility improvements made to the highway is likely to improve existing congested conditions. This project would reconstruct the highway and address safety deficiencies, such as lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
21.1	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>Briefly, how do I also find out about the Farmington (Exit 39)/ Route 4 redesign where the old Parson's Chevrolet was and those potential plans? Thanks</i>	With regard to your inquiry about Exit 39, that intersection is outside of the study area boundaries for the I-84 Hartford Project. This intersection involves two separate projects. The first project, which directly addresses Exit 39, is being evaluated by CTDOT's Project Concepts Unit under Tom Borden who can be reached at 860-594-3485. The other project, the Route 4 project, is Project No. 51-260 being administered by Michael Calabrese who can be reached at 860-594-2075. On the State of Connecticut website under Department of Transportation/Publications/Plans, Projects and Studies, there are several links to studies and projects where you can find more information: <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=3529&amp;q=426026&amp;dotNav=1">http://www.ct.gov/dot/cwp/view.asp?a=3529&amp;q=426026&amp;dotNav=1</a> .
22	Public Involvement	Effectiveness	<i>Concern that we are starting scoping too early in the project before the rail study had been completed and before CTfastrak had been up and running for awhile, and may not know what our impacts to transit would be. She also asked if there would be more public meetings besides what had occurred this week; she felt that more people should have been at the public scoping meeting and made comments as well advertised as it was.</i>	Scoping is intended to be an early coordination and communication milestone. CTDOT and FHWA believe that scoping has occurred at the appropriate time, and not too early. The NEPA/CEPA process will last several years and will appropriately incorporate the findings of the Rail Relocation Study planned for completion in the latter half of 2015. Additionally, CTfastrak will be incorporated into the traffic analysis and modeling to be conducted for the I-84 Hartford Project.
23	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>I attended the Hartford Library public outreach meeting on January 21, 2015. I would like to comment about the East Coast Greenway (ECG). I note that you have identified that the East Coast Greenway in existing plans, and note that it travels from the Founders bridge out to Bushnell Park, between the Armory and LOB, down Capitol Ave, and right on to Whitney Ave. This route is close to following the existing I84 viaduct. The new I84 viaduct should include the ECG as part of the interstate route. I believe any interstate highway for cars should also have an interstate route for bicycles that is safe and convenient and can potentially follow the same route. The Hartford Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as developed by the CRCOG (Capitol Region Council of Governments) recommend that the ECG should be completed through the region (under Multi-year efforts item 4.1). The ECG should be safe and off road. The route should be a separated path for bicycles, walkers, roller blades, and be ADA accessible. It should be a trail that can serve as an effective bicycle commute route. Please make it happen as part of your highway improvement project in Hartford. Rob Dexter, cell 860-836-9304, skicouncil@sbcglobal.net</i>	Bike routes cannot be part of an interstate, as it is a fully-controlled limited access highway which prohibits bike/pedestrian access for safety reasons. CTDOT will continue to work with the City and CRCOG to coordinate and support their efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. Your comments will be shared with both the City and CRCOG for consideration in completion of the East Coast Greenway.
24	Alternatives	Lowered Highway and Tunnel	<i>Congratulations on the great work so far. Making something this big and important happen will require perseverance; I encourage you to keep it up. I strongly recommend pursuing the big thinking around Option #3 and #4. Both will lead to unexpected positive benefits (look at Boston). And the current situation is untenable.</i>	Thank you for your comment. The Project Team will take it, as well as all other comments received, into consideration during the Alternatives Analysis process.
24.1	Purpose and Need	Mobility	<i>The merging of on-coming traffic with traffic looking to exit is horrendous and creates unnecessary traffic delays that also add to the negative perception of Hartford. Fix the problem! Sooner rather than later. They built the Empire State Building in a year.</i>	CTDOT is evaluating the location of interchanges and entrance and exit ramps as part of the Alternatives Analysis process, taking into account safety, access, and congestion. Once that evaluation is complete, detailed information about the potential locations of ramps and interchanges will be available to the public for review and comment.
25	Public Involvement	Survey	<i>Hello - I'm a proud Hartford resident and excited for this opportunity to change the landscape of Hartford. I'm from Syracuse, a city with many similarities to Hartford; most notably the current process to redesign I81, which runs straight through downtown, cutting off Syracuse University from the rest of the city. Many of the same effects of isolation have been felt there as well. After public polling and much debate, City Council in Syracuse just voted unanimously to urge the state to build a boulevard style replacement. <a href="http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2015/01/syracuse_city_council_to_restore_the_city_tear_down_i-81_viaduct.html">http://www.syracuse.com/news/index.ssf/2015/01/syracuse_city_council_to_restore_the_city_tear_down_i-81_viaduct.html</a> One detail I noticed in their reports that I have not seen is the public survey, created by The Post Standard and Sienna College: <a href="http://www.scribd.com/doc/240547578/Interstate-81-poll">http://www.scribd.com/doc/240547578/Interstate-81-poll</a> Has something similar been done for our project here? If not, why not? UConn Department of Public Policy (the one moving downtown) has an excellent Master's in Survey Research Program. I would like to see that department's involvement in created balanced, informative polls throughout the process. Looking at the project schedule, it seems the Data Collection and Analysis phases have passed? Are there viewable results available?</i>	The I-84 Viaduct Study (CRCOG 2010) investigated a boulevard alternative which was not recommended for further study for a variety of reasons. Traffic volumes on I-84 are close to double that of I-81 and a boulevard would not be able to safely handle that volume of traffic. It is important to note that I-81 has an existing suitable bypass route, which makes a boulevard through Syracuse safe and feasible. There is no such suitable bypass route for I-84. When finalized, the "I-84 Analysis, Needs and Deficiencies Report" will be posted on the project website. The Project Team is investigating a survey (poll) for the I-84 Hartford Project as per your suggestion.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
26	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I would like to see the Hartford metro area become more usable for non-drivers. I would like it to be so public transportation- and walk/bike-friendly that commuters actually opt to NOT drive. Rather than making driving more appealing by improving the highways and interchanges, I vote to build up non-automobile centered infrastructure. Pedestrian lanes, bike lanes, and a well-linked public transportation system. Firstly, we need pedestrian and bike paths connecting EVERYTHING, whether bike paths are collocated on the road or separate, just get them there. I just lived in Germany for 7 years and I knew, no matter where I lived, I could walk or bike to work, shopping, etc safely, quickly and easily. Biking was faster than driving - and that is a selling point! Paths were everywhere, and the drivers knew that bikers have priority. In fact, even now back in the USA, I still automatically keep an eye out for bikers when driving, making right turns, etc...and chuckle to myself when I sadly realize that there probably aren't any to watch out for. The ease of walking and biking everywhere in Germany enabled everyone to get where they needed to be, having a car wasn't even necessary. A city should support people without a car! We should provide the opportunity for someone without a car to not have to take a 1.5 hour bus ride somewhere where cars can go in 20 minutes. The ability to travel without a vehicle levels the playing field, closes the gap between the haves and have nots. This is the kind of metro community we want to enable - right?</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
26.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>In terms of building up a better public transportation network, I would love to see the area go back to using the trolley network that connected the suburbs to Hartford. Obviously those tracks are long gone, but transport system via bus (or in my dreams, a tram/street train system) which uses lanes separate from the cars would work well. Get those buses out of the normal lanes. In Munich, the buses travel in a center lane which frees up the road for car travelers and allows the buses to keep to an accurate schedule. It seems the Fasttrack bus system will be similar, so perhaps we could go further and put serious effort and budget into expanding this system into the suburbs and creating a wide spread, well connected, easily accessible commuter transport system. IF it is well connected, meaning people could live, work, shop and play via stops along the routes - it would absolutely change the way we live here. I am not an urban planner, but it seems like these types of changes are possible. I truly believe "if you build it, they will come", and this means building the public transportation infrastructure that enables everyone to enjoy working and living in the Hartford metro area without worrying about driving to/through it.</i>	The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. In addition to the Purpose and Need, the Project Team has developed several goals, one of which is to create opportunities for connections to existing and future modes of transportation within the corridor. The CTDOT opened CTfastrak in spring 2015, which provides transit service on a dedicated busway.
26.2	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>ps. regarding the DASH shuttle - can we please extend the operating hours to 1 am? More people are moving downtown and we want to use it!!</i>	While the I-84 Hartford Project is coordinating with the CTDOT staff, the Project Team is not in a position to make recommendations regarding scheduling for the Dash Shuttle. Your comment will be shared with the CTTRANSIT Team.
27	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I cycle in and around Hartford at least a few times a week, for recreation, exercise, and transportation. I would appreciate consideration of cyclists' needs during this redesign, including maintenance of routes post-construction.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
28	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I live on the CT/NY border. I ride quite often in your great state. The more bike friendly routes, the more reason to ride. And spend dollars !!</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
29	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>Please, please, please include the development of the East Coast Greenway as well as any other ped/bike friendly access to the city in your planned revisions to I84 in Hartford.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
30	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I am a bicyclist and frequently ride through and around Hartford. Getting around or through the area in a direct manner can at times be difficult and I would greatly appreciate consideration of bicyclist's needs in the final designs. Thank you</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
31	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I am a bicycle commuter (no car, by choice - bicycle as primary means of transportation year-round) who works in East Hartford and travels in and around Hartford many times per week. My many cycling friends and I look forward to more bike-friendly routes to encourage this low impact transportation option as our city moves forward. Thank you for your consideration.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
32	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>This is a wonderful opportunity integrateThe East Coast Greenway bike route into a major improvement project. No matter what design ends up being adopted this will add minimal cost and greatly enhance the overall project benefiting all every resident.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
33	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Bicycle access lanes. Please include bicycle and greenway walking access into you plans. Fantasy idea is to change underused commuting lanes to bike lanes., but conventional lanes and inclusion is really needed.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
34	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>Please insure that the East Cost Greenway bicycle route is included in all your considerations.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
35	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>I would like to stress the importance of connectivity/access for the City of Hartford for all travelers including bicyclists. A modern transportation network must be designed to accommodate future transportation needs. Multi-modal and bike/ped networks are the way of the future. Complete Streets design will provide a good guide, but the big picture must be considered (i.g., where are bicyclists/pedestrians traveling to/from). I strongly recommend consideration and completion of the East Coast Greenway route through Hartford. Completing the connection to Bloomfield and Tariffville/Simsbury will provide safe bike/ped connectivity and significantly increase the number of bike commuters.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
36	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>The East Coast Greenway (<a href="http://www.greenway.org/">http://www.greenway.org/</a>) is encouraging people to ... well ... tell you about the East Coast Greenway. I think it's an amazing project, and I'd love to bike along it. If there's an opportunity to plan for the trail, please do include someone from <a href="http://www.greenway.org/">http://www.greenway.org/</a> in the planning process. thanks!</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
37	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I've been an advocate for the lowered highway alternative since the beginning. In fact, I refer to it as the VIRTUAL TUNNEL alternative. If we were to compare the tunnel option to the Big Dig in downtown Boston, then perhaps the lowered highway should be compared to the Mass Pike through Back Bay in Boston; it wasn't built as a tunnel per se, but its presence is hardly noticeable. The unique topography works with this alternative just as it does with the lateral shift in the railroad corridor.</i>	The scoping process elicited many similar statements in favor of the Lowered Highway Alternative, currently being studied by the Project Team. Further information on the alternatives will be provided later when the range of reasonable alternatives are fully developed and evaluated in the NEPA/CEPA document. The public will have an opportunity to review and comment on them at that time.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
37.1	Alternatives	Options	<p><i>With that being said, I believe one more alternative should be put on the table. I call it the South end alternative. It comes without many of the complexities connected with rebuilding a highway in its current location; but, it introduces its own set of issues. One of the reasons why I am suggesting this alternative is that it challenges the consensus that a bypass is not an option because it won't solve the core problem of moving traffic between West Hartford, Hartford and East Hartford. This alternative would maintain (or even enhance) access between downtown and the immediate suburbs. In addition, it would shorten the trip between West Hartford and East Hartford. The other reason is that (in my mind) this proposal doesn't seem any more prohibitive than the tunnel alternative, which is on the table. A south end alternative that starts near the Flatbush exit ramps would involve boring a tunnel through the ridge that Trinity College sits on. A new 84/91 interchange would be located in the industrial area of the South Meadows. An expanded Charter Oak Bridge would bring the highway over the river. The Flatbush ramps and part of the existing alignment up to the neighborhoods west of downtown would be reconfigured into a short north-south expressway that intersects with I-84. The proposed route would shorten the I-84 corridor through the region by more than half a mile. The biggest drawback of a south end alternative would probably be neighborhood opposition. A few blocks of residential would probably be condemned and its residents would need to be relocated. A couple of blocks between Brookfield and Zion streets as well as a couple of blocks between Maple and Wethersfield avenues would be affected. There would no doubt be considerable opposition for this reason alone. Although the south end proposal may not get much support from the community, it would yield possibilities that are far beyond all of the other alternatives. The new alignment would eliminate many of the complexities of rebuilding the highway in its current location. For example, the current route interweaves with the railroad tracks, the busway and the Park River. Moreover, keeping the traffic flowing on a busy highway corridor while another one is being built in the same place will be a challenge. If a new south end alignment opens, the old route could be removed; that would include everything between and including the Sisson Avenue interchange and the I-84/91 interchange. There will then be room for greenways, the Park River, train track alignment and improved local street connections. The Bulkeley Bridge could be restored to a city street and the towering ramps that impede access to the river could be removed.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team has developed conceptual alignments that relocate I-84 to the south and also to the north. This exercise was done as part of a comprehensive process to completely understand the corridor deficiencies as well as the corridor constraints. For the southern relocation, I-84 would continue east from the Flatbush Avenue interchange to the Connecticut River via the Charter Oak Bridge. That alignment would provide some traffic relief to the project corridor. The southern bypass was not envisioned as a tunnel but rather as an at-grade or lowered highway option. Any option through the southern part of Hartford is burdened with potential impacts to buildings and parks and cultural resources. Also, that new relocated highway would not address the need to fix the deteriorating bridges within the project corridor. Therefore, the southern relocation option is not being pursued. More information on the I-84 relocation options and possible bypass routes will be published in the future "I-84 Hartford Project Alternatives Routes White Paper". Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
38	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>I look forward to the improved I-84 project and request that bicycle and pedestrian access be a key component of the design. It is critical that the project include dedicated bicycle/pedestrian facilities, especially for purpose of providing connection between Hartford and points west to E. Hartford where I work.</i></p>	<p>The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.</p>
39	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>In three letters, dated October 14, 2014, to the Hartford City Council, Mayor Pedro Segarra wrote "the stadium is to be constructed on land designated as <u>Parcel A</u> in Downtown North Project", which includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. 1214 Main Street, Pleasant Street, 271-273 Windsor Street;</i></li> <li><i>2. Complementary development will occur on 150 Windsor Street (Parcel G). Those two parcels are divided by Windsor Street.</i></li> <li><i>3. Trumbull Street, Windsor Street and Pleasant Street</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Mayor Segarra wrote in the letter, "In order to have sufficient space to build the stadium in accordance with standards for Minor League Baseball Parks," the area includes Parcel A.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Relocating the southerly street line of Pleasant Street approximately 5 feet to the north for a distance of approximately 830 feet as measured along the center line on Pleasant Street, this location is necessary to accommodate the construction of the baseball stadium.</i></li> <li><i>2. An ordinance to discontinuing Windsor Street between Trumbull and Pleasant Street in the Downtown North Project.</i></li> <li><i>3. Relocating the street lines of Trumbull Street approximately eighty-five (85) feet to the South for a distance of approximately eight hundred eighty-five (885) feet as measured along the center line of Trumbull Street. This relocation is limited to the area of Trumbull Street that extends from Market Street to Main Street.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>In the Hartford Courant article, January 8, 2015 "Hartford Approves Special Permit for Stadium Developer" by Jenna Carlesso. The Planning and Zoning Commission gave the Developer to build the stadium near the intersection of Main and Trumbull Street on the north side.</i></p> <p><i>Windsor St. is a major thoroughfare from Main and Windsor Streets in the north end to Windsor and Trumbull Streets to the south. There are presently 6 bus routes that travel on Windsor Street. The Windsor buses going north the Windsor, CT, turn right on Trumbull Street, left on Windsor to Main and Windsor Streets, and right on Main Street, and on to Windsor. During the peak hours some of the Windsor buses turn right on Trumbull Street, left on Market Street to the Rev. Moody Highway, to Boce Barlow Way, and right on Windsor Street, and right on Main Street and on to Windsor.</i></p> <p><i>These changes made to the Windsor Street, Pleasant Street, Market Street, and Trumbull Street will be made in Parcel A-Downtown North Plan, will have a negative impact on the buses that use Windsor Street.</i></p>	<p>The closure of Windsor Street, and changes made to Pleasant Street, Market Street, and Trumbull Street are outside the I-84 Hartford Project limits. These comments will be forwarded to the City who is responsible for the changes to the local street network in this area and to the local bus operators (CTtransit and CTDOT) for their consideration.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
39			<p><i>For instance the buses can't turn right on Trumbull Street anymore, They expect the buses to turn right on Pleasant Street and left on Windsor Street. The buses can't turn right on Pleasant Street because there is not enough space. The buses that have to travel to the north on Main Street to Pavilion Street and turn right on Windsor Street in order to reach Windsor Street.</i></p> <p><i>Please include this letter in your Public Scoping Meeting on the I-84 Hartford Project. I do not have a computer and I can't make meeting at the library on January 21, 2015.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for taking time to read my letter.</i></p>	See response above.
40	Purpose and Need	Safety	<i>I am in favor of repairing the I-84 as soon as possible in order to cut down accidents on the approximately 2.88 mile section of I-84 in Hartford from the West Hartford town line (milepost 59.30) to downtown Hartford platform Trumbull Street and Main Street over I-84 (milepost 62.18).</i>	Thank you for your comment. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a> .
40.1	Environmental	Land Use	<p><i>Hartford's Planning and Zoning Commission voted on Thursday, January 8, 2015 to grant a special permit to DoNo Hartford, the developers of a \$56 million minor league baseball stadium to be built just north of downtown.</i></p> <p><i>These permits include property in other locations, which would greatly have a direct negative impact on the I-84. For instance: C. Approved: Special Permit at 1143, 1161, 1181-183, 1185, 1189, 1209, 1213, 1243 Main Street; 40, 44, 58 Chapel Street. New construction of a multiple residential unit development that will contain a grocery store, fitness center and mixed uses in the B-1 district. Applicant: DoNo Hartford LLC. This is right next to the downtown Hartford platform (Trumbull Street and Main Street over I-84, milepost 62.18).</i></p> <p><i>DoNo Hartford plans on putting a grocery store and fitness center on Main Street near Trumbull Street on the odd numbered side of Main Street, right next to the boxing gym. With the people entering and existing I-84 behind these buildings, there are bound to be more accidents in the future.</i></p> <p><i>Please include my letter in your Public Scoping Meeting on the I-84 Hartford Project. I do not have a computer and I can't make meeting at the library on January 21, 2015. Thank you for taking time to read my letter.</i></p>	The Project Team will work with the City and CRCOG to incorporate this project into the existing roadway network as seamlessly as possible, and the traffic analysis will take into account the new traffic that would be generated from the DoNo Hartford development and the baseball stadium. CTDOT is not responsible for the City's action with regards to the baseball stadium or DoNo development, but will forward your comments to the City for further consideration.
41	Public Involvement	Notification of Meetings	<i>I attended the Scoping Meeting which went well. I only read about it in Wednesday's Courant and wondered if others received earlier notice.</i>	<p>CTDOT provided online notifications for the scoping meeting in the Connecticut <i>Environmental Monitor</i> on December 16, 2014; January 6, 2015; January 20, 2015; February 3, 2015; and February 17, 2015. CTDOT placed ads in the <i>Hartford Courant</i> on December 16, 2014; January 6, 2015; January 18, 2015; and January 20, 2015. CTDOT also placed ads, in Spanish, in <i>La Voz</i> on December 18, 2014; January 8, 2015; and January 15, 2015. Additionally, notice was posted on the project website, <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a>.</p> <p>All scoping attendees who left their name/address on the sign in list will be included on the mailing list and will therefore receive all future meeting notifications. Please visit the project website (<a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a>) for relevant and up to date information on all project related events.</p>
41.1	Environmental	Land Use	<i>What I worry about is diminution in attendance of Hartford's great resources. We've lost our retail but I don't want to see the death of the theaters and music. We already have many suburbanites who won't come to the city for fear of crime and racism. You will have to plan carefully.</i>	The Project Team will work with the City and CRCOG to incorporate this project into the existing roadway network as seamlessly as possible, while trying to minimize impacts to residences, businesses, and other institutions.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
41.2	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>Why can't the through traffic connect to 91 south and then back on 84?</i>	The Project Team is currently developing an "I-84 Hartford Project Alternate Routes White Paper" (the "Bypass White Paper"), which evaluates a series of historic potential bypass routes, as well as others that have recently been proposed. Some of these historic bypass routes were completed; others cancelled for a variety of reasons. The Project Team determined that the recently proposed Hartford bypass routes were not feasible for three overarching reasons. First, and primary to the Purpose and Need for the I-84 Hartford Project, is the need to address the structural deficiencies of the viaduct, which would not be achieved with any bypass route. Secondly, the majority of the I-84 traffic on the project corridor during the morning and evening peak hours is not through traffic, but local traffic that gets on and/or off the highway in Hartford, such that a bypass route would not provide measurable congestion relief to I-84. Lastly, the bypass routes evaluated have been associated with significant environmental and right-of-way impacts. Given these issues, CTDOT has determined that none of the bypass routes warrant further consideration. Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
41.3	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Extra buses would be helpful for people with center city jobs.</i>	Your comment will be forwarded to CTTRANSIT and the Transit Division within CTDOT for further consideration.
41.4	Traffic & Transportation	Parking	<i>Closing the overbuilt central city parking lots would help too – many are underused as it is. Has there been an inventory?</i>	The Project Team has conducted an inventory of off-street and on-street parking in order to determine the impact that the range of alternatives will have and to identify the need for any replacement parking.
41.5	Environmental	Land Use	<i>I live by Founders Bridge and watch the mobs coming into games so Harford still has some attractions. No mention of the baseball field. Why? Is it still uncertain?</i>	The Hartford Yard Goats Baseball Stadium, now known as Dunkin' Donuts Park, received approval from the City to build the stadium. No other permits were required as it a permitted use in the zone. Construction is scheduled to be completed in 2016.
42	Public Involvement	Effectiveness	<i>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the alternatives for a new Interstate 84 through Hartford. At this early but key point in the lengthy process for re-designing and reconstructing an interstate highway through an urban area, there exists a chance to repair decades of damage done by the original construction and to stimulate a revival of the city in the best way possible through the new design and development opportunities that are opened by the total re-thinking of the project. I believe that the suggestions below can help to do that.</i>  <i>These comments are from me alone at this point. They will be considered and possibly acted upon by the West End Civic Association at its March, 2015 meeting. The results of that meeting will be communicated to you.</i> <i>The public involvement process that the DOT and its consultant team have conducted has been open and welcoming. I believe you are listening and that I have been heard.</i>	CTDOT is committed to listening to the stakeholders and public, and ultimately ensuring that this project enjoys broad support for the Preferred Alternative. CTDOT is very appreciative of the work of the Public Advisory Committee and the many other stakeholders who have provided valuable time and energy in understanding the various complex issues associated with the rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement of I-84 in Hartford.
42.1	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I. HIGHWAY REDESIGN ALTERNATIVES. Choose "Alternative 3: Lowered Highway". Use a cut section from Laurel to Myrtle Street that effectively "disappears" the highway in that stretch, and relocate the railroad track to the north, incorporating a new transportation center also to the north so the highway need not be elevated to cross over the tracks. It is possible that "Alternative 4: Tunneled Highway" would be better for these purposes, but it would undoubtedly be much more expensive, and would not seem to add enough additional advantage to justify the additional cost.</i>	The Project Team is currently investigating various alternatives including a Lowered Highway Alternative, a Tunnel Alternative, and some combination of those alternatives for portions of the highway. Further design details, engineering, analysis of impacts, and preliminary cost and funding information on those alternatives will be documented as part of the NEPA/CEPA process, and will be the subject of many public meetings, charrettes, and workshops to come. The relocation of the railroad tracks to the north and a new station are also being considered as part of the Alternatives Analysis process.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
42.2	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<p><i>II. INTERCHANGES. Eliminate all three of the existing interchanges and instead build two new full interchanges designed to integrate seamlessly with the local streets, take up much less acreage, and provide needed access to major centers of employment. Use roundabouts and other traffic-calming devices at the exits to dramatically slow traffic without making it stop, and design the local roads that traffic merges into to be as narrow as reasonably possible.</i></p> <p><i>A. Eliminate these interchanges:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Eliminate the Sisson Avenue interchange and with it the incentive for locals to take the highway for four-minute trips to go downtown. This action would provide a major redevelopment opportunity for residential and some commercial development that can reconnect the West End, Frog Hollow and Parkville neighborhoods with one another.</i></li> <li><i>2. Eliminate the east-only Sigourney Street interchange to relieve the Aetna area of excessive traffic congestion and billboards. Lower Sigourney Street and redesign it to be a moderate-sized local road that makes a natural connection between the Asylum Hill and Frog Hollow neighborhoods.</i></li> <li><i>3. Eliminate all of the ramps that make up the spaghetti of Exit 48-A, Asylum Street and Exit 48-B, Capitol Avenue and that together create the largest, ugliest and least safe and functional interchange that was designed partly just to allow legislators to park under their desks. This removal would liberate a large amount of acreage on the west side of Bushnell Park that could be returned to the city's grand list and developed as described in III-D below.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. Your comment will be taken into consideration with regards to reducing and installing new interchanges, and improvements that could be made for access to and from the interstate in these locations. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.</p>
42.3	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p><i>B. Create two new, full interchanges:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Build a new interchange in the vicinity of the current Laurel-Capitol Avenue intersection. This area is presently vacant or used as parking, and much of it is underneath the presently-elevated highway. With the highway lowered and moved to the north along with the railroad track, a great deal of acreage can be utilized there without disturbing existing uses. This interchange, which would be only a few hundred yards west of the present Sigourney Street half-interchange, would serve Aetna, St. Francis Hospital, the State office complex, and the West End, Asylum Hill and Frog Hollow neighborhoods.</i></li> <li><i>2. Build a new interchange in the vicinity of Spring/Myrtle/Edwards Streets, much of it underground, to serve the new railroad station, the Hartford Insurance Group, the Capitol complex, and west downtown. This location would open up new development opportunities in, and reconnect to the North End.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. The Project Team is evaluating the location of interchanges and entrance and exit ramps as part of the Alternatives Analysis, taking into account safety, access and congestion. Once this evaluation is complete, detailed information about the potential locations of ramps and interchanges will be available to the public for review and comment.</p> <p>Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. It is with this in mind that the Project Team is developing the current range of alternatives to maximize such opportunities. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of such properties. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects. The Project Team will continue to balance the needs to improve mobility (vehicular, truck, pedestrians and bicycles) with the goal of creating large parcels of land for potential development.</p>



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
42.4	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<p><b>III. LOCAL STREETS.</b> Rationalize, reconnect, redesign and where possible create new local streets to maximize the benefits of the above changes:</p> <p>A. Leave Capitol Avenue east connected to Capitol Avenue west, once the highway is relocated, rather than to West Boulevard, as appears to be shown on the Alternative 3 map. Once the highway is out of the way, this section of Capitol Avenue should be redeveloped as office and denser residential, similar to its character east of Sigourney Street.</p> <p>B. Connect the east end of West Boulevard, once it is no longer a highway ramp, to Hawthorne Street just to the south of the Hartford Public High School tennis courts. This new street should be developed as residential in a pattern similar to the western blocks of West Boulevard, or perhaps more densely as townhouses, using Columbia Street as a model.</p> <p>C. Redesign Farmington Avenue and Asylum Street where they converge, including the entire area where the highway and railroad bridges now cross over and under these streets. This area should become a graceful connection between Downtown and the western neighborhoods, between the state government complex and the central transit hub, and include the connections to new streets, particularly Bushnell Park West, as described below.</p> <p>D. Create a new street, Bushnell Park West, a connector running from Spruce Street along the west side of Bushnell Park to Oak Street on the other side of Capitol Avenue. This street should be a high-value, high-density residential street, a boulevard that at its southern end uses the location of the previous highway ramps, passing under the LOB-Capitol connecting walkway as they did.</p> <p>E. Re-connect Flower Street between Farmington Avenue and Capitol Avenue.</p> <p>F. Take other opportunities as they arise to add to and improve local streets and to maximize and re-create connections to the historic local street grid.</p> <p>G. Create new streets as needed and possible, in order to connect to and re-establish the existing street grid.</p>	<p>The Project Team will be evaluating ways to improve local roads that are impacted by the project. Specifically, several of your ideas are currently being evaluated including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a western interchange option that keeps Capitol Street on its current alignment as an east-west corridor.</li> <li>• Developing several western interchange options that align West Boulevard with Hawthorn Street. This alignment avoids the high school property but requires a partial acquisition of the City's Hawthorn Street property (corner of Forrest Street and Hawthorn Street).</li> <li>• Improving the Asylum Street/Downtown connection via Asylum Street by lowering the highway and the railroad below Asylum Street.</li> <li>• Creating several eastern interchange options for Alternative 3 (lowered highway) that include a new roadway on the western boundary of Bushnell Park that connects Asylum Street with Capitol Avenue. This new connection provides valuable north/south redundancy in the local network.</li> <li>• Re-connecting Flower Street to vehicular traffic under the lowered highway (Alternative 3), which may result in property impacts due to the revised profile grade, and possibly providing a pedestrian/bicycle connection for this alternative.</li> <li>• Evaluating the possibility of restoring the vehicular connection at Flower Street for the elevated highway (Alternative 2) and the tunneled highway (Alternative 4).</li> <li>• Exploring new streets and connections in an effort to add redundancy to the local roadway network and to distribute traffic in a more effective way.</li> </ul> <p>The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
42.5	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><b>IV. TRANSIT SERVICE</b></p> <p>A. Integrate CTfastrak fully from the beginning of the design process for the highway and the new transportation center (see V-A below), carrying it with the highway across the Connecticut River and designing it to serve the new stadium and Downtown North should these get built.</p>	<p>Early planning and design stages of the I-84 Hartford Project have and will continue to fully integrate CTfastrak. The existing CTfastrak guideway will be accommodated as part of the project. However, the Purpose and Need of this project is to address the structural deficiencies of the viaduct; improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and address mobility deficiencies. Thus, CTfastrak will not be extended across the river as part of this project. Other CTtransit routes currently connect from CTfastrak to Manchester and Downtown North, and there is consideration of extending CTfastrak further east as a separate project.</p>
42.6	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p>B. Design highway on- and off-ramps for inter-city buses to use the new transportation center.</p>	<p>As part of the Alternatives Analysis process, the possibility of using dedicated on- and off-ramps for buses will be explored for alternatives that relocate the railroad and CTfastrak.</p>
42.7	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p>C. Improve bus service on Farmington Avenue, the busiest bus line in the state, through street re-design, improved bus stops and pre-emption at traffic signals.</p>	<p>While the Project Team is not directly responsible for this bus route, your comments will be shared with CTtransit, who operates this route, for their consideration.</p>
42.8	Purpose and Need	Redevelopment	<p><b>V. MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>A. Design and develop the large area between the new Bushnell Park West and Flower Street. With the highway ramps gone, develop this acreage mainly for office/residential and to serve as a seamless connection among the Asylum Hill neighborhood, Downtown, the State Capitol complex and the Frog Hollow neighborhood.</p>	<p>The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of such properties. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
42.9	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>B. Create a new transportation center somewhere between Spruce and Spring Streets for direct access underground by the re-located railroad tracks. The transportation center should be mostly underground (that is, into the side of the hill), but with an aboveground component that is an important architectural statement.</i>	Union Station will remain in its current location for all of the alternatives being considered. There could be several options/alternatives for its use if the railroad tracks are relocated north of the highway. Moving the rail station, or an annex to Union Station, further away from downtown could be mitigated with local bus service and/or enhanced pedestrian walkways. The Project Team is still very early in the Alternatives Analysis process and has much to study. One of the project's goals is to increase mobility and integrate transit - including CTfastrak - into all of the design alternatives. The Project Team will present more comprehensive solutions to these issues as the Alternatives Analysis phase progresses.
42.10	Environmental	Land Use	<i>C. Provide for the adaptive re-use of the old train station. In such a re-design of Hartford's entire transportation system as envisioned here, it is hard to see how, given its location, the 1914 railroad station could continue to play a transportation role. On the other hand, as an iconic building central to Hartford's identity, it is a natural candidate for rehabilitation as a mixed-use, residential/commercial building. It could be a key contributing element to the newly-rebuilt transportation hub of the capitol city. At an appropriate point in the construction process it should be advertised to the private sector as a property available for redevelopment in such a way that supports the overall vision for this location.</i>	Union Station will remain in its current location for all of the alternatives under consideration. Union Station is a key architectural landmark in Hartford and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. There could be several options/alternatives for its use if the railroad tracks (and likewise a new train station) are relocated north of the highway. The Project Team is aware that the City of Hartford is interested in exploring redevelopment opportunities around Union Station as an element of its Transit Oriented Development (TOD) programs, and will continue to share any opportunities for such redevelopment with the City.
42.11	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>VI. BICYCLE ACCESS A. Provide the maximum possible bicycle lanes on local streets.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.
42.12	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>B. Provide a two-way cycle track as an integral part of the highway and as the "mainline" of the East Coast Greenway from at least the new Capitol-Laurel interchange across the Connecticut River, with an exit at the new Spring/Myrtle/Edwards interchange and possibly one or two other, bike-only, on- and off-ramps.</i>	Bike routes cannot be part of an interstate, as it is a fully-controlled limited access highway which prohibits bike/pedestrian access for safety reasons. CTDOT will continue to work with the City and CROG to coordinate and support their efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. Your comments will be shared with both the City and CROG for consideration in completion of the East Coast Greenway.
42.13	Traffic & Transportation	Parking	<i>VII. PARKING Re-think parking in the vicinity of I-84 entirely. There is no engineering or design solution for replacing the 22,000 parking spaces that will be displaced by both the construction process for the new highway and by a new design that lowers the highway to occupy space currently used as parking. A. Force a substantial modal shift. The State of Connecticut must undertake policy changes that reduce the use of the automobile, especially for single-passenger commuting into the city: 1. Charge state employees for parking — or else do not provide them with parking at all. Every major private employer in Hartford charges, often tying parking fees to salary (Aetna, for example), or else simply does not provide parking at all for most employees (Travelers, for example). While the State is bound by union contracts to provide free parking to its employees (when it provides parking at all), this is an embarrassingly outmoded practice for a progressive state government in an urban area. Re-negotiating union contracts is no small matter, so the time to begin is now, with five-to-eight years before construction is due to begin. Clearly this is beyond the jurisdiction of the DOT; the Governor and legislature will have to get involved. 2. Provide substantial transit subsidies to state workers. Again this is a policy used by major private employers, who also provide bike parking, showers and other support services for non-auto commuters and telecommuters.  B. Consider building a large underground parking garage beneath the area described in section V-A above (along the lines of that under the Boston Common), perhaps even to include the western part of Bushnell Park, to help replace the large amount of parking that will be displaced by the highway-lowering. Charge substantial fees for its use.</i>	The Project Team has conducted an inventory of off-street and on-street parking in order to determine the potential impacts that the range of alternatives will have and to identify the need for any replacement parking. The Project Team is taking your comments into consideration as the Alternatives Analysis process progresses and methods to replace parking are evaluated. In terms of your comments on the state policy regarding free parking, that is not within CTDOT's jurisdiction. However, the Project Team will share these comments with the Governor's office for their consideration.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
42.14	Financing	Tolls	<p>3. <i>Employ congestion pricing for highway use that varies with time of day in order to discourage frivolous use of the highway and spread traffic more evenly. This method is being studied for this section of I-84 and for I-95. Such a device could help finance I-84 project.</i></p>	<p>CTDOT is currently undertaking two congestion pricing studies funded through FHWA's Value Pricing Pilot Program (VPPP) in the I-95 corridor and on I-84 in Hartford. The purpose of these two studies is to determine whether a strategy of congestion pricing and highway improvements can provide real congestion relief. Any congestion pricing will be done using All Electronic Tolling (AET). CTDOT expects that it will reduce congestion in the corridor, and potentially help finance highway and transit improvements. If tolls were implemented in Connecticut, only AET would be considered, which requires no toll booths and no slowing of traffic at tolling locations. Much success has been achieved in other states utilizing AET to reduce congestion and to provide an additional funding mechanism in the face of shrinking gas tax receipts and aging infrastructure with huge price tags. These two congestion pricing studies will provide the necessary traffic and financial information so CTDOT can make informed decisions about the applicability of AET in these two Connecticut corridors. These studies will be completed in the latter part of 2015.</p> <p>Any decisions to employ tolling as a means to alleviate congestion would require federal agreements and approvals, such as environmental assessments, including CT legislative action. For more information on the congestion pricing studies, visit the Congestion Management website at <a href="http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com">http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com</a>. Also, for information about the successful implementation of congestion pricing and congestion relief in other states, watch the roundtable discussions held on June 4 and 5, 2014, in Bridgeport and Hartford where representatives from other regions spoke of congestion management projects in their areas. View this at <a href="http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/dialogue">http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/dialogue</a>.</p>
42.15	Purpose and Need	Redevelopment	<p><i>The project recommended here is obviously not only for the reconstruction of an aging highway, but also for a redesign and reconstruction of the central portion of the city of Hartford, including all of its central mass transit facilities and intermodal connections. These cannot be avoided, due to the extensive local street, transit and redevelopment work that the highway project requires. Yet such reconstruction holds the promise of the renewal of Hartford into a world-class city—but only if it can be paid for. The city government could not begin to provide the funds for that work. Nor is much federal funding likely to be forthcoming, even for the highway work itself. It is fitting and appropriate that the state of Connecticut should finance this renewal, not only because Hartford is the state's capitol, but also in recognition of the decades of destruction wrought by the original highway, which the highway designers themselves anticipated, with unintended irony.</i></p> <p><i>“Doctors, we are told, bury their mistakes, planners by the same token embalm theirs, and engineers inflict them on their children's children. Of three types of error, the engineering variety is in the long run the most costly to the community.” [sic]</i></p> <p><i>Robert Moses in “Arterial Plan for Hartford “ (May 1949) and acknowledged within a few years of its completion:</i></p> <p><i>“The impact of the I-84 freeway upon the physical environments into which it was introduced has been both dramatic and overwhelming.”</i></p> <p><i>And “Many acres of urban land are used in building the freeway, such of it in valuable, core-area environments.” “Environmental and Joint Use Study” (1970)</i></p> <p><i>Now is the time to begin thinking creatively about a financing mechanism for the future — not just for this project (which will probably become the largest DOT project in state history) — but for similar massive infrastructure projects across the state that are already necessary and will only become more pressing.</i></p>	<p>The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of such properties. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects.</p>
42.16	Financing	Options	<p><i>It is important to think beyond merely raising the gas tax and beyond the congestion pricing study already under way. A review of a VMT tax such as that in Oregon, a study of Colorado's funding methods for a regional light rail system over an area the size of Connecticut, an infrastructure development bank such as has been proposed repeatedly at the federal level, and any other mechanisms that might pay for this and many other projects should be undertaken now with a statewide perspective and the blessing of the Governor and the General Assembly.</i></p>	<p>CTDOT will develop a financial plan for the project that will identify potential funding sources for construction. The Project Team is considering several funding sources, including the potential of tolling. CTDOT is conducting a separate study investigating the feasibility of tolling, specifically congestion pricing tolling, on I-84 in the Hartford area (refer to the project's website for more information: <a href="http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/">http://www.ct-congestion-relief.com/</a>). CTDOT anticipates completing this study in late 2015, and any pertinent recommendations from this report will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document for this project. In addition, the Governor has appointed a panel to examine funding options and develop recommendations for financing a long-term transportation plan. See this website for further details: <a href="http://www.governor.ct.gov/malloy/cwp/view.asp?a=3997&amp;q=563282">http://www.governor.ct.gov/malloy/cwp/view.asp?a=3997&amp;q=563282</a>.</p>



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
43	Traffic & Transportation	Freight	<p><i>Hi. I'm Mike Riley from the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut, which is a statewide trade association. I represent the trucking industry. We have our offices on Forest Street in Hartford. I'm a member of the project advisory committee and I appreciate the openness that's been displayed to ascertain the opinion of the trucking industry, which is a very large user of I-84.</i></p> <p><i>I'll be very quick. I-84 is an interstate highway. It was built largely with federal funds, and it continues to receive federal funds as part of the formulas that are in place. Every truck that travels through Connecticut, and every other state, pays that state fuel taxes for the fuel that it consumes in the state. So the trucking industry contributes a significant amount of money to the State of Connecticut through the fuel taxes and the mechanism called the International Fuel Tax Agreement, which is the way we do that.</i></p> <p><i>I-84 is an important part of the interstate commerce, interstate -- important to interstate commerce. 175 (sic) vehicles per day travel through there, and a lot of those are trucks. I-84 carries persons and products from all over the world, beginning in Connecticut and going out, coming into Connecticut, and a large part of it is through Connecticut, being a pass-through state to the rest of New England, New York and beyond. Unfortunately, 84 was designed to come right through Hartford with the effects that we realize today, and the ring road, which may not have diverted a lot of the traffic today, but would --the trucking industry would be using that to get around Hartford were it there.</i></p> <p><i>We understand that I-84 needs to be replaced, and we hope we can fix the problems. But it's most important that I-84 continue to function as an interstate highway. As we make changes, we need to ensure that the current and future traffic can move through Hartford and beyond safely and efficiently. Truck traffic is projected to continue to increase in the years ahead, and that traffic must be accommodated.</i></p> <p><i>I finally ask that we undertake -- as we undertake the process of eliminating the choke points and improving safety and flow, we not only consider what's best for Hartford, but that we make improvements which will make I-84 function better as a part of the interstate highway system.</i></p> <p><i>We're concerned that some of the proposals which are on the table could reduce the flow of people and products through the state. Ideas like narrowing lanes, reducing the footprint, removing shoulders, congestion pricing and tolls could all replace an efficient and effective highway with a piggy bank or a tool to force the use of transit.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is cognizant of the need to ensure that this interstate highway corridor continues to serve the needs of freight movement and passenger vehicles. This is important for trips that originate and/or terminate within the project limits, as well as those coming from and/or going to locations far outside the City of Hartford and the State of Connecticut. Any improvements or adjustments to lane width will take into consideration freight traffic and the need to accommodate vehicles of a variety of widths and lengths.</p> <p>The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which will likely improve the flow of through traffic on the I-84 mainline. In doing so, the Project Team is currently working with major employers (several of which are on the Public Advisory Committee) to address their needs, particularly in terms of access to their facilities. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and made available at public and PAC meetings as the project progresses. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
44	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<p><i>Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll introduce myself. I'm attorney Joe Sweeney, and until about three months ago I practiced law here in downtown Hartford with one of the downtown law firms. Throughout all this time I have lived east of the river, Manchester a few years and East Hartford. So on a daily basis, for more than the last 48 years, I have traveled, driven my car from my home east of the river into downtown Hartford, and I can confirm many things that have been said here tonight.</i></p> <p><i>Number one, we do have major problems that need to be addressed, and the whole point of this is to find the solution, which is going to achieve the greatest good and also be within reasonable price range.</i></p> <p><i>At the last meeting of this group last June I personally spoke in support of the underground tunnel approach, again pointed out how Interstate 90, running from Boston, Massachusetts to Seattle, Washington has tunnels at both ends. There is the underground tunnel, the so-called Ted Williams Tunnel, in Boston which many of us know about, and also, in the Seattle area, they have a beautiful island, which is a suburb of Seattle, through which the underground Interstate 90 feeds so discreetly that you hardly know that the interstate highway is going through the island. It's in a tunnel most of the way. So I've seen that.</i></p> <p><i>I've also reviewed the materials tonight. There are four alternatives, we know. Number one is the alternative no-build. To me that's -- that is no solution; it's just prolonging the agony. Next we have the alternative -- (Phone rings) I'm sorry. This thing should be turned off. Just give me a second.</i></p> <p><i>I apologize for this happening.</i></p> <p><i>But in any event, the other alternatives, as we have seen them tonight, are the elevated roadway. The third alternative is the lowered highway, but not in a tunnel. And last is a tunneled highway. I have read the materials that they passed out tonight, and to me the cost, the cost of putting through a complete tunnel seems to be not only the most expensive, but it's out of reach.</i></p> <p><i>(Phone rings)</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
44			<p><i>I would suggest the alternative number three, the underground -- the lowered highway. I think that does the best.</i></p> <p><i>I would suggest a couple of modifications: That there be at least, for a few blocks, a putting of that highway underground so as to connect the adjoining neighbors of Hartford. I think that's probably the best alternative. Thank you.</i></p>	See response above.
45	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>I'm one of those people who hadn't intended to speak tonight, but they put the sheet in front of me, and I figured, "Well, maybe if I hear something interesting, I'll say a few comments," so here I am.</i></p> <p><i>First off, it was not my intention to layer more work on you folks or to expand the scope of your project, but I think there is a huge item that's missing from this. I liken it kind of to the Olympics. It's not enough to just build the venue; you have to plan for everything else that's going to be affected as a result of it. In particular, in this case, you have to provide for the people to get to the venue.</i></p> <p><i>What I'm thinking of is, based on the slide I saw, we could be talking upwards of ten years of disruption on I-84, and I don't actually know very much about the impacts east of the river -- because I'm a west-of-the-river guy -- but I'm thinking people going to work, going to school, going to shop in Hartford, for ten years being disrupted, what is being planned for to provide them with alternatives to get into Hartford when 84, frankly, will be a nightmare? And I'm thinking of improvements to highway interchanges, parking structures, more buses. Is there anybody here from CT Fastrak? There is a hand. I believe as part of all the mitigation measures you're talking about, all the considerations, concerns, planning and action, you've got to do a lot more coordinating with CT Fastrak, because I see that, right now, as the only thing on the horizon that's going to provide an alternative to being able to use I-84. But to do that, we're going to need more buses, better ways to get off the highway sooner, and places to park your car so you can take a bus. Thank you.</i></p>	<p>CTDOT has designed and built CTfastrak, which opened in the spring of 2015, and provides transit service similar to a trolley, in that the bus will be able to travel on a dedicated roadway and not be subject for much of its journey to the impacts of traffic and congestion.</p> <p>CTDOT will coordinate with CTfastrak and CTtransit as part of the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (M&amp;PT) Study to determine ways to minimize impacts to commuters during construction. The M&amp;PT Study will contain three parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stated preference survey of drivers to ascertain their potential to change modes under certain M&amp;PT scenarios</li> <li>• An on-board survey to gather information on current transit riders (origin/destination/time of travel) and expansion of the CRCOG regional travel demand model to incorporate this information</li> <li>• Assessment of different traffic management scenarios to evaluate impacts to the traveling public</li> </ul> <p>The NEPA/CEPA document will incorporate the findings of this M&amp;PT Study and provide a thorough evaluation of construction related impacts to the natural and built environment, including traffic impacts on the interstate and local roadway network. In addition, innovative construction techniques and staging are being considered to reduce the duration of construction. All construction related impacts and mitigation will be documented in the NEPA/CEPA document and will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
46	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>Howdy. Tony Cherolis. I live in Hartford. I have a little bit different viewpoint of the highway, living in Hartford and also not having a car, which is something you can do if you live in the city. And a lot of people in the city don't own a car and do walk and do ride. And if they try to do that anywhere near the entrance and exit ramps of the highway as they currently exist, they can risk dying.</i></p> <p><i>And I think the DOT and the planning group has done a really good job of engaging the community members and community users of the streets that may not drive, or may drive, you know, to school past the exit ramp, not necessarily getting on the highway. So that's been good to date, and I would like to see that continue, including the East Coast Greenway connection, which is a critical link through Hartford.</i></p> <p><i>I like the Fastrak and the train backups, because this is going to really disrupt Hartford when it does occur.</i></p> <p><i>The other thing I would challenge, you know, the detailed design when it gets to that phase is to look at the details. They have to be right. The DOT doesn't move quickly. If the city finds out that, like, this just didn't work at this intersection near the highway and it has the DOT involved, it's going to be another 50 years before it gets touched again. So we have to get it right the first time, and we have to get it right for the community.</i></p> <p><i>The DOT is pretty good at, you know, moving things fast through the city. It's where it touches cities that it hurts, so... Thanks.</i></p>	The Project Team is working collaboratively with the City of Hartford, CRCOG, and a Public Advisory Committee, which includes bicycle and transit advocates, along with representatives from neighborhood associations, civic groups, and local businesses, to find ways to reconstruct I-84 and minimize impacts to the City as well as the traveling public.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
47	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>Good evening all. I am Aaron Gill and, like Tony, I'm also a resident in the City of Hartford. Unlike Tony, I drive on the stretch of 84 at least twice a day. I live close enough that my residence showed up in the couple of photos in the presentation.</i></p> <p><i>I'm encouraged by the fact that one of the first things we talked about was reducing the impact of this stretch of the neighborhood -- I'm sorry, this stretch of the highway on the City of Hartford, on the neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>I'm discouraged by the fact that we seem to be leaning towards alternative three, or the at-grade option to accomplish that. When we talk about reconnecting the neighbors, when we talk about reducing traffic flow, we talk about long-term maintenance, when we talk about environmental effects, reducing the noise and air pollution, all of those seem to be even greater benefitted by option four. And I realize that there is a downside of the additional cost. However, I'm disappointed tonight to see option four almost laughed off as if it's not an important or not a viable option.</i></p> <p><i>When we're talking about something here that's going to last for 75 to 100 years, like Tony mentioned, I think it's incredibly important that we get it right. And when we talk about all the goals in that PowerPoint presentation that were brought up, alternative four really seems to be the one that accomplishes all of those goals the best. Again, with the exception of cost, when we talk about everything else that was presented for the goals of this project, alternative four, lowering the highway beneath grade, really seems to do the best job in accomplishing all those and truly eliminating the impact, the negative impact that this highway has had on the neighborhoods of Hartford for the last 50 years.</i></p> <p><i>So thank you.</i></p>	<p>In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three build alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. Both the Lowered Highway and Tunnel Alternatives have various opportunities for reconnecting neighborhoods, reducing congestion, and improving the overall quality of life in the City. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses will be conducted. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
48	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>Hi. My name is Antoinette McCrary. I live in Hartford, Connecticut.</i></p> <p><i>My point here, was it -- it possible that there is more buses out there? Or is it -- is it more -- is it more highway of -- or busway, to -- to -- to -- could we build the -- the -- that situation? Or are there all kinds -- all kinds of highway the I-84 in Hartford? Isn't that possible that the highway in -- it's like the back -- back of Woodland Street, and then there is a highway that goes over that way. So what -- what kind of highway is that, and railroad track, train, trains are supposed to be coming? Okay. Will you please tell me about that, please.</i></p> <p><i>Also -- also, I was thinking -- I was so --so I was thinking, you think -- you think the highway is a very -- very good idea? Or is it -- it's the best way of the -- we build the bridge, and what about as the concerns about that?</i></p>	<p>Bus routes exist throughout much of the Hartford area, and with the addition of CTfastrak, additional bus capacity is now available to those traveling in the area.</p> <p>This project will accommodate the existing rail and CTfastrak within its corridor, whether it be relocating the track and busway north, or going over these with bridge structures.</p>
49	Alternatives	Options	<p><i>I've been doing this for over a year, the infrastructure. What happens is, when you spend \$40 million on rehabbing something that was already decaying and -- the infrastructure they allocated billions of dollars to repair, but they didn't do that. So the substructure was gone when they built it.</i></p> <p><i>If they put granite pillars vertically pounded into the ground and then put your roadway on top, which would be above grade, it could be -- it has to be pre-poured and it has to be earthquake tested, because we're not earthquake tested at all. We failed earthquake.</i></p> <p><i>We never ever even thought of the catastrophe of vibration, because we use a lot of rebar in all of our roadways and our supports above roadways. So when you put rebar, which is a metal, and you're putting cement on it and you've got traffic on it, it's like a big tuning fork; it just vibrates off and it decays and just falls apart. So years of rehabbing, which means all they're doing is putting more cement on it and didn't fix the problem or tear anything down.</i></p> <p><i>So if you went to vertical poles on four sides or on a 35 degree angle, you'll have the support, plus it will handle any earthquake problems, weather, snow or anything else. You don't have to worry about water. So it will prevent flooding.</i></p> <p><i>Another thing is, your sides should have went granite also, but your middle support, where it divides your traffic, should have been, like, a magnetic barrier, which means it's a polar on A, on one side, and B, negative on the other side, so when you have traffic coming in, they can never hit. So that's what a magnet is, it has a different polar -- opposite polars. That means you'll not have to worry about cars running off the road or jumping the supports or going into another lane.</i></p> <p><i>They didn't do that. What we did is, we just put cement in that's full of rebar. And you have no way to get that off the roads, because it just oscillates and it falls apart.</i></p>	<p>Currently the project is in the NEPA/CEPA and Alternatives Analysis phase. It is too early to determine the types of construction materials that will be used for the project. The main focus of the NEPA/CEPA phase is to determine the alternative that best meets project Purpose and Need while minimizing social, economic, and environmental impacts. The types of construction materials used for constructing the project will be determined during final design. The materials used will be tested and will meet CT DOT's standards for roads and bridges.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
49			<p><i>So basic engineering tells you, when you build something, you have to design it and it has to last, because when there's a flaw in it, it has to be torn down and it has to be earthquake proofed. So all the material that you bring in, which would probably be a granite base material with the cement or whatever, you would have to have -- it would be porous for the rain and the snow. You don't have to put so much stone, because what happens is, you take the heat from underneath it. Our pillars are so hot. When we built this, we didn't use pillars or use an oval pillar. We went square. All we did is take more cement, made it a small width, small -- no depth. So what happens is, they can't take the weight. And then even the Corps of Engineers, which on their website and everything it says cement and metal will never -- it's nonbinding. It's a disaster. So you're already committed knowing that you've made a disaster, because you engineered something that is basically a more dangerous situation than -- actually, in my terminology, it would be assassin for hire, because preplanning somebody's death and knowing that it's going to happen isn't engineering; it's just a disaster. And that's with all of our infrastructure coming into the city. And when they also did the roadways, they put water mains underneath in the roadways, which is surrounded by dirt and sand. So when you do that, water comes, and all the sand and dirt washes away, and you got a sinkhole. And that's why you have potholes, because there's no material to support the tar. So the tar is basically -- when you put sand on it, it's a nonbinding material, and it just fractures because of vibration of heavy traffic and weather.</i></p>	See response above.
49			<p><i>So I went to MDC asked them, "Why are we putting it in the middle of our roadways, and why are you surrounding it by sand and not by basically cement?" So they said, if you encased everything in cement and dropped it about 70 feet, then it doesn't have to worry about people, because the cement would probably be a barrier for the vibration cracking your water mains. That's why we have a lot of water main fractures, because they're not deep enough. Plus they put a metal cast iron fixture shut-off, which means you have more vibration, you have instant vibration, because the traffic is coming over your raw iron, and it just basically breaks everything apart.</i></p> <p><i>So whatever you build your water mains out of -- I know what they're made out of it; it's basically junk material -- it fractures, it just splits, because when you're putting cast iron -- plus you've got manual, hands on. Somebody --actually a person has to go, take the metal cap off, put a little, like, Allen wrench on top of it, and then turn it off by hand.</i></p> <p><i>So what happens is, you have pressure-release valves, which is mandated by the government. You have a fracture anywhere, you shut off the main, and there is no water going any further from that fracture. You shut it here, and then it would shut it down in another way. And what happens is, you put a little beeper in there with an antenna, and it sends a signal home saying, "We have a breach."</i></p> <p><i>We don't have communication that way in this state. In other states they figure, if it breaches right away, they can get to it. Plus we don't have engineers to really fix anything. We just archaically do everything.</i></p> <p><i>You're dealing with hazardous material, because water and sand and -- the cast iron is another known toxin that kills people. So cast iron, the cement, which is made out of whatever you want to put in it, it's carcinogenic.</i></p>	See response above.
49			<p><i>So you're driving down the road, and your road disappears. There's no road, because it's sand around the cast iron or -- but the plastic is also oxidized inside the water main. I investigated the water mains, and they're all pitted inside. They tar it, which is a carcinogen.</i></p> <p><i>So when you're putting something in the middle and it's oxidizing before it's even in the ground -- I said, "That's a water main?" "Yes, that's a water main." It's all pitted. Whatever gets in there goes into the hydrant, and the hydrant can't handle it, because all the metal fibers are going into the hydrant, which fractures, because they're not -- the hydrant system is an obsolete system in a way, because the nozzles are facing not towards the building, they're facing towards the roadway; they're the wrong diameter; you don't have a flexible exit for water to the main building, because you have a curve, so you're losing a lot of vertical pressure that way, because the hose is not straight. It has to do a semi-circle. So there you have less friction. So there's no water pressure to go to wherever you want to go.</i></p> <p><i>So if we went to non-combustible buildings and get rid of cigarettes, because everybody smokes, and banned it like everybody else because it's a carcinogen, we would be a lot better off, because we live in a highly combustible city, which we shouldn't be.</i></p> <p><i>Other cities -- New York, Rhode Island --I've dealt with their engineers, and they've already went zero. So you have zero combustibles in New York, Rhode Island, New Jersey and 47 states. So there's no substructures collapsing. And when they find something, they use a granite or a marble pillar system where you drive down vertically into the ground, and then you lay everything on top of it.</i></p>	See response above.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
49			<p><i>Your inner city has to be above grade. So when you're walking -- here the vehicles are above you. You're walking either below it or above it. So basically you can drop the roadway about another two feet underneath the walkway so that the people that are walking are not being run over. So then when you do it, you have the open ground.</i></p> <p><i>That's what a subway does. We don't do subway. We went Fastrak, which Fastrak is a disaster, because it's diesel. Diesel is a carcinogen that kills people. It has PCBs in it.</i></p> <p><i>See, Connecticut sued the federal government, EPA violations, because we did not want to follow the strict codes of EPA, which means zero carbons in the air. We're a diesel and trucking state, and we don't like rail. I got told that many times at public meetings: We are a trucking state. We are not a heavy rail state. Even though we got sued in court and we lost, our preference is to go trucking, because we can make more money sitting on the Teamsters than we can sitting on Amtrak, because Amtrak is a federal agency.</i></p> <p><i>Well, now the trucking industry, because they all failed, all your trucks have failed EPA, they're subject to be banned off the road and seized by the courts, because they are in violation of the Clean Air Act. They're unsafe for the roadways, because they're built out of a highly corrosive material. It's a thin wall, so it vibrates. Plus your tires and your rims are very oxidation too, because they corrode.</i></p> <p><i>So when you're driving anywhere, you see a truck, but all of its rear cargo, wheels, are all corrosive, so it means you can have a fracture. Plus they use retread tires, which are another illegal from the U.S. DOT, not the state, because the state doesn't follow federal law. I've told that in a lot of meetings.</i></p>	See response above.
49			<p><i>Basically that's all I have to say. If we went to a vertical pillar system, put everybody above -- the traffic above the people, and then put the people below it, and then put a cover on it, that way it prevents tragedies. That's the biggest problem. We can prevent all injuries, all car accidents, anything, if we designed everything the way it should be. Either we go below the people and have them walk this way and drop the traffic below us -- plus you put a barrier so they can't fall through into the roadway. But most of these are monorail systems, which are diesel free, and you don't have to run electric wires all the way down the middle aisle and put more corrosive poles, because they're all oxidizing. They're made out of steel or lead.</i></p> <p><i>Lead poisoning is a carcinogen, and so isn't cast iron. It's called heavy metal toxics, and it kills children and everything else. It gets into your lungs, and your lungs just turn to mush because they can't handle it. Also it gets in your eyes. It causes cancer of the liver, the lungs. Neurological, which is the brain, it can't function at a normal rate.</i></p> <p><i>You don't want to think of what the future could be, because we're only dealing with today when we're supposed to be dealing with 600 years from now with the structure. That's why our buildings are --they fall, it goes into the road, because you glue the side of the building, and then you affix a piece of marble to it, and you wait for it to fall apart. We use Styrofoam and glue everywhere in this city. We don't need it.</i></p> <p><i>So when you built the thing by Bushnell Park that came all the way up from Bushnell Park, they built a wall, and what they did is -- it's all rebar. It's all oxidized. It's really corrosive. And then they cemented it, and then what they did is they glued it, put a glue in, and then they fixed another thing on both sides. So it looks nice, but it's glued on.</i></p>	See response above.
49			<p><i>There's also a lot of glue all over the city, which means it's a trip-and-fall for elderly and women. So I sued them under that, with all the judges and all the states. And I got a federal mandate that, when you put glue in your walkways and women are wearing high heels -- and glue and high heels don't mix, they always trip and fall -- the state is in violation, because they knew about the trip-and-fall, because they're engineers and they designed it that way. Somebody is always making money.</i></p>	See response above.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
50	Environmental	Parks and Recreation	<p><i>I'm David Morin, President of the Parkville Revitalization Association.</i></p> <p><i>Obviously the project starts in Parkville and goes east, and I'm interested in the project, but my comments are for the maps that you have out there.</i></p> <p><i>I'm also President of the Friends of Pope Park, which is a major park along the route of the I-84 study you're about to look at. And my concern is that you have a portion of the Pope Park that's not on the maps. On the north side of Russ Street is a section of Pope Park called Pope Park North or Baby Pope, because it's next to an elementary school. That's why they call it that.</i></p> <p><i>And it's also where entrance ramps start from Park Terrace and go up to the Sigourney Street entrance ramps. So I'm very concerned that you include that in your maps and your environmental review process, and I wanted to make sure that comment got in. It's on the north side of Russ Street, and it runs from Park Terrace to Putnam Street. I'm trying to help them make it on the map.</i></p>	<p>The maps showing Pope Park have been updated accordingly, and are included within Appendix C of the Scoping Summary Report dated July 2015.</p>
51	Environmental	Air and Noise	<p><i>David Morin, President, Parkville Revitalization again, Public Advisory Committee member.</i></p> <p><i>My question is in regards to the air quality of the different alternatives shown on the displays here, specifically the lowered level alternative. I don't remember which number it is, sorry.</i></p> <p><i>But my question is, currently the viaduct is up in the air a certain amount of feet, 50, 60, I don't know the exact number. So with all the traffic and the emissions from the autos, the auto emissions go up and get dissipated to some extent. In the lowered level alternative, what is the effect on the air quality at street level for local streets for people walking with all that auto emissions coming up from the lower level and gathering at street level without the dissipation? I'm sure they have to be studying this, and I want to know the answer. Thank you.</i></p>	<p>In accordance with NEPA and CEPA requirements, a technical Air Quality Analysis will be conducted to evaluate the air quality impacts of the various alternatives under consideration. That analysis will be based on traffic and design data and will provide information on the positive and negative air quality impacts generated both during construction and for permanent operation of the I-84 Hartford Project. In addition to other factors, this analysis will take into consideration the distance of the preferred alternative to sensitive air receptors. In the coming months, the Project Team will be coordinating with regulatory agencies including the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CTDEEP) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in terms of modeling methodologies to be utilized. That information will be available for the public to review in the NEPA/CEPA document.</p>
52	Purpose and Need	Operations	<p><i>My comment is, if Route 84 is not going to be three lanes all the way through Hartford in both directions, we're wasting our money. There's a traffic jam here twice a day because it merges from three lanes to two lanes. So if we're not going to fix that, save your money. Thank you.</i></p>	<p>While the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes, safety, operational, and mobility improvements to the highway are likely to improve existing congested conditions. This project would reconstruct the highway and address safety deficiencies, such as structural deficiencies, lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and present this information at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
53	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>I think what we're talking about here today is a logical extension of what the Connecticut Fastrak is trying to accomplish.</i></p> <p><i>The delays on 84 are the second busiest in the state of Connecticut, along with 95, New Haven to New York. The viaduct is going to be incredibly important, but we also have to look at alternative methods of transportation while that's going to happen. That's rail and that's bus.</i></p> <p><i>What I want to say to people is that we need to look at the busway as a viable alternative to the issues that are going to be created by the viaduct. Even without the viaduct, we're incredibly overcrowded on the roads.</i></p> <p><i>So I came here today to say, I understand what we're doing with the Department of Transportation and what the Governor is doing, which is important. Mass. transportation and transit-oriented development are huge, and this is just a logical extension of it. But get on the busway.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is currently evaluating several alternatives. These alternatives will address the need to maintain access for pedestrians, buses and vehicles during construction. CTDOT opened CTfastrak in spring 2015, which provides transit service on a dedicated busway. One of the project's goals is to make transit more user friendly in downtown Hartford, and the Project Team is designing the I-84 Hartford Project in full support of that.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
54	Alternatives	Options	<p><i>David Morin, President of Parkville Revitalization Association.</i></p> <p><i>Again, two questions in regards to what has been presented tonight in different alternatives. One is, on any of the alternatives, why is earthen berm not proposed with any of the alternatives similar to what exists from Olive Street in Hartford to Park Street, specifically along the Wellington Street corridor? That will give them plenty to look at.</i></p> <p><i>The area I'm concerned with -- I know there has to be a bridge over Park Street, but in all the alternatives, the viaduct, either lowered, elevated or tunneled, the section remains elevated on the north side of Park Street to Laurel Street. Why could that area not be an earthen berm instead of an elevated structure, which to me would be the least expensive to maintain in the future?</i></p> <p><i>People have told me -- different design people have told me it's because the slope on an earthen berm needs to be, like, two to one, I'll say, and it's a constrained corridor. But on Wellington Street itself, there is a concrete wall that exists that makes the footprint of an earthen berm much narrower. This will allow the highway to follow along the railroad instead of crossing it until it gets to Laurel street. Cost savings.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is currently evaluating several alternatives, including lowering the highway from Park Street to Sigourney Street. The Project Team is also evaluating the feasibility of lowering the highway under Park Street. There are a variety of factors that will be considered in terms of whether structures or earthen berms are used including right-of-way impacts, cost, aesthetics, and environmental impacts.</p>
55	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>I think Option 4, the tunnel, is the best one. I know it's the most expensive, but I think it accomplishes what we want to accomplish and also buries the highway and gives us more options to have stuff on top of it, which is nice.</i></p>	<p>One of the alternatives currently being considered is a Tunnel Alternative, which does encourage economic development opportunities. The Project Team will share additional information on the range of reasonable alternatives as they are fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
56	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>My question to you is, is it possible that they could build a highway and have you rebuild the bridge? And how do you reconstruct the roadway, as far as the railroad system, you know, the train, the buses, cars? I mean, we build the buses, right, and in the future the CT Fastrak. And so CT Fastrak, how long it takes to phase the CT Fastrak area?</i></p>	<p>CTfastrak was designed and constructed by CTDOT and opened in the spring of 2015. Alternatives are currently being developed in coordination with the CTfastrak Team and include options both with CTfastrak and the existing railroad line remaining in their current location and being relocated to the north.</p>
57	Public Involvement	Effectiveness	<p><i>Thank you very much for offering the option of having a stenographer, so if we didn't want to go up and speak in public, we had a way of getting our comments right here at this public meeting.</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a>.</p>
58	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>Something that popped into my mind was, did they consider this Fastrak before they started looking at this I-84 deal first, or did they look at it -- I mean, you know what I'm saying? Did they have that in mind when they came up with these four different proposals?</i></p> <p><i>I mean, what I'm getting at is, a couple of years ago, maybe they shouldn't even put the Fastrak in, or if they did, maybe they should have put it in a different area if they knew they were going to do something with I-84. That's my first question: Did they have any inkling as to what was going to happen? A waste of money.</i></p>	<p>CTfastrak was designed and constructed by CTDOT and opened in the spring of 2015. Alternatives are currently being developed in coordination with the CTfastrak Team and include options both with CTfastrak remaining in its current location and being relocated to the north.</p>
58.1	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>The other thing is, I'm all for proposal Proposal 4, putting in maybe \$5 or \$6 billion more, I believe it was. Over the long run, I think it's going to be saving money having it in a tunnel versus building up and replacing those bridges with more bridges. Bridges will need more maintenance over the years, I believe, than a tunnel will.</i></p> <p><i>So over the years, they would save money. It's a lot of money to spend right now, but I think it's the best of the four options. It would bring the city back together. Leave the train where it is. Leave the busway where it is. Everything would be underneath, and we won't have to deal with it.</i></p> <p><i>We're looking at 50 years ago when they built this I-84. Looking down 25 years from now -- if they build this bridge again, we're going to be looking at big dollars to repair it, and then every year after that, five, ten years after that, repairing it, repairing it.</i></p> <p><i>I think the best bet is the fourth option. Put it in the tunnel and forget about it for 75 years, basically. Much better for the city overall and all the residents. You won't have to deal with putting bridges over the roadway if you lowered the road, and you can do away with all the parking lots.</i></p> <p><i>That's my feeling. The other option of lowering the highway, that's just going to need more bridges for every street that has to go over that highway, to get from one part of the city to the other. That's more bridges, and it's just dividing the city.</i></p>	<p>One of the alternatives currently being considered is a Tunnel Alternative, which does encourage economic development opportunities. The Project Team will share additional information on the range of reasonable alternatives as they are fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
59	Environmental	Socioeconomic	<p><i>I like the tunneling option, and I guess my comment is, how much is the economic impact weighed in the decision process? Although the tunneling option is certainly the most expensive, I also think it has the most potential for a positive economic impact on the city of Hartford, and I think that needs to be weighted more heavily in this whole process.</i></p> <p><i>My question is, how much is it weighted and how much is that taken into account? I think it should be more, because it didn't seem like it was -- they're still probably studying it, no doubt. Obviously this is a big project to do. I think it should be weighted more heavily than at least it appeared to me tonight.</i></p>	<p>The economic impact of the current range of alternatives, both positive and negative, is one of the many criteria that will be considered during the Alternatives Analysis process. The Project Team will develop a Preferred Alternative that best meets project Purpose and Need while best achieving the project's goals and objectives, one of which is to increase opportunities for economic development. While fiscal constraints will be considered in determination of the Preferred Alternative, the level to which an alternative creates economic development opportunities in the City of Hartford will also be acknowledged. The weight that economic impact will be given will be determined by the Project Team based upon agency coordination and public input.</p>
60	Public Involvement	Effectiveness	<p><i>My name is Tyler Smith. I am a downtown Hartford resident and principal in the Hartford-based firm of Smith Edwards McCoy Architects. I have been actively involved in a variety of civic and urban design issues for the 40 some years I have lived and worked in Hartford. I am writing in response to the request for public comment made at the meeting at the Hartford Public Library on January 21, 2015 regarding the I-84 Project.</i></p> <p><i>It is not an exaggeration to say that the redesign of the I-84 Viaduct offers the opportunity to positively impact Hartford to the degree that is similar to, or greater than, the negative impact the original design of I-84 has had on this community. It has been heartening to see the extent of civic engagement this project has generated, and the creativity, responsiveness, and quality of the work done to date by the DOT and its consultant team. It is also true that an even greater degree of care and commitment will be needed in the coming months and years of planning to successfully resolve the daunting number of design and policy issues that must be confronted and correctly resolved to make this project the success it need be for both through traffic and the Hartford community.</i></p> <p><i>It is in that context that I would like to offer the following comments:</i></p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a>.</p>
60.1	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<p><i>It seems clear both from a planning and budgetary perspective that Alternative 3 - Lowered Highway - is the preferred, best option. This brings so many benefits that I would hope this option could be established as the preferred choice so that the focus can turn to addressing the many challenges that will have to be resolved with this selection.</i></p> <p><i>The exact alignment and positioning of the at-grade roadway to adequately function for through traffic I will leave to the highway engineers. I would like to focus my comments on the design and policy issues that relate to how to heal, with this redesign, the great wound that I-84 has inflicted on downtown Hartford and its immediate neighborhoods.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is currently evaluating three Build Alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Evaluated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. Further design details, engineering, analysis of impacts, and preliminary cost and funding information on those alternatives will be documented as part of the NEPA/CEPA process, and will be the subject of many public meetings and workshops to come.</p>
60.2	Environmental	Land Use	<p><i>The "big idea" of pushing the railway tracks into a "cut" in Asylum Hill and keeping the railroad tracks to the north of the Interstate opens up all the possibilities that come with an at-grade solution, so be it. Union Station, as an established architectural landmark must remain, but let it repurposed in the context of transit oriented development.</i></p>	<p>Union Station will remain in its current location for all of the alternatives under consideration. Union Station is a key architectural landmark in Hartford and listed on the National Register of Historic Places. There could be several options/alternatives for its use if the railroad tracks (and likewise a new train station) are relocated north of the highway. The Project Team is aware that the City of Hartford is interested in exploring redevelopment opportunities around Union Station as an element of its Transit Oriented Development (TOD) programs, and will continue to share any opportunities for such redevelopment with the City.</p>
60.3	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p><i>The three I-84 Interchanges - Sigourney Street, Sisson Avenue, and Capitol Avenue - need to be completely redesigned and downsized to "liberate" the acres of land they consume so that this land can be put to a higher and better use. This would allow for the expansion of Bushnell Park to the west up to Broad Street as well as creating acres of developable land that were taken from the city in the original construction of I-84.</i></p> <p><i>It is clear that considerable study and negotiations with various major employers and user groups will be required to determine if the number of downtown exits can be reduced and the nature of the reconfigurations. In either case, the amount of land area these current exits/entrances consume is staggering. The redesign of these exits/entrances can surely be made tighter, safer and more efficient. At the same time, equal consideration and discussion with potential stakeholders need to be given to the repurposing of land no longer required for highway functions, be it for open space or development.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is evaluating the location of interchanges and entrance and exit ramps as part of the Alternatives Analysis, taking into account safety, access, and congestion. In doing so, the Project Team is currently working with major employers (several of which are on the Public Advisory Committee) to address their needs, particularly in terms of access to their facilities. Once that evaluation is complete, detailed information about the potential locations of ramps and interchanges will be available to the public for review and comment.</p> <p>Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. It is with this in mind that the Project Team is developing the current range of alternatives to maximize such opportunities. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of such properties. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
60.4	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<p><i>The re-establishing, reconnecting, and possible new street connections need to be an integral part of the I-84 realignment project. Great care must be taken in re-establishing the city streets that will be impacted by the realignment. This will allow for new north-south city streets as well as connecting streets that were previously cutoff by I-84.</i></p> <p><i>These phrases and concepts are all part of a changing transportation landscape as we, as a society, move away from an auto-centric mindset to more balanced, multi-modal transit options. While this lowered section of I-84 will obviously have to meet standards for interstate highways, it is important that all the resulting city street connections and improvements precipitated by the highway realignment fully embrace and utilize these concepts.</i></p>	As the Alternatives Analysis progresses, the Project Team will consider the design and function of the local streets impacted by the highway and its interchanges. Local streets may need to be realigned, or new connections made within the local street network. The Project Team is also evaluating potential impacts from the proposed alternatives to the local bicycle and pedestrian networks. The Project Team will share that evaluation with the public as part of the NEPA/CEPA process.
60.5	Traffic & Transportation	Parking	<p><i>The issue of parking, as it so often does, could once again prove to be "the tail that wags the dog". How this issue, which extends far beyond matters of design, gets addressed and resolved may well determine the success or failure of this massive highway planning effort. (See the attached editorial, Hartford Parking Could Take Hit that appeared in the Opinion section of the Hartford Courant on Monday February 2, 2015.) Currently significant portions of the land under and around the elevated section of I-84 serve as surface parking lots, and this parking is utilized by the State of Connecticut employees and major area corporations. The reconstruction of this section of I-84 based on Alternative 3 - Lowered Highway - could result in the loss of as many as 25,000 parking spaces.</i></p> <p><i>A parallel effort to the ongoing design process needs to be initiated that engages governmental, corporate and labor leadership. The end result must be a coordinated strategy to substantially reduce the automobile dependency by both State and corporate commuters. Certainly the CTfastrak busway and expanded transit options will be an important piece of a potential solution. And while the case can be made that they city has more parking than it can efficiently utilize, multiple, new strategies to reduce car dependency will have to be developed. Corporate incentive programs now in place will need to be expanded. In the caes of State workers, free parking as a right of employment will need to be renegotiated between the State and its employee unions. Addressing this parking issue presents a huge challenge and needs to be addressed starting right now.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your consideration, and continue the good work!</i></p>	The Project Team has conducted an inventory of off-street and on-street parking in order to determine the potential impacts that the range of alternatives will have and to identify the need for any replacement parking. The Project Team is taking your comments into consideration as the Alternatives Analysis process progresses and methods to replace parking are evaluated. In terms of your comments on the state policy regarding free parking, that is not within CTDOT's jurisdiction. However, the Project Team will share these comments with the Governor's office for their consideration.
61	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I attended the scoping meeting and received the literature. I was not able to respond by computer so I need to write. It was impossible to reply by computer. I favor the "Lowered Highway", Alt no. 3 because of cost and looks.</i>	The Project Team encourage comments through all available methods, one of which is the United States Postal Service.
62	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I love Hartford and commute to the city every day from east of the river. I'd love to see a plan that takes the highway down to ground level with wider shoulders. It is my goal in life to be able to take rapid public transit to work one day, and any plan that considers bus, train, and pedestrians as much as cars is good for that goal and I think good for the transit future of the state as a whole.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. One of the alternatives currently being evaluated is a Lowered Highway incorporating wider shoulders. The Project Team will share additional information on the range of reasonable alternatives as they are fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
63	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Safe bike routes are extremely important. It provides an alternative to driving or busses, and it is great exercise. If you build a safe bike route, people will use it. Why can't Hartford become one of this progressive, bike friendly places to live, like Portland, Mineapolis, or even NYC?</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
64	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I bike to work spring through the fall and improvement to the rad way for cyclists would be a great help and alot safer.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
65	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>The inclusion of cycling/pedestrian access would greatly improve the Hartford-East Hartford commute and leisure links. For a 'once in a lifetime' opportunity, this is a great chance to make an improvement that can be enjoyed for decades. It would certainly contribute to a more vibrant community instead of just cars flashing by.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.
66	Purpose and Need	Redevelopment	<i>In the I-84 redesign through Hartford, the community in which it intersects must be given priority. It must not divide the city like it does today. It must not have a negative effect on a healthy city like it does today.</i>	The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. In addition, goals and objectives for the project include reducing the highway's footprint on the City, lessening the highway's visual and physical impact on surrounding neighborhoods, better integrating the highway into the urban environment, creating linkages to all transportation modes, and supporting Hartford's economic development goals. Achievement of these goals and objectives will improve the quality of life for people living and working in the City of Hartford.
66.1	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>The on and off ramps need to take into account a complete streets design when coming into the city, it does not today.</i>	As part of the Alternatives Analysis process, the Project Team is addressing the design and function of the local streets that are impacted by the highway and its interchanges. This includes complete street concepts such as improved bike and pedestrian conditions, sustainable stormwater management infrastructure, and landscaping.
66.2	Alternatives	Bypass	<i>Use some imagination in the new design. Here's an idea to get the brainstorming started, make I84 from Southington to Hartford a spur, I-384. Then renumber I691 to I84 and have I-91 from meridan to Hartford be I91/I84.</i>	The Project Team is currently developing an "I-84 Hartford Project Alternate Routes White Paper" (the "Bypass White Paper"), which evaluates a series of historic potential bypass routes, as well as others that have recently been proposed. Some of these historic bypass routes were completed; others cancelled for a variety of reasons. The Project Team determined that the recently proposed Hartford bypass routes were not feasible for three overarching reasons. First, and primary to the Purpose and Need for the I-84 Hartford Project, is the need to address the structural deficiencies of the viaduct, which would not be achieved with any bypass route. Secondly, the majority of the I-84 traffic on the project corridor during the morning and evening peak hours is not through traffic, but local traffic that gets on and/or off the highway in Hartford, such that a bypass route would not provide measurable congestion relief to I-84. Lastly, the bypass routes evaluated have been associated with significant environmental and right-of-way impacts. Given these issues, CTDOT has determined that none of the bypass routes warrant further consideration. Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
67	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>Note: I am a car free bike, walk, and transit commuter that lives in Hartford and works at Pratt &amp; Whitney in East Hartford.</i></p> <p><i>This may be outside the footprint of the I-84 project, but I've always been amazed that the pedestrian crossing for the I-84 Bulkeley Bridge interfaces with two high speed (uncalmed) highway ramps. On the East Hartford side the highway speed traffic is exiting and the gradual curve and no marked crosswalk make that crossing harrowing. On the Hartford side the pedestrian or cyclist has to deal with crossing accelerating traffic that can be rather dense during rush hour.</i></p> <p><i>Will non-car users have to wait another 20 years before CT DOT considers this issue worth addressing? The visibility of a pedestrian wishing to cross safely could be significantly improved with a marked crosswalk and button triggered flashing pedestrian crossing signs. Rumble strips could also be painted to slow traffic just prior to the crosswalk.</i></p> <p><i>With Hartford's Downtown North development (housing, entertainment, &amp; stadium), the use of Bulkeley Bridge for pedestrian access will increase, and the traffic in that area will also increase. At this point its a very substandard and dangerous crossing. It probably won't be able to be brought to full design standards, but there are simple things that could be done to improve this location. Does the DOT ever do simple things to mitigate risk in the near term?</i></p> <p><i>Thanks for your consideration of the safety issues at this location for non-car users. Keep up the good work!</i></p>	<p>While the pedestrian crossing for the I-84 Bulkeley Bridge is outside the project limits for the I-84 Hartford Project, the Project Team understands the importance of pedestrian safety at this location. The Project Team will share your concern with the appropriate representative within CTDOT for their consideration. It is important to note that part of the Purpose and Need for the I-84 Hartford Project involves improvements to pedestrian and bike mobility and safety on the local roadway network affected by the Project. As such, the I-84 Hartford Project will result in improved access and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p>
68	Alternatives	Options	<p><i>A center lane that can be made one way east or west depending on the time of day, an express lane would work. On 95 in VA coming into the DC area they have a lane like that. Inbound it is open on the north bound side in the rush hour am times and open going south at evening rush. Now that could make sense here.</i></p>	<p>While the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes, safety, operational, and mobility improvements to the highway should improve existing congested conditions. This project would reconstruct the highway and address safety deficiencies, such as lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and evaluated at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
69	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>Bicycling infrastructure is an important part of any construction project. The current I-84 pedestrian lane is too narrow for cyclist and pedestrians. Hartford will be on the national cycling stage in a few short years when cyclocross nationals are held just north of the bridge. We should show the nation that we are bicycle friendly.</i></p>	<p>While there is currently no "I-84 pedestrian lane" on the interstate due to safety issues, the project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall bike and pedestrian access throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.</p>
70	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<p><i>I think that the best long term solution would be a ground level highway widened to three or four thru lanes from west hartford to east hartford. A tunnel would be a nightmare! Just look at Bostons tunnel projects and you will shudder.</i></p>	<p>The Project Team is currently evaluating three alternative profiles for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. The scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes; rather it focuses on safety, operational, and mobility issues, such as the lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84, which is likely to improve existing congested conditions. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
70.1	Alternatives	Bypass	<i>An alternate route should be posted permanently in Waterbury and East Hartford for thru traffic during peak traffic hours using I91 and 691 to avoid Hartford.</i>	Certainly during construction, alternate routes will be posted throughout the project area so that drivers are made aware of alternative routes. Today, I-691 is posted as an alternate to I-84. Alternate routes are most effective for traffic travelling through the boundaries of the study area. The majority of I-84 traffic through Hartford during the morning and evening peak hours is not through traffic, but local traffic that gets on and/or off the highway in Hartford, such that a bypass route would not provide measurable congestion relief to I-84. The Project Team is currently developing an "I-84 Hartford Project Alternatives Routes White Paper" (the "Bypass White Paper"), which evaluates a series of historic potential bypass routes, as well as others that have recently been proposed. Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review/comment.
70.2	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>What about the elephant in the room? the I84 and I91 interchange? IT'S NOT WIDE ENOUGH!!!</i>	Reconstruction of the I-84/I-91 interchange is not within the scope of this study.
71	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>As you consider and plan the I84 project I am requesting that you consider a path for cyclists separated from traffic. It is so important to consider reducing our carbon footprint and encouraging alternate means of transportation. I am a member of the East Coast Greenway Alliance and ride a section of it each year. I have experienced first hand the need for these urban bike trails.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall bike and pedestrian access throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
72	Traffic & Transportation	East Coast Greenway	<i>Team I-84 What a great opportunity to implement Governor Malloy and Comishoner Redeker commitment to including bike/ped sensitivity to all transportation policy and projects. Hopefully you know that the East Coast Greenway is the 2,900 mile multiuse trail planed from Canada to Key West. This trail connects cities with Hartford being a key destination. The project is 30% complete.  Please visit <a href="http://www.greenways.org">www.greenways.org</a>. Happy trails Bill O'Neill Past member of ECGA Board Of Director Past Chairman oc Connecticut Greenway Council</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. This includes support for CRCOG's efforts to complete the East Coast Greenway. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall bike and pedestrian access throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
73	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>When the I-84 viaduct through Hartford is redesigned, it most definitely should include some pedestrian and bicycle friendly features. Ideally, I-84 would be in a tunnel under the city freeing up open space, increasing access on the surface streets, and removing the visual blight that is the viaduct. However, having I-84 sunked below the surrounding streets (but not totally enclosed) would be a good alternative (achieves much of the same effect and will likely cost much less). Having a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over I-84 would not garner high public support. A similar approach has been used over the new CT Fasttrack busway on Flower Street in Hartford. The public was very much against a bridge and would have preferred direct access at road level. While access is still maintained across teh busway, the neighborhoods on either side very much feel segragated from each other. People are much more apt to travel from one neighborhood to the other if they have direct line of sight and do not have to go up and over an obstruction. If the obstruction is below the level of the road (like a sunken highway would be) people are much more apt to use it.</i>	The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project.
74	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I'm in favor of the plan developed several years ago during a lengthy charette at the Hartford Public Library which proposes to bring the highway down to grade, eliminate several exits, move the railroad tracks to the west and tuck the roadway into the hillside below Asylum Hill.</i>	In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three alternative profiles for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. All three of the Build Alternatives involve elimination of exits, while the Lowered Highway and Tunnel Alternatives also involve relocation of the railroad tracks north and/or west of the highway. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
75	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Incorporate a Bike Station at Union Station. The Hartford region needs to transition to sustainable transportation that is less dependent on the resource and space hungry personal vehicle. A bike station combined with a bike shop at Union Station would be a great fit and could be part of the overall regional transportation plan that includes the redesign of I-84. Bike lanes, bike racks, and other related Complete Streets infrastructure would be needed to support this concept of a true multi-modal hub at Union Station. Other cities have incorporated "Bike Stations" successfully and find that they are very well utilized. There is a lot of under-utilized space in the Great Hall of Hartford's Union Station that could be repurposed to better serve transit users that may need to store a bike (or bike share) for the last mile or two of their Hartford commute. There are also zero functioning bike shops in Hartford and a bike station could help fill that void. Thanks for your consideration of this suggestion. I'm posting it here because several of the I-84 design concepts include changes to Union Station</i>	As part of the Alternatives Analysis process, the Project Team is investigating alternatives that would relocate the railroad to the north side of I-84 and alternatives that would leave the railroad in its existing location. For alternatives that relocate the railroad, a new station to access the railroad platform would be proposed. Under such a scenario, the existing Union Station would remain and would provide an opportunity for Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Regardless, the suggestion of a bike station at either the existing station or the potential new station would appear to be advantageous in terms of encouraging better use of bicycling. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.
76	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Before I even moved to Hartford two years ago, I knew it as a city whose fabric had been torn by the construction of two freeways through its center. As a Hartford resident who walks to work and bikes many other places in the city, I want it to become a less car-centric place. Some of the most dangerous intersections in the city, particularly for people walking or biking, are around highway interchanges, like the Aetna viaduct around Sisson Ave. I strongly encourage the I-84 Hartford project to make Hartford a priority--to value it as highly (more highly, really!) as it values I-84.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. As the Alternatives Analysis process progresses, the Project Team is evaluating design options that will improve bike and pedestrian safety within the local roadway network affected by the I-84 Hartford Project.
77	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>After attending your community meeting at the HPL, I've decided that burying the highway is the best option for the city. I think it all but eliminates that "cut off" feeling that now divides the city. It will allow for greenways and new economic development above the highway. I agreed with much of what one of the speakers said that night, Aaron Gill. This maybe the most expensive option but I think it's the best option for my beautiful city. Thanks.</i>	In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three Build Alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. In comparing these alternatives, it is reasonable to assume that a tunnel alternative may maximize potential economic redevelopment opportunities above the highway, although the railroad and CTfastrak would still act as physical barriers. However, the other alternatives may present their own opportunities of redevelopment and addition of green space. Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor any such redevelopment. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects. The Project Team will share additional information as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed with the City and DECD and information will be presented at a series of stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
78	Purpose and Need	Operations	<i>First off, my perspective on the Project is based on having lived and worked in Hartford for over 30 years before moving out to the Litchfield Hills a little over a year ago. I continue to visit Hartford regularly for business, recreation, and volunteer commitments. I was involved professionally and as a local activist in community economic development in the city during much of my time there. Like most regular users, I have scratched my head continually about what the heck the city planners and traffic engineers were thinking when they laid the highway out as it now is. (They also screwed up access to the river with the layout of I-91, but that's a problem for another day.) Short and sweet I totally celebrate the fact a serious rebuild of I-84 is now contemplated. A few observations: 1) Primary issues to be addressed in no particular order: a) Safety and durability of design and construction. High frequency of accidents is tough not only for the drivers involved, but clearly also for public safety responders, and for all the other drivers held up by resulting congestion.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
78.1	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<p><i>b) Repairing the wound that was done to the urban fabric when the northern half of the city was sliced off from downtown and the southern half of the city. It is essential that the city's integrity be restored for the benefit of residents, local businesses, and visitors needing to move around. I believe this will have wide-ranging positive repercussions far beyond the immediate traffic implications. Serious efforts to improve quality of life, rebuild the local economy, and address assorted social issues will be always be hindered so long as that bloody tear remains unhealed.</i></p> <p><i>c) Well-thought-through integration with city traffic flows. Local traffic "planning" is frankly. For most of the 30 years I have been in Hartford, I have felt that two thirds of the traffic lights in Hartford could be removed or synchronized to expedite traffic flow rather than impede it. Where and how one-way streets are located also needs serious rethinking. Getting these things right would eliminate considerable stress in the lives of folks who use the city streets to move around in regularly and would reduce the number of people like me who use side streets creatively to avoid the lights and circuitous one-ways, to the detriment of the quality of life of people who live on those streets. I mention it in this context because if the number of interchanges is to be significantly reduced - a very good idea in my opinion - then the impact on commuter traffic flow will be significant. It needs to be ensured that commuters can move fluidly on and off the highway through local streets that feed the new interchanges, or major employers will begin wondering whether Hartford is such a good place to ask their employees to work. Not to mention residents will curse even more than they now do at the commuters congesting the local streets as they try to go about their daily business. I'm not sure how the I-84 Project will integrate with city traffic plans, but there's a huge opportunity here to achieve positive improvements beyond those involving the highway directly.</i></p>	<p>CTDOT is aware of the physical barrier that was created with the construction of the I-84 Viaduct. As part of the Alternatives Analysis, the Project Team is evaluating ways of better integrating I-84 through the City to reduce the highway's visual and physical impact. These design concepts will be shared with the public and stakeholders through a series of meetings conducted throughout the course of the project. Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a project goal and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of such properties. The City of Hartford and the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects.</p> <p>The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.</p>
78.2	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>d) Care should be taken to ensure pedestrian and bicycle movement is facilitated rather than discouraged. Also in this vein, since for environmental reasons I believe it is critical we begin to dramatically enhance the rail and light-rail options both for through traffic and regional commuting, the engineering of the highway should allow for possible build-out of the existing rail infrastructure. I recently visited Copenhagen, Denmark, which is one of the most user-friendly cities in world with regard to all forms of transportation. This is a major reason it is renowned for the quality of life it offers. I would love to see Hartford become a place people talk about because of the ease with which visitors, residents and commuters can move around in it.</i></p>	<p>The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. The Project Team is aware of the need to improve transit use in the City and the development of alternatives will support, and by no means preclude, reasonable foreseeable transit improvements.</p>
78.3	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>2) Of the options currently on the table, I'd probably lead with no. 4, although no.3 has its virtues (and clearly will cost less). In either of those cases, I would underscore the importance of addressing the ease of access and egress challenges and the need to integrate well with city traffic flows that I mentioned above. No. 4 would go farthest to healing the wound created when the highway was first built. On the other hand, I don't love driving through tunnels and there's something to be said for highway users from elsewhere being able to see something of the city as they pass through it.</i></p> <p><i>That's it for today. As I said, I celebrate the fact that this discussion is happening. Almost any solution is likely to be significantly better than what we have. I'd be happy to share my thoughts in more detail if there's interest in my doing so.</i></p> <p><i>Best regards, Timothy Cole, PhD</i></p>	<p>In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three build alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment.</p>
79	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>I am a person who lives in Bolton and unfortunately works in Farmington. This commute takes anywhere from 25 minutes to 90 minutes depending on traffic. I would like to use alternative means, specifically a combination of bus and bike. Hartford now is one of the most unsafe cities to bike in.</i></p> <p><i>PLEASE consider safe options for bikers when figuring out how to re-invent I84 in Hartford. We need to stop making the car the number 1 priority in transit in this state. We are light years behind in terms of public transportation infrastructure in the USA.</i></p>	<p>The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
80	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>As the State of Connecticut begins the once in a lifetime endeavor of rebuilding the I-84 viaduct through the City of Hartford, we, the residents, land owners, and business owners, of the Frog Hollow neighborhood, write to share with you our strong support for burying the I-84 viaduct.</i></p> <p><i>The Connecticut Department of Transportation (DOT) has listed multiple goals for the project, including; better integration of the interstate with the urban environment, maximizing public investment in the corridor, as well as insuring the long-term serviceability of the project. Of the options presented by the DOT, burying the I-84 viaduct is the option that successfully completes these goals.</i></p> <p><i>Burying the I-84 viaduct through Hartford will truly reconnect the neighborhoods of the city by returning this valuable space to the city's residents and workers. We envision a park/greenway, with bike and pedestrian paths, spanning from downtown and Union Station, along Bushnell Park and the Capitol, extending south past Pope Park into the Parkville neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>Burying the I-84 viaduct will further improve the overall environment for those living and working in the city by removing the vehicle emissions, noise, and vibration pollution currently associated with the highway.</i></p> <p><i>Burying the I-84 viaduct also promises to generate economic stimulus within the City. Burying interstate highways located within an urban core has proven to spur development along these corridors while also increasing land values, and as a result, tax income for cities adding much needed cash to city coffers.</i></p>	In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three build alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment.
80.1	Purpose and Need	Redevelopment	<p><i>As cities across the country, and around the world, look to recapture lands in the urban core by burying interstate highways, we believe the DOT must not move forward with replacing I-84 at grade (Option 3). Rebuilding I-84 at, or slightly below, grade only exacerbates the long standing damage inflicted upon our neighborhoods by the highway. An example of this is the neighborhood now referred to as DoNo, a neighborhood separated from downtown by an "at grade" section of I-84. As a result of this separation, the City has struggled for decades to successfully develop this area. Rebuilding I-84 at grade along the current location of the viaduct will further divide our city and suppress economic development in the area for decades to come.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, we strongly encourage the State of Connecticut Department of Transportation to bury the I-84 viaduct through the City of Hartford to finally reverse the damage that was inflicted on the city neighborhoods and residents decades ago.</i></p>	In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three build alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment.
81	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>The Hartford recognizes that the I-84 Hartford Project is in its beginning planning stages, and it will be years before construction commences. Therefore, at this point in time we do not have an extensive list of specific comments. However, we do generally believe that it is extremely important for the thousands of people we employ at our world headquarters on Asylum Hill in Hartford to be able to easily access and exit our campus via I-84. Any future plans for I-84 should provide for exit ramps off of and entrance ramps onto I-84 that are easily accessible by The Hartford's employees, and in substantially similar locations to the current Asylum Avenue east and west exit ramps, the Asylum Avenue I-84 West entrance ramp, and the Broad Street I-84 East entrance ramp.</i>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. The Asylum Avenue interchange is used by many traveling to and from Hartford. Your comment will be taken into consideration with regards to maintaining this interchange. The Project Team will continue to work with The Hartford and other major employers in the City regarding safe and efficient access to and from the interstate.
81.2	Purpose and Need	Mobility	<i>In addition, we believe that any future plans for I-84 should improve the connection between the Asylum Hill neighborhood and the downtown/Bushnell Park area. The Hartford reserves the right to modify its comments and to provide further comments as the I-84 Hartford Project proceeds.</i>	The Project Team is looking at ways of improving connections across I-84, including the Asylum Avenue corridor. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and present this information at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
82	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>After review the initial designs, I believe that the third option, to lower the highway, makes the most sense.</i>	The scoping process elicited many similar statements in favor of the Lowered Highway Alternative, currently being studied by the Project Team. The Project Team will share additional information on the range of reasonable alternatives as they are fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
82.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>It is my firm hope that DOT and the scoping project will place a priority on safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, which were considerably reduced by the closure of Flower Street. Particular attention to this issue will need to be paid on the west end of the study area where Hartford High students currently cross in large numbers.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
83	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Although I am a PAC member representing AHNA (Asylum Hill Neighborhood Association), this response is mine alone. Leadership changes have prevented AHNA from preparing a neighborhood response by the due date. However, I expect that AHNA will still submit comments to you at a later date. Please consider the following: The Myrtle Street connection between Asylum Hill and downtown must be preserved. This is a popularly traveled route by both Hartford residents and commuters. It is a critical connection to downtown. It must remain open especially considering that a southern connection was lost by closing Flower Street.</i>	The Project Team has heard from several people about the importance of maintaining the Myrtle Street connection and understands the sensitivity of losing another north/south connection within the corridor. The Project Team is evaluating ways to maintain a connection, whether it is vehicular or pedestrian/bicycle only, between Asylum Hill and Downtown that does not involve significant property impacts.
83.1	Environmental	Land Use	<i>The Hawthorn site is one of the largest undeveloped sites in the city. The city has finally taken possession of this property and is securing funds to remediate the site to prepare it for future development. This parcel is an asset to Asylum Hill and it is unfortunate that its future now hinges on the I-84 project. It is disappointing that its best use may be to fix I-84. In any case, it is imperative that after the remediation has been completed, measures are taken to improve this eyesore until its future use is determined.</i>	Promoting economic development of vacant tracts of land abutting the corridor is a goal of the I-84 Hartford Project, and represents a rare opportunity to improve the quality of life in the City of Hartford. However, it is not within CTDOT or FHWA's purview to sponsor redevelopment of properties owned by others. The City of Hartford and possibly the State's Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) will be responsible for planning, design, and construction of any such redevelopment projects.  At this point early in the alternatives development process, the potential impact to the Hawthorn Site is undetermined. There are currently several possible alternative alignments, some of which could impact this currently vacant parcel on the south side of Hawthorn Street. CTDOT is aware that the City of Hartford owns the site and that there is interest in developing the property. The Project Team has frequent briefings about the project with representatives from the City of Hartford, as well as with representatives from CRCOG.
83.2	Traffic & Transportation	Mobility	<i>The traffic problems that involve the Trident area need to be addressed. The solution needs to be bold and creative. Consideration must be given to look for solutions beyond the curb cuts of the existing streets. If moving railroad tracks and streets and highways are being considered, this approach should also be used for the Trident.</i>	The Project Team is currently evaluating several alternatives for I-84 and the local roads that construction may affect. The Asylum Avenue/Farmington Avenue Trident area is being evaluated from a traffic and safety perspective because it is within the project limits. Several possible design solutions for the Trident intersection will be presented to the public in the future as the Alternatives Analysis proceeds.
83.3	Purpose and Need	Mobility	<i>The major corporations located in Asylum Hill are an asset to the neighborhood. Although their needs are not always the same as ours, we need to find a solution that is workable for both the corporations and the residents.</i>	The Project Team is currently working with major employers (several of which are on the Public Advisory Committee) to address their needs, particularly in terms of access to their facilities. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and present this information at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
84	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>Of the four options listed in the Hartford Courant article from 01/26/2015 concerning this topic, I would rank them (1 = most liked, 4 = least liked) as follows: 1: slightly below ground level viaduct 2: Big Dig style tunnel 3: even higher elevated highway 4: identical replacement</i>	Thank you for your comment. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a> .
84.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>No matter which option ultimately is chosen, I strongly urge the I-84 Hartford Project planners to consider design features that can be incorporated into this project in order to benefit not only motorists, but cyclists and pedestrians as well.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall safe bike routes throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
85	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>CT needs to start thinking big with a long-term focus. The Hartford sections of I-84 and I-91 should be replaced with underground highways like the Big Dig in Boston. I-84 should go underground from the West Farms Mall area and re-emerge at Rentschler Field. I-91 should go underground before the Charter Oak Bridge and come up in the North Meadows. The I-84 and I-91 interchanges should also be underground.</i>	In addition to the No Build Alternative, the Project Team is currently evaluating three Build Alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment. In regards to your comment regarding the interchange of I-84 with I-91, the project limits of the I-84 Hartford Project do not extend to I-91.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
85.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>The plan should also include plans, if not preliminary infrastructure, for a future subway system. This is a great opportunity to make Hartford a model city.</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, a future subway system does not address the project Purpose and Need and is not within the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROCOG for their consideration.
86	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>Dear I 84 Team, I know I'm going to sound like a broken record however, from past experiences, I know that this interstate really needs to change it's direction and meet the needs of the future. You also know this and I appreciate your time and efforts. I will say again and again that I fully believe that you need to get that highway on the ground. It's a very daunting and tedious direction but it's the safest way to get traffic through the busy Metro area. Many families and businesses were affected when 84 initially was built, my own family included. Our family home on Hamilton St in Hartford was right in it's path.</i>	The Project Team is aware of the physical barrier that was created in construction of the I-84 Viaduct in the 1960s. A series of Lowered Highway Alternatives are currently being evaluated by the Project Team. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment.
86.1	Purpose and Need	Safety	<i>You also need to consider taking the curves out and replacing with a road that is strait and less dangerous. So many trucks and cars travel this highway in high volume times. The curves cannot accommodate the speeds that motorists travel. We can all blame it on high speed and irresponsible driving however, the roads play a huge part in dangers. When you come into the tunnel area, a curve can blind a driver to a vehicle broken down in there. If one is locked into a lane, a crash is sure to happen. I also suggest expansion of lanes. The road is surely outdated and cannot accommodate the high volume of traffic. Many of my friends live out of state and dread coming through Hartford. Quite frankly, so do I and I live in West Hartford. I avoid it at all costs. The entrance and exit lanes need to be made safer also. They are victims of a designer who seemed to lack foresight. Many accidents happen with folks are trying to jockey for position to get off 84 onto a city street. What were the original designers thinking back then? They seemed not to have any thoughts to future development in the city nor the safety of motorists. I actually hope that the bus way is used to capacity. This is a great chance for the State Of Ct. to move forward in a good way. Our highway system is a disaster as it is now. I do observe rot under the bridges and it scares me enough to try to avoid an area that might one day collapse. I don't think I'm being over reactive, my common sense tells me that now is the time to move forward with great thought, diligence and foresight. I applaud your work and contributions of time and great effort to get the input of all who care to be a part of seeing this highway come into the 21st century and beyond. Yours Truly</i>	While the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes, safety, operational, and mobility improvements to the highway should improve existing congested conditions. This project would reconstruct the highway and address safety deficiencies, such as structural deficiencies, lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these design features as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and evaluated at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
87	Environmental	Air and Noise	<i>The goal of these comments is to alleviate the environmental impacts caused by increased congestion and longer commuting distances both likely outcomes of the concepts expressed in the scoping initiation packet. As explained in more detail in the paragraphs that follow, for a design to be environmentally successful, the design must include a sufficient number of interchanges, each one close to Hartford's largest employers. The current design options would lead to an increase in congestion, primarily on the local city grid and nearby neighborhoods, which would in turn lead to increased emissions and fuel consumption. Removing interchanges would also result in an increase in commuting distance, requiring more vehicles to pass through residential areas, thereby impacting the residents with emissions, noise and the many other dangers associated with high levels of traffic in/near residential neighborhoods.</i>  <i>Under NEPA, the air quality impacts alone support the necessity of a different design. A study published in 2010 by researchers at the Harvard Public School at Public Health quantified the impacts highway design can have on air quality. The study explains that an expert committee, the Health Effects Institute of Boston, had previously reviewed epidemiological literature on exposure to traffic-generated air pollution and adverse health effects and found strong evidence for a causative role for traffic-related air pollution on mortality, particularly from cardiovascular events. Road design that results in increased road congestion also results in increased air pollution, with negative impacts on both the environment and public health. Therefore, decreasing traffic congestion should be a top priority when designing roadways.</i>	<p>The Project Team is conducting a detailed traffic analysis of the I-84 Hartford Project, which will evaluate traffic impacts on the mainline, as well as impacts to the local roadway network. In part, this analysis will compare existing congestion with future build congestion once the project is complete.</p> <p>The Project Team will conduct detailed Air Quality and Noise Analyses to evaluate the impacts of the various alternatives under consideration. These analyses will be based on traffic and design data and will provide information on the positive and negative air and noise impacts generated both during construction and for permanent operation of the I-84 Hartford Project. The Project Team is coordinating with regulatory agencies including CTDEEP and USEPA regarding the most appropriate air quality and noise modeling methodologies. This information will be available for the public to review in the NEPA/CEPA document.</p>

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
87.1	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p>According to the I-84 Viaduct Study, administered by the Capitol Region Council of Governments and published in 2010 (HUB Study), approximately 45-55% of the vehicles that use the viaduct have either origins in Hartford, destinations in Hartford, or both. Currently, there are eight interchanges providing access to the viaduct. When the viaduct was originally constructed there was a recognized need to efficiently transport employees living in other areas of the city and in the surrounding suburbs to the largest places of employment, such as Aetna, The Hartford, Saint Francis Hospital and the State Capitol complex. Most of the viaduct interchanges were therefore located in areas convenient to those places of employment, in order to reduce the time spent commuting through Hartford's neighborhoods. Promoting efficient commuting simultaneously minimizes community impacts and enhances the environment. The need for a highway system that promotes efficient commuting has only increased as the traffic volume has increased. It would be a mistake to throw out the good aspects of the original construction plan along with the bad.</p> <p>Despite this, all of the alternative concepts expressed in the scoping initiation packet (with the exception of the no-build alternative), include the statement that the number of interchanges would be reduced. The motivation for this reduction appears to be a concern for the safety of those using the viaduct. This is a laudable concern, but there is no evidence that spacing of half a mile would be any more dangerous than spacing of one mile. Proponents of reducing the number of interchanges point to the fact that the new standard for interchange spacing for interstate highways is one mile, but fail to recognize that a waiver of this standard can be, and frequently is, obtained from the Federal Highway Administration when appropriate. In this case, where shorter interchange spacing would not only promote efficient commuting, but would also decrease negative impacts on the surrounding community and the environment, such a waiver should not be difficult to obtain. Most major cities, especially those in the northeastern United States, have interchanges with much less spacing than one mile for these same reasons.</p>	<p>According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the design guidance for interchange spacing in an urban area is one mile. This guidance is based on general knowledge of the interaction between highway and ramp traffic. Mainline free flow speeds are impacted by ramp traffic due to the mixing of slower vehicles with higher speed vehicles. When interchanges are spaced far enough apart, this mixing of vehicles is confined to the area around the ramps and is independent from other interchanges. When interchanges are closely spaced, it causes mainline traffic exiting the highway to compete for gaps with ramp traffic entering the highway. This creates turbulence within the mainline lanes and is a significant cause of congestion. Once the mainline traffic is affected by multiple interchanges, the interchanges are no longer independent and, therefore, the friction is compounded. It is well known that congestion is a cause of higher accident rates. The project corridor includes sections between closely spaced interchanges where the accident rate is four times the state average. The Project Team's goal is to improve safety and mobility throughout the corridor, which is a delicate balance. There are eight full or partial interchanges within this three-mile segment of highway. Increasing the distance between interchanges means some ramps would have to be eliminated. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.</p>
87.2	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p>As it is, the interchanges at Asylum Street, Capitol Avenue and Sigourney Street are overburdened with commuters during the morning and evening rush hours. Reducing these six interchanges would be disastrous as the same number of employees would still need to exit, but now their options would be more limited. Improvements can be made to address safety concerns without taking actions that would increase the traffic burden on the viaduct. For example, the oncoming entrance traffic of the east bound Sigourney interchange is challenging to vehicles that need to exit onto Asylum Street and Capitol Avenue. This issue, however, can be easily resolved, as just one example, by relocating the Capitol Avenue interchange closer to the Sisson Avenue interchange (prior to the Sigourney Street interchange), thereby introducing exiting traffic to the west side of Capitol Avenue and allowing vehicles to enter the viaduct from Sigourney Street unhindered by the vehicles exiting onto Capitol Avenue. The eastbound Asylum Street exiting traffic could be accommodated by a left hand exit or joined with a modified High Street right hand exit (with a possible split to Myrtle or proximate area east of The Hartford's campus, similar to the split at the existing Asylum/Capitol street design), again eliminating any crossing traffic from incoming Sigourney Street ramp vehicles. These improvements would also result in safer travel for pedestrians and cyclists between Downtown Hartford and Frog Hollow.</p> <p>If the Asylum Street/Capitol Avenue interchange is completely eliminated, however, government employees traveling eastbound will be forced to exit at any remaining interchanges, with the many thousands of commuters employed by Aetna and The Hartford, and no benefit will be realized. There are too many commuters to expect that they can all use one interchange without that interchange failing and impacting the remainder of the viaduct. Multiple interchanges are needed during peak hours to efficiently deliver a substantial amount of traffic to a very narrow geographic area. Extending westbound commuters travel distance to Sisson Avenue, then backtracking on the local grid would add an aggregate of thousands of commuter miles per day (and the associated emissions).</p> <p>Reducing the number of interchanges can only have adverse consequences to viaduct users and those working and living in the surrounding neighborhood communities. Commuting distances will increase, as will the amount of time commuters will waste stuck in traffic. Once off the viaduct, a greater amount of time will be spent on city streets. Commuters will be forced to travel longer distances through residential neighborhoods, negatively impacting those that live there.</p> <p>The traffic burden, once borne by the viaduct, will now be placed on top of a city grid that is already challenged and, in some areas, is completely failing to meet today's traffic demands. The city grid cannot be easily modified sufficiently to accommodate and disperse greater traffic volumes coming from fewer interchanges, especially as any development will need to work around existing properties, many of which are historically protected.</p>	<p>The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve the flow of through traffic on the I-84 mainline. In doing so, the Project Team is currently working with major employers (several of which are on the Public Advisory Committee) to address their needs, particularly in terms of access to their facilities. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay. The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p>
87.3	Traffic & Transportation	Sigourney Interchange	<p>For these reasons and more, we do not support any scenario that would result in the elimination of the Sigourney Street interchange, unless the interchange is replaced with an even demonstrably more effective option. That interchange is currently the most effective transportation solution for the approximately six thousand Aetna employees, visitors and vendors, as well as thousands of other commuters, who come to the campus every day. To satisfy NEPA, the new viaduct design must take into account the multitude of negative impacts that would necessarily result from forcing those that work for Aetna, The Hartford, Saint Francis Hospital, the State Capitol complex, and the many other businesses surrounding the viaduct to use fewer interchanges and drive longer distances when commuting to their places of employment.</p>	<p>The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sigourney Street interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sigourney Street, and continues to explore potential improvements for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be made available for public comment and review as part of the NEPA/CEPA document.</p>



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
88	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>I encourage the DOT to BURY the I-84 viaduct. Option 4 is by far the best option to meet the DOT's stated goals of reconnecting the neighborhoods while eliminating noise and air pollution in the community. While this is the most expensive option, the DOT has noted that this project has a 100 year life span. Given the duration of time this decision will impact our city, and all of central Connecticut, let's not simply jump to the cheap option. Further, Option 4 is the most resilient choice minimizing the amount of weather related wear and tear issues (UV exposure, plowing, etc.). At a time when the climate demands more and more from our infrastructure, building the most resilient option would be the most logical.</i>	Comment noted.
88.1	Environmental	Air and Noise	<i>I strongly oppose Option 3. Option 3 will further divide the neighborhoods of Hartford. Placing the highway at, or slightly below, grade will do nothing to reconnect the city. The north end of Main St. is a perfect example. The city has tried for decades now to "reconnect" this area since being separated by the "at grade" portion of I-84. Option 3 will force this same division through a greater length of our city. Option 3 is like eliminating a smoke stack from a factory. Where currently all vehicle emissions are discharged above the existing residences, Option 3 brings the emissions down and distributes them into the surrounding neighborhoods. Option 3 does the same with the noise pollution associated with the highway. Option 4 is the only option that meets all of the goals set forth by the DOT</i>	Local roadway connections over a potential lowered highway are currently being evaluated by the Project Team as part of the Alternatives Analysis process. These local road connections could be very effective in reconnecting the City. Detailed air quality and noise impact analyses will be performed to evaluate the air quality and noise impacts of all reasonable alternatives during temporary construction activities and for permanent operation of the I-84 Hartford Project. These technical evaluations will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document which will be available for public review and comment.
89	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>As a resident of the City of Hartford I believe that burying I-84 is the best way to ensure better integration of the the interstate with the existing urban environment as well as maximizing public investment in our corridor. Therefore, option 4 is by far the best option when trying to achieve all of the goals set forth by the DOT.</i>	Comment noted.
90	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>I do support renovation of I84. I believe that safety, aesthetic, and efficiency can all be dramatically improved. However my main comment is that when renovating this highway we also enable and install a mass transit component. In particular I am part of a group working on a light rail proposal for hartford that would enable intra city and intercity light rail transit. Ideally local traffic into and out of the city would be handled by the light rail allowing the improvements to focus on getting no local traffic effectively through Hartford. In a nutshell - I'd recommend that this renovation accomodate and build an inter modal transit system the was future looking. Can you please add me to your citizen project team? Bernie Pelletier</i>	The Purpose and Need of the I-84 Hartford Project is threefold: 1) to address structural deficiencies of the viaduct; 2) improve traffic, operational, and safety deficiencies; and 3) address mobility deficiencies as exhibited by existing constrained connectivity between the north and south sides of the highway. As part of the Alternatives Analysis process, the Project Team will be investigating how other modes of travel impact traffic and mobility throughout the project area. Coordination with project teams exploring and/or developing alternatives to automotive travel, including the CTfastrak project and the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield High Speed Rail Project, are also ongoing. The design of the alternatives will accommodate the existing railroad line and CTfastrak, whether they remain in their current location or are relocated.
91	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>Whatever you choose to do please just bury the viaduct underground. The highway running through the heart of the city truly scarred it.</i>	Comment noted.
92	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>please. Bike lanes EVERYWHERE and safe bike parking. Thx</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. However, for local city roads not impacted by the project, and for overall bike access and parking throughout the City, the Project Team will share your comments with the City and CROG for their consideration.
93	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>The current I-84 viaduct is unseemly, and has created a physical barrier that has had many negative ramifications for the Hartford community over the years. Putting 84 underground will connect disconnected neighborhoods, increase green space, improve the aesthetics of the city, and make winter travel easier and safer by reducing accidents and backups caused by snow and ice. As climate change projections indicate that winter precipitation will increase in our region, I think this is a very important to approach this project with climate change in mind. Boston's Big Dig, though costly, was transformative for the city. Please make the smart choice as opposed to the easy one and put 84 underground.</i>	The Project Team is aware of the physical barrier that was created with the construction of the I-84 Viaduct in the 1960s. The Project Team is currently evaluating three Build Alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As part of this analysis, the Project Team is evaluating ways of better integrating I-84 through the City to reduce the highway's visual and physical impact, although the railroad and CTfastrak would still act as physical barriers. These design concepts will be shared with the public and stakeholders through a series of meetings conducted throughout the course of the project.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
94	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>As someone who lives directly in the shadow of the Aetna viaduct: please, please bury that monster. Let us have our roads and our neighborhoods back. Please consider the enormous effect this will have on the lives of people who live in Hartford, not just what's cheapest while still being convenient-ish for commuters. They have every a right to get to work in whatever type of vehicle they choose, and we have a right to see blue sky out of the windows of our homes. That scar running through the heart of our Capitol City breaks the heart of everyone who looks at it. You have a chance to change that-to make the day-to-day lives of the 200,000 people who live and work here quantitatively better. Please don't squander it.</i>	Comment noted.
95	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>This project should enhance alternative modes of transportation. Dedicated safe bike lanes should be included: 1) Farmington Avenue from West Hartford center to Union Station/Bushnell Park. 2) Trinity College, through Pope Park, past Hartford High School, along Park River to UCONN Law and University of Hartford. Most of the right of way already exists</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. The Project Team will share your comments with the City and CRCOG for their consideration.
96	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<i>Please put pressure to bear on Farmington, to allow addition of lanes to exit 39; so that commuters do NOT pass through West Hartford (to avoid the backlog at exit 39) ... Thank you</i>	This intersection is outside the project limits but the suggestion will be forwarded to appropriate personnel within CTDOT for consideration.
97	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>Regarding the I-84 viaduct, it seems that residents of Greater Hartford are at a crossroads and a commitment to this project will affect many future generations to come. Before us is a unique is a unique opportunity to undo some of the the damage inflicted by previous transportation decisions that have adversely impacted core neighbourhoods in a city that has seen marked decline but holds huge potential and promise to become a vibrant, distinguished, and engaging place. There is a significant trend towards re-connecting with an urban lifestyle, and it is vitally important to foster that desire; the viaduct plays a huge role in this process. More and more people and organizations are realizing that there can be no compromises if this re-work is to produce a valuable result, despite the high costs involved. Our Capital City, Hartford and all of the people of Greater Hartford and Connecticut deserve infrastructure improvements on par with any majour city for the sake of fostering long term development in the core of it's downtown and connecting neighbourhoods. This simply means the I-84 viaduct MUST BE BURIED UNDERGROUND IN A TUNNEL to maximize quality of life, potential for new human accessible spaces, and allow for multiple modes of transit at grade such as bikeways coupled with pedestrian routes atop the tunnel. No other "solution" is adequate. Thank you for your consideration, Dave Mourad Windsor</i>	The Project Team is aware of the physical barrier that was created in Hartford with construction of the I-84 Viaduct in the 1960s. The Project Team is currently evaluating three Build Alternatives for reconstruction of I-84: Elevated Highway; Lowered Highway; and Tunnel. As the Alternatives Analysis process proceeds, the Project Team is conducting detailed traffic and environmental impact analyses of the reasonable alternatives. This evaluation will support the selection of the Preferred Alternative and will be included in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be available for public review and comment.
98	Alternatives	Bypass	<i>I think the I84 downtown corridor should be abandoned and a Hartford bypass be developed. The present corridor should be torn down and revert to city streets</i>	The Project Team is developing an "I-84 Hartford Project Alternate Routes White Paper" (the "Bypass White Paper"), which evaluates a series of historic potential bypass routes, as well as others that have recently been proposed. Some of these historic bypass routes were completed; others cancelled for a variety of reasons. The Project Team determined that the recently proposed Hartford bypass routes were not feasible for three overarching reasons. First, and primary to the Purpose and Need for the I-84 Hartford Project, is the need to address the structural deficiencies of the viaduct, which would not be achieved with any bypass route. Secondly, the majority of the I-84 traffic on the project corridor during the morning and evening peak hours is not through traffic, but local traffic that gets on and/or off the highway in Hartford, such that a bypass route would not provide measurable congestion relief to I-84. Lastly, the bypass routes evaluated have been associated with significant environmental and right-of-way impacts. Given these issues, CTDOT has determined that none of the bypass routes warrants further consideration. Once complete, the final Bypass White Paper will be available on the project website for public review, as well as incorporated into the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.
99	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>I'm writing to support "Alternative 4: Tunneled Highway" as the preferred option for Hartford. The City needs to reconnect the neighborhoods, and getting the highway out of sight will have numerous benefits. Thanks, Kyle</i>	Comment noted.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
100	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>I advocate that 84 and 91 be buried, be wider, have 2 more lanes in each direction, and with far less exits and entrances in the city, and that the ground level be restored to greenways and made easier for walkers and cyclists.</i>	<p>While the scope of the I-84 Hartford Project does not include adding travel lanes, safety, operational, and mobility improvements to the highway should improve existing congested conditions. This project would reconstruct the highway and address safety deficiencies, such as lack of shoulders and the merging and crossing of traffic on I-84. The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps, which should improve traffic flow on the I-84 mainline. In addition, all the Build Alternatives will have wider shoulders to accommodate disabled vehicles, thus removing the vehicles from the travel lanes, and reducing delay.</p> <p>The Project Team will share additional information on these alternatives as the range of reasonable alternatives is fully developed and information will be presented at a series of public and stakeholder meetings to be conducted throughout this process. This iterative and collaborative process will be thoroughly documented in the NEPA/CEPA document, which will be made available for public review and comment.</p> <p>With regard to your comment on I-91, the project limits for the I-84 Hartford Project do not include I-91.</p>
101	Alternatives	Lowered Highway	<i>I prefer the at-grade option because the cost of construction and time to complete construction will be significantly less than below grade. Instead of spending money on a tunnel, those funds could be used for other projects. The existing viaduct causes too much congestion and too many accidents. The no-build option does not make sense. Constructing a newly designed viaduct does not make sense either, because it would cost more than the at-grade option, would cost more to maintain and would create more negative visual and noise impacts on the city.</i>	Comment noted.
101.1	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Finally, the existing railroad viaduct past Union Station needs to be replaced. When the railroad tracks are moved to accommodate the at-grade highway, that problem is solved, and the straighter alignment should allow more efficient train operations. A new train station would provide a convenient transfer point between rail, busway, and long distance bus</i>	As part of the Alternatives Analysis process, the Project Team is investigating alternatives that would relocate the railroad to the north side of I-84 and alternatives that would leave the railroad in its existing location. For alternatives that relocate the railroad, a new station to access the railroad platform would be proposed. CTDOT is currently studying the feasibility of relocating the railroad as part of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield High Speed Rail Project: Hartford Rail Alternatives Analysis (Rail Relocation Study) scheduled for completion in the latter half of 2015. Findings from this study will be incorporated into development of alternatives for the I-84 Hartford Project to the extent practicable.
102	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>would prefer that the highway be buried underground</i>	Comment noted.
103	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>Of the Preliminary Alternatives presented, I strongly support #4: Tunneled Highway, Relocated Railroad Alignment. As a Frog Hollow homeowner and fulltime bicyclist, I feel that dropping and capping the highway and reconstructing the street grid as seamlessly as possible, especially (but not limited to) Flower Street, is the only reasonable path toward mitigating the severe damage that the viaduct construction did to Frog Hollow and adjacent neighborhoods. It will make the area more navigable by non-motorized and motorized means while helping to transition the region to more responsible alternatives than single-occupant motor vehicles. The current viaduct literally stands in the way of progress, both in an ambulatory and economic sense. It will continue to be an engine of detriment until it is eliminated</i>	Comment noted.
104	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>I believe that despite it's expense a fully tunnelled I-84 through downtown Hartford is the best solution for improving the city, attracting new residents and businesses, and ensuring it's competitiveness in the years ahead. A full buildout should take into account the possibility of incorporating transit, like high speed and commuter rail, as well as BRT.</i>	Comment noted.

ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
104.1	Environmental	Parks and Recreation	<i>This plan should also seek to daylight as much of the Park River as possible, while accounting for flood concerns, in order to restore long ago destroyed eco-systems, beautify the city, re-knit Colt Park, and create a pleasant urban path for the East Coast Greenway</i>	At the Agency Scoping Meeting conducted on January 20, 2015, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) expressed concern on the potential relocation or rechannelization of the Park River Conduit, which is under USACE jurisdiction. The Project Team is coordinating with USACE to determine impacts to the Park River Conduit from the current alternatives. While the Project Team acknowledges the potential aesthetic, recreational, and biological benefits of daylighting the Park River Conduit, those must be considered in accordance with flood control requirements. If impact to the Park River Conduit is unavoidable, the Project Team will secure all required authorizations. In particular, the Project Team will demonstrate compliance with the USACE's "Policy and Procedural Guidance for Processing Requests to Alter US Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Projects Pursuant to 33 USC 408."
105	Alternatives	Tunnel	<i>To Whom It May Concern, My name is Kevin McKernan and I am submitting this comment as a Connecticut native and resident of the City of Hartford.  While I would have liked to have seen an option for a bypass combined with a multimodal boulevard running into Hartford, I am currently of the opinion that the tunneled highway is the best choice for Hartford.  A tunneled highway would not only allow land to be reclaimed and redeveloped but open up the possibilities for new public rights of way. New streets would create a more robust network capable of handling traffic disruptions better as well as help knit together neighborhoods that have been separated for many years. The tunneled section also appears to have the most potential for removing several weaving sections of freeway which likely contribute to the current poor performance. While the option for new streets exists with the at-grade design a new barrier would be created in the form of a river of high speed vehicles, complete with associated noises and smells. Such a barrier would likely be unpleasant to cross and undesirable to be near, possibly preventing much of the potential recovery in the project area. I do, however, believe that both the tunneled highway and at-grade design are both superior options for the city when compared to the elevated highway.</i>	Comment noted.
105.1	Environmental	Air and Noise	<i>I also wanted to mention a subject which will be considered in the next phase of analysis: air quality. Negative health effects which result from living near highways has been studied for some time now. Studies have found evidence to suggest that incidences of asthma increase with proximity to heavily travelled highways. One paper by Caiazzo et al. published in Atmospheric Environment Volume 79 estimated that near 58,000 deaths in 2005 could be attributed to pollution generated from road transportation. According to the EPA, congestion as well as high speeds increase the pollution generated by vehicles. As a result, I would encourage designers to look at removing exits and on ramps where feasible in order to eliminate the turbulence caused by merge &amp; diverge movements while at the same time consider using alignment and roadside friction to encourage drivers to travel through the city at reduced freeway speeds.</i>	In accordance with NEPA and CEPA requirements, the Project Team will conduct a technical Air Quality Analysis to evaluate the air quality impacts of the various alternatives under consideration. This analysis will be based on traffic and design data and will provide information on the positive and negative air quality impacts generated both during construction and for permanent operation of the I-84 Hartford Project. In the coming months, the Project Team will be coordinating with regulatory agencies including CTDEEP and USEPA regarding the most appropriate modeling methodologies. This information will be available for the public to review in the NEPA/CEPA document.
105.2	Environmental	Air and Noise	<i>I also hope to see options such as landscaping and photocatalytic concrete fully explored as means to mitigate pollution and improve the air quality near the proposed highway.</i>	This project is currently in the NEPA/CEPA Alternatives Analysis phase, and it is too early to determine the types of construction materials that will be used. The main focus of the NEPA/CEPA phase is to determine the alternative that best meets project Purpose and Need while minimizing social, economic, and environmental impacts. The types of construction materials used for constructing the project will be determined during final design. The materials used will be tested and will meet CTDOT's standards for roads and bridges.
105.3	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<i>Regardless of the final option chosen, I would like to encourage continued consideration for modes of transportation other than automobiles. My own household only makes a few trips by car per week, instead relying heavily on walking and public transportation to go about our routines. Some of the least comfortable places to walk or bike in the city are near entrances and exits to the freeways. As a result, these are areas where I would appreciate designs which calm traffic and raise attentiveness in people who are driving such as modern roundabouts, which ConnDOT has become very proficient at designing.  Thank you very much for your time and consideration.  Sincerely, Kevin R McKernan</i>	The project's goals include addressing the need to replace the existing highway and supporting better and safer use of transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel on local roads impacted by the project. In terms of your suggestion to encourage traffic calming measures such as roundabouts, CTDOT is considering such measures in the Alternatives Analysis process for traffic circulation on the local roadway network impacted by the I-84 Hartford Project.



ID#	Topic	Subject	Comment	Response
106	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>I write to you on behalf of the Parkville Revitalization Association's and the Parkville Community Association's, Board of Directors to state clearly that we strongly support Option # 4 of the potential concepts offered during the Public Scoping Meeting on January 21, 2015 at our Hartford Public Library.</i></p> <p><i>After Parkville's evaluation of the design alternatives presented, We believe the concept with the Viaduct replaced by a tunnel; rail line relocated to the north side of I-84; city reconnected across the highway is the only concept that definitely provides long term opportunities to create the much improved Urban Highway we Need going through our Neighborhood &amp; City of Hartford.</i></p> <p><i>We believe Option # 4 best meets the majority of all the Project Goals and Objectives stated in the Purpose and Need Statement drafted in June 2014.</i></p>	Comment noted.
106.1	Traffic & Transportation	Interchanges	<p><i>We also urge the cautious undertaking of the review of potential elimination of the Sisson Avenue On &amp; Off ramps. The Parkville Neighborhood watches as CONN. D.O.T. now spends it's funding to redesign the Flatbush Avenue On &amp; Off ramps &amp; now state clearly to you that the Parkville Neighborhood wants the Sisson Avenue On &amp; Off ramps to remain in any final alternative selected. This is the only On &amp; Off ramp that provides access to the West Central neighborhoods of City of Hartford without encountering heavy traffic from the Major Employment Centers and Institutions in Downtown Hartford.</i></p>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. There are many vehicles traveling to and from Hartford that use the Sisson Avenue interchange. The Project Team understands the importance of maintaining the interchange at Sisson Avenue and is examining potential improvements that could be made for enhanced access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be made available for public comment and review as part of the NEPA/CEPA document.
106.2	Traffic & Transportation	Multimodal	<p><i>We applaud the near completion of CTfastrak Busway, but, submit that it will adversely effect Automobile Access to core of Parkville Neighborhood.</i></p> <p><i>Elimination of Sisson Avenue On &amp; Off Ramp would Compound the effect!</i></p> <p><i>Respectfully Submitted,</i>  <i>David G. Morin</i>  <i>President</i>  <i>Parkville Revitalization Association</i>  <i>Vice President</i>  <i>Parkville Community Association</i></p>	The Project Team is evaluating alternatives to find the best solution for providing access to and from Hartford while reducing the number of entrance and exit ramps on the I-84 mainline. The Sisson Avenue interchange is used by many traveling to and from Hartford. Your comment is very important with respect to maintaining the interchange at Sisson Avenue and improvements that could be made for access to and from the interstate at this location. The Project Team is completing a detailed traffic analysis that will evaluate traffic impacts on the surrounding local roadway network, and which will be disclosed in the NEPA/CEPA document to be made available for public comment and review.
107	Public Involvement	Effectiveness	<p><i>I write to you today upon your request re: the eventual and necessary replacement of the I-84 viaduct.</i></p> <p><i>I have attended some "public scoping" meetings and I must say I have come away from them very impressed w/ the processes the DOT is implementing and will implement. It is an exciting time to be a Hartford resident such as myself.</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. Please continue to follow the project at <a href="http://i84hartford.com">i84hartford.com</a> .
107.1	Alternatives	Tunnel	<p><i>I endorse and wholeheartedly support the design, construction and prolonged maintenance of a tunnel. Even though it is the most expensive alternative in the many billions of dollars, I feel it affords the Capital City the best opportunity to engage in redevelopment to the greatest extent possible.</i></p> <p><i>I look forward to attending more meetings and to the eventual debut in the 2020's of the new I-84 viaduct.</i></p> <p><i>Thank you, Mr. Armstrong, for reaching out to Hartford in the grand way of things. It is an exciting time for the CT Department of Transportation, the Nutmeg State as a whole, and I daresay for you as well!</i></p>	Comment noted.