

Appendix A
Stakeholder and Public Comments and Responses on the Tier 1 EA

Table of Contents

1. Letters from Stakeholders and Responses.....	A-1
2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses.....	A-70
3. List of Specific Public Comments Keyed to Responses	A-81
4. Testimony from Public Hearings Keyed to Responses.....	A-103
5. Copy of the workshop report “Dependable Rail in 2016: What Will it Mean for the Knowledge Corridor”	A-287

1. Letters from Stakeholders and Responses

- a. United States Department of Interior June 20, 2012
- b. State of Connecticut
 - i. Department of Economic and Community Development June 22, 2012
 - ii. Department of Public Health June 22, 2012
 - iii. Department of Energy & Environmental Protection June 22, 2012
- c. Capital Region Council of Governments June 22, 2012
- d. City of Meriden June 18, 2012
- e. City of New Haven June 21, 2012
- f. Town of Newington June 11, 2012
- g. Town of Windsor June 22, 2012
- h. Town of Wallingford June 13, 2012
- i. Regional Plan Association June 14, 2012
- j. Greater Meriden Chamber of Commerce June 18, 2012
- k. Greater Hartford Transit District June 21, 2012
- l. Peter Pan Lines, Inc. June 22, 2012
- m. SK Realty June 22, 2012
- n. Tri-State Transportation Campaign June 22, 2012
- o. Connecticut League of Conservation Voters (not dated)
- p. Connecticut Fund for the Environment June 22, 2012
- q. Robert Fromer June 21, 2012



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
408 Atlantic Avenue – Room 142
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-3334



June 20, 2012

9043.1
ER 12/336

Mark W. Alexander
State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546

**RE: Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Evaluation
New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line Rail Project, No. 170-2296
Connecticut and Massachusetts**

Dear Mr. Alexander:

The U.S. Department of the Interior (Department) has received the FTA's Environmental Assessment for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line Rail Project and does not have comments at this time.

The Department will review the Section 4(f) evaluation at such time when the proposed 4(f) evaluation has been completed and provided to the Department.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. Please contact me at (617) 223-8565 if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Andrew L. Raddant
Regional Environmental Officer

Response to the United States Department of the Interior, June 20, 2012

Connecticut Department of Transportation is working with the Federal Railroad Administration who will be providing direction on any Section 4(f) impacts and required mitigation.



State of Connecticut
Department of Economic and
Community Development

June 22, 2012

Mr. Mark W. Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Bureau of Policy and Planning
2800 Berlin Turnpike, P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131

**RE: Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation
New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project # 170-2296**

Dear Mr. Alexander,

The Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield (NHHS) Line High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail project. DECD would like to offer its full support for the project. We believe that the project will stimulate economic development and create jobs in the region. We would like to bring to your attention that DECD is supporting a few transit oriented development (TOD) initiatives in the station communities along the NHHS corridor utilizing state and federal grants. Some of the projects include:

- City of Meriden TOD Plan and Zoning Code (State Urban Act Grant and U.S. HUD Challenge Grant awarded to DECD – total of approximately \$400,000)
- Meriden Property Acquisition for TOD development (U.S. HUD Challenge Grant awarded to DECD – \$730,000)
- Meriden HUB Redevelopment and Remediation (\$3.5 million Urban Act Grant)
- Meriden HUB Demolition Project (\$1.6 million Urban Act Grant)
- Meriden Factory H TOD/Brownfield property demolition and stabilization (\$300,000 DECD Brownfield PILOT Grant)
- New Haven Union Station TOD Planning and Zoning Activities (U.S. HUD Challenge Grant awarded to DECD – approximately \$950,000)
- New Haven Downtown Crossing (\$8.85 million Urban Act Grant)

DECD would like to continue to collaborate with your office on your transit and TOD efforts and would like to offer any support that you may need for the successful implementation of the project. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Lettieri
Community Development Director

505 Hudson Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06106-7106
*An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer
An Equal Opportunity Lender*

Response to State of Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development Comments, June 22, 2012

Thank you for your support of the project. Throughout the preparation of the EA, CTDOT has engaged all of the communities to develop the proposed project in a manner that is consistent with their development plans. CTDOT recognizes the importance of Transit Oriented Development as a way to maximize the economic development of the region and supports TOD efforts that are compatible with the project.

As the project enters final design for the phases that are funded, CTDOT will continue to engage the communities so that the NHHS Rail improvements are consistent with community plans and funding which they have secured for adjacent initiatives.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH



Jewel Mullen, M.D., M.P.H., M.P.A.
Commissioner

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor
Nancy Wyman
Lt. Governor

Drinking Water Section

June 22, 2012

Mark Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
State of CT Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131

Re: Notice of Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High
Speed, Intercity Passenger Rail Project

Dear Mr. Alexander:

The Department of Public Health Drinking Water Section's Source Water Protection Unit has reviewed the above Notice of EIE. Please refer to the attached report for our comments.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please call Pat Bisacky of this office at (860) 509-7333.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric McPhee".

Eric McPhee
Supervising Environmental Analyst
Drinking Water Section

Cc: Roger Dann, General Manager, Wallingford Water Department
Lawrence Deantonio, Control Manager, Berlin Water Control Commission

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Jewel Muller, M.D., M.P.H., M.P.A.
Commissioner



Dannel P. Malloy
Governor
Nancy Wyman
Lt. Governor

Drinking Water Section

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lori Mathieu, Public Health Section Chief
Eric McPhee, Supervising Environmental Analyst

FROM: Patricia Bisacky, Environmental Analyst *2/12/12*

DATE: June 22, 2012

SUBJECT: Notice of EIE for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed,
Intercity Passenger Rail Project

DPH PROJECT #: 2011-0164

TOWNS: New Haven, North Haven, Hamden, Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Newington,
West Hartford, Hartford, Windsor, Windsor Locks, Enfield and Springfield

The Source Water Protection Unit of the Department of Public Health (DPH) Drinking Water Section (DWS) has reviewed the Notice of EIE for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity Passenger Rail Project. The DWS offers the following comments:

See response
to comment
4.4.16-1

- The EIE indicates that in Phase 1, the 10.2 miles of track between Meriden and Newington will be upgraded by construction of a second track. Portions of this upgrade will fall within the Level A Aquifer Protection Areas of the Oak Street Wellfield, a source of public drinking water for the customers of the Wallingford Public Utilities Commission and the Elton Road Wellfield, a source of public drinking water for the customers of the Berlin Water Control Commission. The DWS previously offered comments during the scoping for this project in which best management practices for construction in aquifer protection areas were outlined. It is noted that these recommended best management practices have been incorporated into Section 4.4.16 for mitigation of construction period impacts to water resources and water quality. In addition to what is provided in the EIE, the DWS recommends that a contact person for both of these public water systems is identified for future construction coordination and emergency notification.

See response
to comment
4.3.2-1

The water quality classifications within the study corridor in the Town of Berlin have not been included in Table 4-14. The corridor in this town includes the Level A Aquifer Protection Area for the Elton Road Wellfield. This table should be amended to include the appropriate water quality classifications within the corridor and identification of one aquifer protection area.

- Map 5A in Volume II, Section 2.5 shows the preliminary Level B Aquifer Protection Area for the Elton Road Wellfield. It should be revised to show the Final Level A mapping.

See response to
comment 4.3.2-2



Phone: (860) 509-7333 • Fax: (860) 509-7359 • VP: (860) 899-1611
410 Capitol Avenue, MS#51 WAT, P.O. Box 340308
Hartford, Connecticut 06134-0308
www.ct.gov/dph

Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer

Response to State of Connecticut Department of Public Health Comments, June 22, 2012

Response to comment 4.3.2-1

The Town of Berlin was included in the CE for Phase 1 rather than this EA. However, Table 4-14 is revised as part of Section 6.0 of this FONSI to include the Berlin well field.

Response to comment 4.3.2-2

Section 2.5 mapping for the Town of Berlin has been revised and included in Appendix D of this FONSI

Response to comment 4.4.16-1

As the project enters final design for the phases that are funded, CTDOT will continue to engage the communities so that the NHHS Rail improvements are consistent with the needs of the Berlin and Wallingford public water systems. Specific contacts recommended are:

- Wallingford Public Utilities Commission: George Adair,
Director of Public Utilities
203-294-2263
- Berlin Water Control Commission: Bruce Laroche - Chairman
5 Worthington Lane
Berlin, CT (860) 828-1558



**CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
79 ELM STREET, HARTFORD, CT 06106-5127

To: Mark W. Alexander - Transportation Assistant Planning Director
DOT - Office of Environmental Planning, 2800 Berlin Turnpike, Newington

From: David J. Fox - Senior Environmental Analyst **Telephone:** 860-424-4111

Date: June 22, 2012 **E-Mail:** david.fox@ct.gov

Subject: New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line

The Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) has reviewed the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) for the high speed passenger rail project on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line. The following comments are submitted for your consideration.

The Inland Water Resources Division reports that they have been involved in pre-application discussions regarding the passenger rail project and therefore have no comments concerning the information in the EIE at this time.

In both our scoping comments dated January 13, 2009 and comments on the Administrative Draft dated October 20, 2011, the Department recommended that low impact development (LID) techniques be employed, where feasible, to manage stormwater at the train stations. At this point in project development, it is understandable that the Station Concept Plans are only preliminary in nature. Page 59 states that LID and other innovative techniques will be considered by designers. We again urge ConnDOT to consider utilizing LID measures when designing additional parking facilities at the existing stations as well as parking at the new stations. In contrast to the CTfastrak project, improvements to the rail stations will be adding significant amounts of new parking. Although in many cases the station areas are largely existing impervious surfaces, LID techniques can mitigate historic as well as project-related water quality impacts.

See
response
to
comment
4.2.4-1

The Design Report (Volume II) notes that drainage concepts were developed based on requirements of the *Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual*. A *Low Impact Development Appendix* to the manual has been prepared to provide specific guidance on low impact development techniques. It is available on-line at: [LID Appendix](#). Page 5 does list LID measures such as uncurbed pavement, vegetated swales and rain gardens as potential treatments.

The effectiveness of various LID techniques that rely on infiltration depends on the soil types present at the site. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service's Soil Web Survey, the soils at most of the station locations consist of urban land and/or udorthents. These soils are unrated in their suitability for various stormwater management practices. The soils at North Colony/Parker Street alternative site, as well as a portion of the Ward Street/Judd Square alternative site, both in Wallingford, are Penwood-Urban Land complex, rated as most suitable

for pervious paving and somewhat suitable for infiltration. Infiltration practices may be suitable at any of these sites. Test pits should be dug in areas planned for infiltration practices to verify soil suitability and/or limitations. Planning should insure that areas to be used for infiltration are not compacted during the construction process by vehicles or machinery. The siting of areas for infiltration must also consider any existing soil or groundwater contamination.

Parking structures are proposed at several of the stations, including those in Windsor, Meriden and Wallingford. The following standard recommendation concerning stormwater management should be observed.

See
response to
comment
4.2.4-2

Stormwater management for parking garages typically should involve two separate collection systems designed to treat the runoff from different types of parking areas. Any exposed parking levels will produce a high volume of runoff with relatively low concentrations of pollutants. Runoff from such areas should be directed to the storm sewer system and the collection system should include controls to remove sediment and oil or grease. A hydrodynamic separator, incorporating swirl technology, circular screening technology or engineered cylindrical sedimentation technology, is recommended to remove medium to coarse grained sediments and oil or grease. The treatment system should be sized such that it can treat stormwater runoff adequately. The Department recommends that the treatment system be designed to treat the first inch of stormwater runoff. Upon installation, a maintenance plan to remove sediment and oil or grease should also be implemented.

Interior levels of the garage will produce a low volume of runoff with relatively high concentrations of pollutants. In addition, the need for cleaning of the garage must be considered and floor washwater cannot be directed to a stormwater sewer system. Runoff from interior areas should be directed to the sanitary sewer system, again with appropriate treatment. An oil separator tank with a capacity of at least 1000 gallons is required. A licensed waste oil hauler must clean the tank at least once a year. A list of certified haulers can be obtained from the Bureau of Materials Management & Compliance Assurance at 860-424-3366. The discharge of floor washwater is covered under a *General Permit for Miscellaneous Discharges of Sewer Compatible Wastewater* as building maintenance wastewater. Registration is required for discharges greater than 5000 gallons per day. For further information concerning stormwater management, contact the Permitting & Enforcement Division at 860-424-3018. A fact sheet describing the permit and the registration form may be downloaded at: [Miscellaneous Discharge GP](#).

See
response
to
comment
4.3.4-1

The proposed North Haven station is within Connecticut's coastal boundary as defined by section 22a-94 of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS). The EIE notes that a Coastal Consistency Review and coordination with the Office of Long Island Sound Programs will take place as part of project permitting in 2012 and 2013. Coastal management concerns which should be carefully addressed in future phases of the project planning process are the potential mobilization of pollutants in contaminated soils and appropriate use of urban retrofit stormwater best management practices, wherever possible.

If local planning and zoning approvals, variances or building permits are required for the station project, the Coastal Site Plan Review requirements of sections 22a-105 through 22a-110 of the CGS would be applicable. The municipal planning and zoning commission or designated zoning official should be consulted regarding this matter.

Page 83 notes that most of the corridor within the coastal boundary is already double-tracked except for a small segment in North Haven. Sheet No. 04 of the Concept Design in Volume II depicts the proposed double-tracking starting at milepost 7.0 and extending northerly. This location is just beyond the northernmost extent of the coastal boundary, so it appears that no double-tracking will occur within the coastal boundary. (The text of the document notes that double-tracking begins at milepost 7.1, even farther to the north.)

Page 44 concludes that “the low level of auto trips generated by the proposed project relative to total regional trips is unlikely to negatively impact regional air quality.” On a regional basis, these local trips generated by the increased use of the train (short trips to the station) would be more than offset by the longer trips (to the final destination) that would be eliminated. The Department agrees with the statement on page 1 that improved rail service would decrease highway congestion, reduce energy use and **improve** air quality.

In discussing measures to mitigate air quality impacts during the construction phase, page 190 notes that non-road construction vehicles will be required to comply with federal regulations, including Tier 4 standards. If the newer equipment specified by Tier 4 cannot be used, equipment with the best available controls on diesel emissions including retrofitting with diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters in addition to the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel would be the second choice that can be effective in reducing exhaust emissions. The use of newer equipment that meets EPA standards would obviate the need for retrofits.

See
response
to
comment
4.4.16-1

DEEP also recommends the use of newer on-road vehicles that meet either the latest EPA or California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards for construction projects. On-road vehicles older than the 2007-model year typically should be retrofitted with diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters for projects. These on-road vehicles include dump trucks, fuel delivery trucks and other vehicles typically found at construction sites. Again, the use of newer vehicles that meet EPA standards would eliminate the need for retrofits.

The DEEP-State Parks Division is in favor of relocation of the Windsor Locks station north of the town’s central business district and adjacent to the historic station structure. This conceptual plan incorporates an up-and-over to a platform on the east side of the tracks, which would also provide access to the west bank of the Windsor Locks Canal. This plan has the potential for a future connection from the east platform across the canal, perhaps via reconstruction of the historic swing bridge, to the southern end of the Windsor Locks Canal State Park Trail. A station at this location would thus overcome one of the two major obstructions of public access to the trail.

See
response
to
comment
3.3-1

Mark W. Alexander

- 4 -

June 22, 2012

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact me.

cc: Robert Hannon, DEEP/OPPD
Jeff Caiola, DEEP/TWRD
Rob Clapper, DEEP/SPD
Kristal Kallenberg, DEEP/OLISP
Chris Malik, DEEP/WPSD
Ellen Pierce, DEEP/APSD

**Response to State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) Comments,
June 22, 2012**

Response to comment 3.3-1

Please see Response to Comment 3.3 B in included in “2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses”.

Response to comment 4.2.4-1

Thank you for your support of the project and your continuing involvement, guidance, and advice as the project advances into final design and permitting. Be assured that during final design CTDOT will coordinate with DEEP to implement LID and other innovative techniques to reduce storm water runoff and mitigate water quality impacts. As indicated in Volume II, final design will follow Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual which would include applicable appendices.

Response to comment 4.2.4-2

The conceptual designs included in Volume II do not identify floor drainage systems for the garages; this level of detail will be developed during final design in accordance with all applicable regulations and permitting requirements. CTDOT appreciates your input at this time which is being included in the FONSI available for reference to the final designers.

Response to comment 4.3.4-1

Because of railroad geometry considerations the exact starting point for the Phase 1 double track must be determined during final design. At that time CTDOT will determine if the project extends into the coastal boundary.

Response to comment 4.4.16-1

Be assured that during final design and preparation of contract documents for construction CTDOT will coordinate with DEEP to implement the best management practices for controlling air quality during construction. CTDOT appreciates your input at this time which is being included in the FONSI available for reference to the final designers.



Capitol Region Council of Governments

241 Main Street • Hartford • Connecticut • 06106

Telephone (860) 522-2217 • Fax (860) 724-1274

www.crcog.org

Mary Glusman, *Chairman*
Lyle D. Wray, *Executive Director*

MEMBERS June 22, 2012

- Andover*
- Avon*
- Bloomfield*
- Bolton*
- Canton*
- East Granby*
- East Hartford*
- East Windsor*
- Ellington*
- Enfield*
- Farmington*
- Glastonbury*
- Granby*
- Hartford*
- Hebron*
- Manchester*
- Simsbury*
- Somers*
- South Windsor*
- Stafford*
- Suffield*
- Tolland*
- Vernon*
- West Hartford*
- Windsor Locks*

Dear Mr. Alexander:

The Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) applauds the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) for their efforts in advancing the New Haven – Hartford – Springfield Line High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Project and completing the Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Evaluation (EA/EIE). The following summarizes our written comments on the EA/EIE:

See response to comments 4.4.10-1

- Enhanced rail service along the New Haven – Hartford – Springfield (NHHS) line in combination with the construction of CTfastrak, the recent award of TIGER monies for Hartford’s Intermodal Triangle Project and the location of Bradley International Airport offers the Capitol Region a unique opportunity to establish a cohesive, coordinated, state-of-the-art multi-modal transportation system. Mobility is paramount and seamless connections to other modes of travel need to be components of the NHHS Rail system. CRCOG is interested in working with ConnDOT and other stakeholders to ensure mobility is optimized.

See response to comments 4.4.10-2

- Hartford’s Union Station is an important regional, intermodal transportation ‘hub’ located adjacent to aging highway and rail viaduct structures. Conceptual plans developed under the Interstate 84 Viaduct Study identify a vision for relocating the existing rail line along the north side of the existing highway viaduct structure and creating a Union Station annex. Planning within this transportation ‘hub’ should be given special consideration and all plans need to be coordinated. Furthermore, not providing additional parking capacity at Hartford’s Union Station is a limiting factor which needs an alternative solution or mitigative measure. CRCOG is available to work with ConnDOT, Amtrak, City of Hartford and Greater Hartford Transit District officials to further discuss parking opportunities surrounding Union Station.

A voluntary Council of Governments formed to initiate and implement regional programs of benefit to the towns and the region.

See response to comments 4.4.13-1

The installation of supplemental safety devices by Amtrak at all necessary public crossing is important in meeting 'Quiet Zone' requirements. Per the EA/EIE, municipalities and Amtrak will be required to jointly apply to FRA for quiet zone designations. We stress the importance of establishing these quiet zones and assisting municipalities in working with Amtrak to file the necessary paperwork.

See response to comments 3.3-1

- As outlined in the Capitol Region Transportation Plan, CROCOG supports Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) as a regional transportation and development strategy. We support locating the Windsor Locks station just north of the Towns Central Business District, particularly because of its TOD potential. We are familiar with the long term traffic impacts as a result of locating the station downtown and will work with municipal officials, ConnDOT and other stakeholders on identifying potential funding sources for advancing mitigative measures.

See response to comments 4.4.2-1

- CROCOG supports the creation of sustainable, livable communities. We encourage ConnDOT to continue coordination with CROCOG and our municipal officials as design details are refined. Incorporation of green infrastructure technologies, where appropriate, and enhanced walking and bicycling connections are suggested.


There are numerous on-going initiatives that support the NHHS Rail and CT fastrak corridors. For this reason, and in keeping with a 'corridor-approach' to coordinated planning, CROCOG will be looking to establish a Corridor Advisory Board for the NHHS Rail Corridor this fall. We would the opportunity to further discuss the roles and responsibilities of this Board with you and encourage ConnDOT's participation

See response to comments 1.3-1

- CROCOG encourages ConnDOT to apply for funding to support the advancement of 'new' regional rail stations. We further encourage ConnDOT to explore funding opportunities for advancing larger scale improvements such as the Hartford Rail Viaduct and the Connecticut River Bridge.

Please include CROCOG's comments above part of the record of submitted comments on the EA/EIE. We look forward to implementing High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail within the region and continuing to work with ConnDOT to advance this important project.

Sincerely,



Lyle D. Wray
Executive Director - CROCOG

cc: CROCOG NHHS Rail Municipalities

Response to the Capitol Region Council of Governments' Comments, June 22, 2012

Response to Comment 1.3-1

As indicated in Table 1-1 and in Sec. 1.3 (on page 10) of the EA, the available funding for the project cannot be used for the construction of regional rail stations; CTDOT must therefore apply for future funding from the FTA for improvements to New Haven's State Street Station, and proposed new stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford and Enfield.

Response to Comment 3.3-1

Please see Response to Comment 3.3B included in "2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses".

Response to Comment 4.4.2-1

Section 4.4.2 of the EA confirms that the proposed project would be consistent with all State of Connecticut, regional, and municipal plans in the corridor. During final design CTDOT will continue to coordinate with local stakeholders. CTDOT would continue to engage CRCOG via your proposed advisory board that would streamline the coordination process.

Response to Comment 4.4.10-1

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Page 165) acknowledges that rail transportation has to be integrated with all other modes of transportation (pedestrian, bus, bus rapid transit, and air). During final station design CTDOT will continue to work with all stakeholders to develop the station facilities to ensure that mobility is optimized.

Response to Comment 4.4.10-2

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pages 153, 165, and 166) discusses that the existing parking in the area of the stations is not adequate to support the projected ridership for 2030. The travel demand models completed by CTDOT and Amtrak were used to determine the modal split (riders getting out of their autos and boarding the train). Specific parking capacity requirements, based on those models, are included in Table 4-30. The basis of the modal splits and parking capacity requirements is a reference document (Data Collection/Ridership Analysis) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. As noted in Table 4-30, parking for Hartford, would not be constructed as part of this project but will be addressed and advanced by the local parking authorities to be compatible with their downtown development plans which would include the Interstate 84 Viaduct Study and a vision for relocating the existing rail line.

Response to Comment 4.4.13-1

Section 4.4.13 of the EA, Table 4-34 identifies the Proposed Action at grade crossing in the corridor. Grade crossings will receive either two quad gates and a median or four quad gates. These improvements make them eligible to be designated as "Quiet Zones" to mitigate noise impacts. During final design, CTDOT will continue to work with the communities to implement "Quiet Zones".



CITY OF MERIDEN
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
ROBERT J. BASS, P.E., DIRECTOR
142 EAST MAIN STREET, ROOM 19
MERIDEN, CT. 06450-5667
(203) 630-4018 FAX (203) 630-4025

June 18, 2012

Mr. John Bernick
Connecticut Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT. 06131-7546

RE: New Haven – Hartford – Springfield High Speed Rail
Meriden and Berlin Grade Crossing Improvements

Dear Mr. Bernick:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Assessment/Impact Evaluation and Concept Drawings. The following are our comments:

Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation

Page ES-1

What are the maximum allowable speeds throughout the corridor? Where are the speed restrictions located? The appendices show the maximum attainable speeds on each segment, but not the posted or allowable speed.

Page ES-6

The Meriden Station preferred alternate differs with respect to the placement of the pedestrian bridge structure from the plan submitted as part of the Grading and Drainage plans dated March 23, 2012.

Page ES-18

Traffic impacts should list the Meriden grade crossings at East Main Street and at Britannia Street.

Page 15

The annual and daily intercity boardings in Meriden are third highest in the line. Is there supporting documentation for this data?

Page 22

The Inventory of Undergrade Bridge Improvements in Project indicates planned work for the Gypsy Lane, South Colony Street, and Harbor Brook crossings in Meriden. Could additional information on this work be provided (scope, timeframe)?

Page 51

The Wayside Train Noise Impacts indicates two, Category 2, moderate impact receptors of noise. Is the recommended course of action for this noise insulation?

Page 178

The grade crossing of Britannia Street inhibits higher train speeds due to excessive delays at the intersection. Has any evaluation been done to the train time savings and resultant cost savings associated with separating the crossing?

Concept Drawings and Environmental Resource Graphs

Page 9 - Is retail incorporated into Parking Garage (similar to Lot E in New Haven).

Concept Design Review


What is the capacity of the Kiss and Ride at the Meriden Station? Striping and/or hardscape needed to delineate public transportation from Kiss and Ride. Up and Over pedestrian bridge is attached to parking garage. Other design concepts show this south of the Intermodal Center.

Community Facilities Map - Meriden

Hub should be shown as a Recreation site.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Very truly yours,



Howard J. Weissberg, P.E., PTOE
Associate City Engineer

HJW/mb

cc: Robert J. Bass, P.E., Director of Public Works
Paul A. Kopek, Assistant City Engineer
Brian Ennis, P.E., Associate City Engineer
Project File - New Haven – Hartford – Springfield High Speed Rail – Correspondence 2012
File

Response to the City of Meriden's Comments, June 18, 2012

Response to Comment Regarding Page ES-1

Train speeds are a function of many factors including distance between stops, frequency of at-grade crossings and track alignment. Therefore, they vary along the length of the corridor. The proposed train speeds along the corridor are shown in Appendix D of the reference document "Service Development Plan". Section 8.0 of the EA provides instructions for reviewing reference documents.

Response to Comment Regarding Page ES-6

The station concepts included in the EA are intended to show an overall concept to determine feasibility, general proportions, and land use. Throughout the preparation of the EA, CTDOT has engaged all of the communities to develop the proposed project in a manner that is consistent with their development plans. CTDOT recognizes the importance of Transit Oriented Development as a way to maximize the economic development of the region and supports TOD efforts that are compatible with the project. As the project enters final design for the phases that are funded, CTDOT will continue to engage the communities so that the NHHS Rail improvements are consistent with community plans.

Response to Comment Regarding Page ES-18

Section 4.4.10 of the EA details the anticipated impacts that increased train service would have on traffic operations at existing at-grade crossings and improvements that will be implemented to mitigate these impacts. Page 164 contains statement "Intersections adjacent to the Meriden Station will not deteriorate in LOS (level of service of traffic operations) due to grade crossings compared to the no-build conditions and there are no adverse impacts. The intersections studied in Meriden are included in Table 4-29 (Page 160). Technical Report "7. Traffic Operations Analysis" referenced in Section 8.0 of the EA studied grade crossings near the station and included East Main Street and Britannia Street. It was determined that the increased train frequency would not cause a reduction in LOS. A copy of that technical report can be obtained through CTDOT.

Response to Comment Regarding Page 15

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pages 165 and 166) discusses that the travel demand models completed by CTDOT and Amtrak were used to determine the modal split (riders getting out of their autos and boarding the train). Specific parking capacity requirements, based on those models, are included in Table 4-30. The basis of the modal splits and parking capacity requirements is a reference document (Data Collection/Ridership Analysis) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. The final layout of the station, pedestrian access, bus stalls, auto access, and parking layout will be determined during final design.

Response to Comment Regarding Page 22

CTDOT will work with the City of Meriden as the final design of the structure improvements develops. The following structures in Meriden are included in Phase 2 of the project which is intended to be complete by 2016:

- MP 16.78 28' deck girder over Gypsy Lane Rehab/Repair
- MP 16.84 18" corrugated metal pipe with brick arch Rehab/Repair
- MP 17.00 3' x 4' brick arch Rehab/Repair
- MP 21.12 Overhead bridge abutment Remove

Response to Comment Regarding Page 51

Section 4.2.2 of the EA (Pages 52 and 53) indicates that noise mitigation must be considered for severe noise impacts. Impacts in the moderate range may require consideration if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate. CTDOT is committed to evaluating each receptor on a case-by-case basis during final design to ascertain the need for mitigation. Noise insulation is a potential mitigation if mitigation is necessary.

Response to Comment Regarding Page 178

Delays at grade crossings have been identified when the intersection is near a station and the train stopping at the station causes the gate to close the roadway. Britannia Street grade crossing was studied and is not affected by the train stopping at the Meriden station. The increased train speed does not cause intersection delays; converting the grade crossing to quad gates as indicated in Table 4-34 meets safety requirements due to the higher speed of the train. CTDOT has not prepared a cost study for grade separating Britannia Street; studies at other locations in the corridor have demonstrated that they are not feasible.

Response to Comment Regarding Concept Drawing Page 9 and Concept Design Review

The station concepts included in the EA are intended to show an overall concept to determine feasibility, general proportions, and land use. Table 4-30 of the EA (Page 166) indicates that 11 spaces are intended for Kiss and Ride. These are generally identified by pavement marking or signage. Throughout the preparation of the EA, CTDOT has engaged all of the communities to develop the proposed project in a manner that is consistent with their development plans. CTDOT recognizes the importance of Transit Oriented Development as a way to maximize the economic development of the region and supports TOD efforts that are compatible with the project. As the project enters final design for the phases that are funded, CTDOT will continue to engage the communities so that the NHHS Rail improvements are consistent with community plans.

Response to Comment Regarding Community Facilities Map

CTDOT is aware of the City's intention to develop the Hub into a TOD and recreational area. As such the concept plans for the station do not use any of that property. The City's current zoning maps identify the Hub area as zoned C-1 "Central Commercial".



NEW HAVEN CITY PLAN DEPARTMENT
165 CHURCH STREET, NEW HAVEN, CT 06510
L (203) 946-6378 FAX (203) 946-7815

June 21, 2012

Mr. Mark Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director,
P.O. Box 317546,
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Mr. Alexander:

(Subject: Regarding New Haven- Hartford- Springfield High Speed Inter-City Rail Program)

The City of New Haven Planning Department was pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the New Haven- Hartford- Springfield (NHHS) High Speed Inter-City Rail Program. Susmitha Attota, Assistant Director of Comprehensive Planning, testified at that hearing, on behalf of the city. I am writing to reiterate that testimony.

We strongly support this Program as it proposes to significantly increase the speed and frequency of passenger service along NHHS rail corridor and consequently enhance economic growth along existing and proposed station locations. However, we are extremely disappointed to know that the proposed station improvements at the New Haven State Street station are not included in Phases 1 and 2, which are currently funded and scheduled for completion by 2016.

State Street station, as you know, is the penultimate stop for Shoreline East trains, which experienced a significant increase in ridership (by nearly 107%) since the station opening in 2002. New Haven's Union Station also experienced a significant increase in ridership (195%) from FY 1999 to FY 2011 and remains the 10th busiest station in the national Amtrak system. Rail ridership along Metro North New Haven rail line is very high with a weekday inbound ridership of 3,700 people and weekend inbound ridership of 8,400 people as of 2011. New Haven also experienced an overall increase in population by 5% over the past decade and continues to have the highest share of population (22.8%) and density in the South Central Connecticut region. This clearly indicates that we have a very strong potential ridership base for the proposed rail service in New Haven. In addition, a high concentration of low-income residents in the region also live in New Haven and can avail themselves this service to connect to their employment destinations in the inner ring suburbs.

Even though the proposed high speed rail service would stop at Union Station once Phases 1 and 2 are complete, many of the potential riders of the line will not have the opportunity to utilize the pivotal connection at State Street station. This is needed to enhance connectivity to other transit and transportation modes in the area and further the City's goal of enhancing economic growth opportunities and diverting automobile trips to rail and other modes of transportation in the area. The location of the State Street station cuts travel time to destinations in the northern portion of central New Haven and encourages walking to these locations.

The EA states that currently “traffic congestion occurs mostly on Interstate 91 located primarily near New Haven and Hartford and businesses in this area are at a competitive disadvantage due to higher wages needed to attract employees and lower productivity resulting from employee commute travel time and the cost of required business delivery services.” It should be noted that some of our major employers such as Yale University, Knights of Columbus, Saint Raphael Hospital, and majority of our commercial/retail businesses are located in Downtown closer to State Street station and therefore the proposed rail’s stop location at this station is critical due to its visibility and direct access from Downtown. This would also fulfill one of the objectives of the proposed rail service to connect the “knowledge corridor” from New Haven to Springfield.

Another primary purpose of this project is “to provide beneficial economic stimulus at existing and proposed station locations” as stated in the EA. New Haven is currently undergoing a major transformation due to several development projects planned or proposed such as the de-construction of the Route 34 corridor (Downtown Crossing project), Union Station Transit Oriented Development, Church Street Affordable Housing Project, West Rock/Brookside Housing redevelopment, Farmington Canal Greenway Trail Phase IV design and construction, and Long Wharf Boat House project. Most of these projects will be located in Downtown or closer to Downtown. Certainly, these developments could cause congestion on the regional and city-wide road network if alternative options to automobile trips are not proposed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Karyn Gilvarg, AIA
Executive Director
City Plan Department
165 Church Street
New Haven, CT - 06510

Response to the City of New Haven's Comments, June 21, 2012

As indicated in Table 1-1 and in Sec. 1.3 (on page 10) of the EA, the available funding for the project cannot be used for the construction of regional rail stations; CTDOT must therefore apply for future funding from the FTA for improvements to New Haven's State Street Station.



John Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 Cedar Street Newington, Connecticut 06111

Town Plan and Zoning Commission

Craig Minor, AICP
Town Planner

June 11, 2012

Mr. Mark W. Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Re: Bridge and Culvert Repairs on the New Haven–Hartford–Springfield Line

I am writing you regarding a long-standing stormwater flooding problem at Stamm Road in Newington. Apparently this problem will be addressed as part of the NHHS High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Project, but I would appreciate it if you could confirm this.

According to Appendix 3 (“List of Bridges and Culverts”) to the May 2012 Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (excerpt attached), the bridge at MP 28.63 is described as being in “poor condition” and is slated for replacement. The associated comment is: “Due to documented flooding at this location, existing culvert will be replaced with proposed bridge (5’ x 11’ box)”. Can you confirm this for us? And if so, are detailed drawings and the drainage analysis of the proposed replacement bridge available for our review?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Craig Minor, AICP
Town Planner

cc:
Town Manager
Town Engineer
file

Phone: (860) 665-8575 Fax: (860) 665-8577
planning@newingtonct.gov
www.newingtonct.gov

Response to the Town of Newington's Comments, June 11, 2012

Section 3.3 of the EA Table 3-2 (Page 23) indicates that the structure at MP 28.63 over Webster Brook is being replaced. This work is included in Phase 1 which is covered under a Categorical Exclusion and the FRA funding is obligated. That work is included in the EA document to satisfy the State of Connecticut Environmental Impact Evaluation requirements.



First in Connecticut. First for its citizens.

June 22, 2012

Mr. Mark W. Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning
Director, CT DOT
P.O. Box 06131-7546
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Dear Mr. Alexander:

I am pleased to have the opportunity to provide comments on the New Haven – Hartford – Springfield Line Intercity Passenger Rail Project Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Evaluation. (EA/EIE) Overall I am excited about the prospective benefits of this significant investment to both the region and Windsor Center.

Based on my reading of the EA/EIE one of the potential impacts to the Windsor community relates to noise created by the increased number of trains when combined with seven grade crossings along the line. We support the conceptual safety improvements as suggested (except for closing Wilson Ave crossing) in the EA/EIE to mitigate this potential impact to over 725 category 2 receptors. The safety improvements as outlined will allow the town to apply to the federal government for what is referred to as "Quiet Zone Designation". Town staff looks forward to working closely with the DOT as further designs for each crossing are developed.

See response
to Comment
4.4.13-1

The report recommends the Wilson Ave grade crossing (MP 39.85) be closed. I respectfully ask the department to review this recommended action. This crossing is already outfitted with safety gates and provides access to State of CT owned passive open space and a recently completed segment of the regional multi-use trail system. I would like to have further conversations with your office concerning this recommendation.

See
response to
Comment
3.3-1

I also would like to note our support for continued maintenance and rehabilitation of the rail bridge over Route 159. The report also states there are not plans to replace the existing overpass at Batchelder Road. I would like the department to be cognizant of the fact that Batchelder Road, which is a prime connector road to the upgraded platform and parking area, is rather narrow under the rail bridge. This condition provides for no safe refuge / pathway for pedestrians or bikers. With the potential for increased traffic in and out of the upgraded platform area I ask that the department consider ways to help improve safety along Batchelder Road.

G:\data\Town Mgr Office\Transportation\6-22-12 PPS comments to DOT on Rail EA-EIS.doc
275 Broad Street • Windsor, Connecticut 06095 • www.townofwindsorct.com

See response to
comment 4.4.7-1

Also, there appears to be no significant alterations planned to the historic stone bridge over the Farmington River. The town strongly supports efforts to preserve the historic integrity of this very important structure that adds so much to the character of the community.


See response
to Comment
4.4.6-1

The report also notes in Section 4, page 109, the need to be aware of the visual impacts of the planned parking structure and rail station along Mechanic Street. I believe by working closely with the various stakeholders and the community during the entire design process an appropriate design can be achieved. It is my hope that the rail station with high level platforms and pedestrian “up and over” can be built in the early phases of the project to facilitate more convenience for commuters as well as redevelopment opportunities to the east of the rail line.

In closing, I thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Please include these comments as part of the record of submitted comments on the EA/EIE.

I look forward to working closely with you and the department on furthering the reinvestment in the New Haven – Hartford – Springfield Line. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 860-285-1800 or at souza@townofwindsorct.com.

Sincerely,



Peter Souza
Town Manager

cc: Jennifer Carrier, Director of Transportation CRCOG

Response to the Town of Windsor's Comments, June 22, 2012

Response to Comment 3.3-1

Section 3.3 of the EA Table 3-2 (Page 24) indicates that the bridge over Batchelder Rd is in satisfactory condition. As such it will not be upgraded under this project. It will be maintained in an ongoing state of good repair by Amtrak.

Response to Comment 4.4.6-1

Visual Resources and Quality is an environmental resource included in Section 4.4.6 that the project intends to maintain. There will be public meetings during design phase at which time decisions regarding the architectural appearance and final site layout will be made. As indicated in Section 1.3 of the EA (Page 9) the Windsor Station is included in Phase 3B and funding has not been awarded. The schedule for this work will depend on funding being awarded.

Response to Comment 4.4.7-1

Section 4.4.7 of the EA Table 4-20 (Page 130) indicates that the Farmington River Bridge in Windsor contributes to the historic New Haven-Springfield Rail Line. Therefore, modifications to the structure must follow the process included in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) as described on Page 147.

Response to Comment 4.4.13-1

Section 4.4.13 of the EA Table 4-34 (Page 178) indicates that the Wilson Avenue grade crossing is to be closed. The Town is encouraged to work with CTDOT as the project continues to identify and implement alternative access to the open space and trail.



Town of Wallingford, Connecticut

JOHN P. THOMPSON, P.E.
TOWN ENGINEER

ROBERT V. BALTRAMAITIS, P.E.
ASSISTANT TOWN ENGINEER

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING
TOWN HALL
45 SOUTH MAIN STREET
ROOM #203
WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT 06492
TELEPHONE (203) 294-2035
FAX (203) 284-4012

June 13, 2012

Mr. John E. Bernick, PE
Project Manager
NH/H/S Rail Project
State of Connecticut
Department of Transportation
2800 Berlin Turnpike - P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546

RE: Town of Wallingford
New Haven/Hartford/Springfield Rail Commuter Project
New Wallingford Railroad Station


Dear Mr. Bernick:

Please be advised that the Wallingford Town Council, at their June 12, 2012 meeting, endorsed the Working Group's recommendation supporting the Cerrito (North Colony Road)/Parker Street Site as the preferred location for the new Wallingford railroad station.

Thank you for the opportunity of working with you in the evaluation candidate sites and in the selection of the preferred site.

If you have any questions or if you want to discuss further, please feel free to give me a call at any time.

Very truly yours,
Town of Wallingford


John P. Thompson, PE
Town Engineer

CC: Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr.
Wallingford Town Council
Railroad Station Working Group: Chief Struble, Chief Dortenzio, George Adair, Kacie Costello,
Don Roe

C:\My Documents\john\061312 John Bernick DOT new railroad station.doc



TESTIMONY OF

AMANDA KENNEDY

ASSOCIATE PLANNER, CONNECTICUT OFFICE
REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION

ON BEHALF OF

REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION

REGARDING

THE NEW HAVEN - HARTFORD - SPRINGFIELD HIGH-SPEED INTERCITY RAIL PROGRAM

BEFORE THE

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

June 14, 2012

North Haven High School, 221 Elm Street

*Public Hearing on the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New Haven - Hartford
- Springfield High-Speed Intercity Rail Program*

Good evening. It's a pleasure to appear before you tonight. I'm here speaking on behalf of Regional Plan Association, a 90-year-old independent urban research and advocacy group that is dedicated to planning for the growth and development of the New York- New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region. We understand the influence that quality transit services can have in shaping a region. I'm here to share RPA's strong support for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Corridor Improvement Program, which will create faster, more frequent, and more connections between important job centers in Connecticut's Knowledge Corridor and Coastal regions, but to emphasize that the rail project must be in conjunction with improvements to local transit, incorporating a branding and marketing campaign, and supporting land use planning to maximize the benefits of the rail system.

RPA has long supported improvements to the transportation network and worked to promote greater transit-oriented development in Connecticut, including projects such as the New Britain-Hartford Busway, which finally broke ground last month. The rail and Busway will complement one another in expanding the transit network in central Connecticut, with connections at both Newington Junction and Hartford enabling quick local transit trips to and from longer commutes by rail.

A year ago, RPA convened 90 business and community leaders, city and regional planners, and government officials for two workshops in Hartford and Rocky Hill to identify opportunities for achieving greater economic growth in the region in conjunction with the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail investment and to determine the strategies necessary to achieve a complementary, regional vision. In preparation we analyzed the likelihood of the region's economy to respond and benefit from rail connectivity. The New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Knowledge Corridor includes at least 75 colleges and universities within ten miles of the corridor, including Central Connecticut State, Southern Connecticut State, Yale University, and Quinnipiac University. The region's employment base also specializes in several knowledge-sector and related industries, such as aerospace, medical device, and precision manufacturing, renewable energy, and educational services. Research has shown that schools and knowledge industries thrive in areas that have fast, frequent, and reliable transportation connections, which enable face-to-face interactions, so scholars can easily collaborate on research and innovation.

At last year's first workshop, we convened planners and economic development professionals to hear from experts from Maine's Downeaster and California's Capitol Corridor, where communities have embraced rail service as the cornerstone of their economic development strategies. Workshop participants discussed how lessons from these case studies and others could be applied to the Knowledge Corridor and engaged in an exercise to develop strategies specifically for this region. These strategies were then presented to an audience

of business stakeholders at a second workshop, which provided additional feedback and suggestions for next steps. A final report was prepared that outlined the recommendations coming out of this workshop.

The following are a few of the key recommended strategies that were formulated at the workshop:

-
- **Rail service must be accessible to communities. To promote access, improve intermodal connectivity at stations** by integrating bus, shuttle, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as developing housing and jobs within walking distance to reduce the need for auto trips.

See Response to Comment 4.4.10-1

- **Cultivate a diverse and loyal ridership with branding and marketing strategies that highlight** the region's natural beauty, history, and culture to help generate ridership and foster a sense of local ownership. Dining cars on Maine trains serve lobster rolls in summer and clam chowder in the winter. Multiple ridership sectors fill empty return train cars, making the rail more financially feasible and supporting higher frequencies.
- **Integrate state and local economic development and planning strategies** to create a single, corridor-wide economic development plan that attracts and retains businesses and talented employees, and maximizes growth in the region.
- **Develop and allow innovative financing mechanisms**, such as value capture, for the communities that would like to use them in order to help fund ongoing capital improvements and local development projects that improve station areas, promote transit-oriented development and pedestrian conditions.
- **Initiate a statewide transit village program** that provides funding and technical assistance to communities that want to promote infill development in their downtown areas and build walkable, mixed-use, commuter-oriented housing around their rail stations. RPA has worked with communities in Connecticut and throughout the region to develop visions for their communities and put in place zoning and design guidelines that implement those visions.
- **Adopt a corridor-wide overlay district** that creates new design standards, but leaves local zoning codes intact in order to encourage transit-supportive development around rail stations that is sensitive to each community.
- **Explore forming a single purpose entity** – such as a Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority – to coordinate the multiple functions and agencies involved in the project. It would provide better interagency and state-local coordination, and ensure that rail operations solutions are developed in a manner that is also supportive of state and local development goals. The new entity should work with a coordinating council of municipalities on the corridor to improve stations and station access.

See Response to Comment 4.4.15-1

Case studies from around the world have shown that improved passenger rail service can bring schools, businesses, and people closer together and expand access to markets, but only if a mix of complementary strategies, like the ones I just listed, are in place. RPA believes that if these approaches are followed, the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Program will generate economic benefits for the region that extend far beyond the station areas.

We hope that the project can proceed as scheduled, and that the Department will work with partner agencies to implement these recommendations.

A copy of our workshop report, *Dependable Rail in 2016: What Will It Mean for the Knowledge Corridor?* is attached to this testimony.

A copy of the workshop report is included in Part 5 of this Appendix A.

Response to Comment 4.4.10-1

Thank you for your comment in support of the project. Discussion of the existing and proposed train stations that will experience increased passenger rail service under this project is provided in Sec. 4.4.1 of the EA. Discussion on transit, parking and pedestrian access to existing and proposed train stations is provided in Sec. 4.4.10 of the EA.

Response to Comment 4.4.15-1

Section 4.4.15 of the EA, “Secondary and Cumulative Impacts”, discusses the beneficial cumulative impacts relative to potential new local development or redevelopment adjacent to or in the proximity of new or improved train stations; the State of Connecticut is encouraging and assisting towns and cities along the corridor to consider and incentivize transit-oriented development (TOD) near the train stations to optimize the benefits of transit, improve the local economy and provide jobs – the table “Summary of Economic Environment and Potential Development” in Appendix 5 of the EA provides information on planned or potential TOD for each of the stations in the corridor.

CTDOT welcomes initiatives from stakeholders that leverage the transportation investment to make the overall region more vibrant and productive. During the design process CTDOT will continue to work with communities to integrate their needs into the constructed facility as well as the operating plan of the service.



President
Séan W. Moore

OFFICERS

Chairwoman
Yvonne de Angeli-Fontanez
- Four Points by Sheraton Meriden

Vice Chairman
Atty. Thomas J. Welsh
- Breen & Welsh, PC

Secretary
Richard Pendred
- A & A Office Systems

Treasurer
Francis Barilario
- Cornerstone Business Advisors, LLC

Immediate Past Chairman
Frank W. Ridley
- F. W. R. Consulting Services

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Al Bazz
- La Insurance

Peggy Brennan
- City of Meriden Economic Development

Bruce Buchstated
- Prints Printing Solutions Inc.

Robert Cappelletti
- Meriden Housing Authority

Miguel Castro
- Prestige Construction Home Improvement

Pam Craig-White
- Marketing Graphics & Promotional Advertising

Joseph Ciriaco
- The Home Store Real Estate

Ron Degan
- Lucha Consulting Engineers, LLC

Linda DePedro
- Meriden Schools Federal Credit Union

Pam Fields
- APC of Meriden & Wallingford

Rosa Galino
- Gatto Dolce and Rosa Galino Realtors

Holly Heger
- A2G Information Technologies

Joseph F. Heller
- Yankee Gas

Sheldon Larsen
- Thompson Chevrolet

David Lowell
- Hunter's Ambulance Service, Inc.

Tari Marshall-Day
- Hampton Inn by Hilton Meriden Wallingford

Zaida R. Molina
- TD Bank

Marc Nemeth
- Amal Laboratories Incorporated

Ken Sterba
- Westfield - Meriden

Anna Wasescha, Ph.D.
- Middlesex Community College

Edward J. Zawaski
- Zawaski Insurance Agency, LLC

569-2023

June 18, 2012

Mark W. Alexander, Transportation Assistant Planning Director
CT Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 06131-7546
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Dear Mr. Alexander:

On behalf of the Board of Directors and the membership of the Greater Meriden Chamber of Commerce and for the purposes of the EAVEIE, we are pleased to recommit our support for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Program.

We will continue to work with the department, the city of Meriden, the Meriden Housing Authority, the Meriden Family Zone, the Meriden Economic Development Corporation and with many other municipalities and entities along the rail corridor in anticipation of the positive transformation of the communities along the corridor. I am confident that the city and the business community in Meriden will be ready for a launch of service in 2016.

We eagerly anticipate FRA issuing a Finding of No Significant Impact so the NH-H-S Rail project can advance to its final design and construction.

Sincerely,

Séan W. Moore
President

The Greater Meriden Chamber of Commerce serves our member businesses
in Meriden, Wallingford, Southington, Berlin, Cheshire and Middletown, CT
Our offices are located at 3 Colony Street, Suite 301, Meriden, CT 06451
Ph: 203.235.7901 Fx: 203.686.0172
info@meridenchamber.com www.meridenchamber.com



*Greater
Hartford
Transit District*

June 21, 2012

Via electronic mail: Mark.W.Alexander@ct.gov.

Mr. Mark W. Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Reference: Review Comments on the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (EA/EIE)

Dear Mr. Alexander:

The Greater Hartford Transit District ("the District") submits the following review comments on the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (EA/EIE) for the above cited project. The project consists of the implementation of more frequent intercity passenger rail service between New Haven, CT and Springfield, MA. The project increases the safety, quality and frequency of passenger service along this corridor addressing current and future transportation needs in the region. Accordingly, the District supports this project and advocates its timely advancement in order to improve the quality of life for the residents of the Greater Hartford region.

Transportation Comments

The EA/EIE does not discuss or coordinate with any of the approved plans for the CT Fastrak project (New Britain-Hartford Busway) currently under construction or other project of local and regional importance. Therefore, it does not adequately address the needs at Union Station. The passenger rail and busway utilize Union Station as a destination. However, the report does not aggregate usage estimates in the assessment of impacts. There is no discussion of the modal split between rail and bus, and there is no parking assessment. The busway project calls for the elimination of parking spaces at the Spruce Street Parking lot as part of the creation of the busway stop serving Hartford. The planned improvement to Union Station as part of the TIGER IV project changes the direction of Union Place and eliminates on street parking. The EA/EIE does not mention the reduction in parking spaces expected in the vicinity of Union Station in its discussion for planned parking capacity.

The District respectfully requests the coordination of projects at Union Station and that a parking assessment need analysis be conducted at Union Station that includes the number of parking spaces that would really be available in the immediate vicinity of our complex. It would also seem logical to determine how many short and long term parking spaces would be required by the integration of the various projects. The District suggests that CTDOT reconsider the construction of new parking facilities and expansion of existing parking areas over the long term, particularly those in close proximity to the Union Station site.

The District believes this project is of enormous importance and value not only to Hartford's Union Station, but to the entire Knowledge Corridor. The District looks forward to the establishment of the High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail in the region and to assist the Connecticut Department of Transportation and other project proponents in the advancement of this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our comments on this proposed development of regional significance.

Respectfully yours,



Vicki L. Stotland
Executive Director

cc: S. Sheehan, Director-GHTD
T. Deller, Director, City of Hartford

Response to Greater Hartford Transit District Comments, June 21, 2012

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pages 153, 165, and 166) discusses that the existing parking in the area of the stations is not adequate to support the projected ridership for 2030. The travel demand models completed by CTDOT and Amtrak were used to determine the modal split (riders getting out of their autos and boarding the train). Specific parking capacity requirements, based on those models, are included in Table 4-30. The basis of the modal splits and parking capacity requirements is a reference document (Data Collection/Ridership Analysis) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. This reference document not only provides the modal split between autos but also indicated the number of riders per day that will change modes from bus and walking to train at each station. The basis for the number of bus bays required for each station is included in a reference document (Transportation/Transit) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. This reference document identifies all of the recommended bus routes for servicing the train stations as well as recommended scheduling/frequency changes in order to provide an integrated transit service. Except for New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield the final layout of the station, pedestrian access, bus stalls, auto access, and parking layout will be determined during final design. As noted in Table 4-30, parking for Hartford would not be constructed as part of this project but will be addressed and advanced by the local parking authority to be compatible with the downtown development plans which would include the initiative to revise I 84 and the existing track alignment in the station area.



Connecting People and Places for over 77 years

Safety | Comfort | Convenience | Socially Conscious | Quality

Peter Pan B U S L I N E S

June 22, 2012

Mr. Mark W. Alexander, Transportation Assistant Planning Director
Connecticut Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 317546
Newington, CT 06131-7546

**RE: New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project
Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (EA/EIE)**

Dear Mr. Alexander:

On behalf of Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc., I am writing to provide comments on the above-captioned report.

We believe the EA/EIE was lacking detail in several areas:

See Response
to Comment
2.0-1

- **Alternative Analysis:** The only alternatives included in the EA/EIE were 'no build' and various levels of rail improvements to the existing rail corridor. There were no other transit modes or corridor alignments included in the document. Good public policy, environmental stewardship, fiscal responsibility, and good business practice should guide ConnDOT to include more transit options for the corridor study, rather than just rail options in a corridor established many decades ago that may not reflect current and future employment and residential centers. Other options that could have better transit ridership, lesser environmental impacts, and be more cost-effective include light rail, Bus Rapid Transit, and HOV lanes for improved ridesharing in both the I-91 and rail corridor alignments.

See Response
to Comment
4.5-1

- **Cost of Operations:** There was little detail on the potential cost of operating the completed rail system, and the sources of funds for this public financial assistance. The potential subsidies required to support rail service could potentially adversely impact existing transit service supplied by CT Transit and/or PVRTA, by diverting state DOT funding from these agencies to the rail service and creating Environmental Justice impacts. If new sources of funding are contemplated for the rail service, the amount and source should be identified.

See Response
to Comment
4.4.10-1

- **Impact on Other Transit Service Providers:** Up to 25 rail trips in the corridor, presumably subsidized with public funding, will most certainly have an adverse impact on current public transportation service provided by Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc., as well as Greyhound Lines. The EA/EIE document provides some information on train ridership diverted from automobiles, but no detail on train ridership diverted from existing private carrier bus service. The potential adverse impacts on and damages to private sector transit services should be acknowledged and quantified in the EA/EIE.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,

PETER PAN BUS LINES, INC.

Michael H. Sharff

Michael H. Sharff
Director of Planning

p e t e r p a n b u s . c o m

1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 1776, Springfield, MA 01102-1776 (413) 781-2900

Response to Peter Pan Lines, Inc. Comments, June 22, 2012

Response to Comment 2.0-1

Alternative Analysis

The Alternative Analysis of the EA considered alternatives meeting the Purpose and Need of the proposed project.

Section 2.0 of the EA (Page 12) identifies the Purpose of the project to *“...increase the frequency and speed of passenger service along the NHHS rail corridor and to address the current and future transportation needs of Connecticut, Central Massachusetts, Boston, and Vermont. By improving the existing rail infrastructure and passenger rail service between New Haven, Connecticut, and Springfield, Massachusetts, this project will allow partnering states of Vermont and Massachusetts to realize the benefits of the infrastructure improvements already funded or planned in those states under FRA’s HSIPR Program, including expanded Vermonter Service extending as far north as Montreal, Canada and inland service between Springfield and Boston.”*

Section 2.0 of the EA (Pages 12 and 13) identifies the Need of the project which recognizes the increase in intercity travel, demographic growth, and capacity constraints on the study area’s highways. *“...the state remains dependent on trucking for 98 percent of its freight needs, congestion problems are anticipated to increase and negatively impact the economic competitiveness of the region.”*

The Need of the project also recognizes the *“...region’s lack of integrated transit service. Though investment has been made in the service that is available, the lack of trip frequency, boarding locations and interconnectedness of services provided ensure the automobile remains the mode of choice when commuting to and from work and for basic needs, as well as for intercity travel.”*

With respect to the Alternative Analysis of the EA, private bus service was not considered an alternative because it would not address the following:

1. Meet the project’s purpose to *“allow partnering states of Vermont and Massachusetts to realize the benefits of the infrastructure improvements already funded or planned in those states under FRA’s HSIPR Program”*.
2. Meet the project’s need to reduce traffic on the highways; insofar as bus service would use the existing highway system it would be subject to highway congestion and delay.
3. Meet the project’s need to provide integrated transit service and provide an alternative to automobile usage; private bus service is limited in the study area as follows:
 - a. Private Bus Service in the Study Area
 - i. Central Business Districts (CBD’s) of Springfield, Hartford, and New Haven are connected with intercity bus service operated by Greyhound/Peter Pan using I-91.
 - ii. Springfield has connecting service operated by Peter Pan with a route to Greenfield via North Hampton.
 - iii. Hartford has connecting service operated by DATTCO with routes to Bristol, Old Saybrook, and Cheshire-Southington.
 - b. Railroad Stations in the Study Area not Serviced by Private Bus Service
 - i. Wallingford, CT
 - ii. Meriden, CT
 - iii. Berlin, CT

- iv. Windsor, CT
- v. Windsor Locks, CT
- vi. Brattleboro, VT
- vii. Bellows Falls, VT
- viii. White River Junction, VT
- ix. St. Albans, VT

Response to Comment 4.4.10-1

Impact on Other Transit Service Providers

Other transit service providers do not offer, as indicated above, one seat service to many of the locations included in the proposed project. Transit service providers do, however, offer service from locations in the study area to destinations outside of the study area. Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Page 165) indicates that all stations will provide transit stalls so that bus service can continue to be integrated with train service; perhaps even more robustly than currently offered.

Response to Comment 4.5-1

Cost of Operation

Section 4.5 of the EA, Table 4-36 identifies the Annualized cost for incremental rail operation and maintenance. The Service Development Plan, a reference document available from CTDOT (refer to Section 8.0 of the EA), and Appendix 7 of the EA provide the values of Table 4-36.

SK Realty
C/o The Standard Paper Co.
285 Newfield Ave.
Hartford, CT 06106

John E. Bernick P.E.
Project Engineer
State Design-Facilities

6/22/12

Sir:

I, as property and business owner of and at 285 Newfield Ave. West Hartford, am deeply concerned that your specific inclusion of my parcel in your report naming it as the site you intend to use to construct a rail station **upon-without even having funding for this portion of the project** will do considerable and irreparable harm to my future prospects, leasing, developing or selling this site and would have a definitive adverse effect on my existing operations due to its causing concerns among my employees and customers about our future.

For the state to issue this report, with my site included would be absolutely and completely irresponsible. I'm flabbergasted that among all the people looking over this report in your department no one even considered the affect such a decision would have on the lives and livelihoods of the people working with and on the site **knowing full well there is no funding for this station presently and its funding might be-and may remain- "miles away"**.

I urge you to expunge any suggestion of my parcel from your report, possibly in favor of a more general notice discussing an inclination to place a station somewhere in proximity of one of the West Hartford busway stations soon to be constructed. Such an adjustment I'm sure will have no bearing on, or in the least hinder, the prospects of your plans coming to fruition and would surely be a better alternative then the present one in its present form. Additional head winds to doing business here, such as those this report, in its present form, would create; **placing this stigma on my property possibly for many years**, would be unnecessarily burdensome. This clearly would not be in anyone's best interest.

Daniel Silver
President
SK Realty
Standard Paper Co.

Response to SK Realty Comments June 22, 2012

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) appreciates your concerns relative to the proposed rail station in West Hartford.

This site is one of the four new regional stations being planned. It should be noted that currently there is no funding in place to move forward with this station or any of the new station locations. The project is being funded by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) through the American Recoveries and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) as High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Service from New Haven to Springfield. Because the station at Flatbush Avenue is considered a regional station (it would increase the benefits of improved rail service by also accommodating commuter service) it is not eligible for FRA funding. CTDOT intends to apply for future Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding to construct the four new regional stations at North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield, as well as, provide an additional platform at the State Street station in New Haven.

No Rights-of-Way action for the West Hartford station is pending at this time. The applicable law and mitigation of impacts related to any property acquisitions associated with the project is as follow: Section 4.4.3 of the EA (Pages 96 and 98) states that:

- **Applicable Law:** CTDOT is required to comply with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970 and provide monetary and other relocation assistance to displaced property owners whose properties are acquired for the implementation of federally funded projects.
- **Mitigation:** In order to mitigate the acquisition of properties for station construction, affected property owners will be afforded relocation assistance through the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970. CTDOT is authorized and required to provide monetary and other relocation assistance to displaced property owners whose properties would be acquired for implementation of the proposed federally funded project.

Section 5.2 of the EA (Pages 201 and 202) identifies meetings held with West Hartford local officials on 4/29/2011 and 7/27/2011 to review the proposed project including the site selection process for proposed new train stations as well as parking layout.

CTDOT acknowledges that additional coordination is required with the town of West Hartford in order to select the preferred alternative site for the West Hartford station.



June 22, 2012

Written testimony of Steven Higashide, Federal Advocate
Tri-State Transportation Campaign
Contact: 860-796-6988

RE: Comments on Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield High-Speed Intercity Rail Project

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield High-Speed Intercity Rail Project (EA/EIE). Tri-State Transportation Campaign advocates for a more environmentally sustainable and balanced transportation system in Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. We have strongly supported this project in the past and reaffirm that support here.

By increasing service within the corridor to up to 25 daily round trips by 2030, the project will establish a true commuter rail network throughout central Connecticut and lay the groundwork for transit-oriented development (TOD) along the line. The EA/EIS estimates that the new service will replace 1.5 million car trips a year; save 3.5 million gallons of fuel; support active, vibrant communities; and create over 12,000 jobs.

See
Response
to
Comment
4.4.15-1

To maximize these benefits, Tri-State urges ConnDOT to pay particular attention to station area planning – specifically, ensuring that planning around stations supports both transit-oriented development and safe, convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to stations. The state and the department have already taken strong steps to support TOD in the corridor, such as awarding TOD Pilot Grants to Hartford, Meriden, New Haven, Windsor, and Windsor Locks. The EA/EIE also points out that the project is consistent with all local and regional plans (except for Windsor's Plan of Conservation and Development, which calls for a second rail station). While we applaud these steps, we ask the state to go further.

"Transit Village" Program/Transit-Oriented Development

One important way the state could support TOD is to institutionalize the aforementioned pilot program. One model could be New Jersey's Transit Village program, which allows municipalities which commit to TOD principles to access technical assistance and receive priority for local aid funding from various state agencies.

Connecticut should also issue a statement of policy, executive order, and/or memorandum of understanding which:

- Outlines a framework for interagency coordination on TOD. This framework should designate a team or entity that would have responsibility for assisting municipalities interested in TOD with permitting, accessing state financing programs, and other requirements; and
- Directs existing funding programs to transit-oriented development sites. (Similar to how the Department of Economic and Community Development's brownfields funding programs contain both location criteria and criteria having to do with health, environmental, and economic benefits.)

Within the EA/EIE itself, we believe that the Purpose and Need statement should note that the project supports development consistent with the smart growth principles advocated by Connecticut, Maryland, and Vermont (which are referenced on page ES-21).

Safe Routes to Transit/Bicycle and Pedestrian Access

The EA/EIS notes that all new and reconstructed stations will have "Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible routes from the existing sidewalks ... to the boarding platforms," and that "sites will be designed to provide access by bicycle on the station drives and bicycle storage." However, for stations to truly be accessible, there must be safe and convenient pedestrian and cycling routes which link the stations with surrounding neighborhoods.

See
Response
to
Comment
4.4.10-1

Transit planners generally assume that people are willing to walk up to ½ mile to rail or rapid transit stations, but multiple studies have shown that this distance varies depending on how safe and pleasant the walking environment is. Providing good bike/pedestrian access to stations will increase the potential market area for transit-oriented development, improve safety around stations, boost ridership, and reduce the need for parking.

For these reasons, ConnDOT should work proactively with municipalities to ensure that safe and convenient access is provided to and from planned stations. One way to incentivize such improvements would be to establish a "Safe Routes to Transit" or similar program which would provide grants to municipalities to improve safe bike and pedestrian access to rail stations.

There are several ways the document could better emphasize the importance of good bike/pedestrian connections. Just as the EA/EIS identifies where the project is consistent with local plans that support TOD, it should identify where pedestrian and cycle access needs improvement. It should also reflect potential bike-sharing programs in New Haven. In April 2012, New Haven [announced](#) that it had applied for funds to operate a bike-sharing system.

Parking Best Practices

In several locations, the project team took care to integrate station parking in ways that support TOD. For example, parking in Meriden and Berlin will be designed to be integrated into those municipalities' TOD plans for the station area. In Windsor, parking appears to be provided in a structure behind planned development which will front on the street. The EA/EIE also notes that ConnDOT will "work with the Town of Enfield and Bigelow Commons' ownership to co-locate a portion of the Enfield Station parking within the Bigelow Commons development; minimize use of riverfront access for parking; and, at the same time, work to minimize adverse effects to access or parking for Bigelow Commons residents."

See
Response
to
Comment
4.4.10-2

We commend the project's use of parking best practices such as shared parking and placing parking behind building frontage. The project team should proactively work with municipalities and use the

same strategies at stations where these practices do not appear to have been followed. For example, the proposed North Haven station would be flanked by large surface parking lots despite the fact that, according to the EA/EIE (pg. 91), the station site is "surrounded primarily by commercial, industrial, and high- and medium-density residential uses."

New commuter and intercity rail service in the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield corridor will provide increased local access and strengthen links between New York City and Hartford and beyond. By taking steps to integrate TOD, parking best practices, and walking and cycling accessibility into the project, ConnDOT and the state can maximize the benefit of this new transportation asset.

Response to Tri-state Transportation Campaign Comments June 22, 2012

Response to Comment 4.4.10-1

Section 4.4.10 indicates that all improvements to the station sites will provide for safe and ADA accessible routes from the public space to the boarding platforms including bicycle storage. While improvements off of the project sites on existing streets and sidewalks could enhance the overall ease of accessing the station by bicycle or walking it is unfortunately outside of the scope of the project.

Response to Comment 4.4.10-2

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pages 153, 165, and 166) discusses that the existing parking in the area of the stations is not adequate to support the projected ridership for 2030. The travel demand models completed by CTDOT and Amtrak were used to determine the modal split (riders getting out of their autos and boarding the train). Specific parking capacity requirements, based on those models, are included in Table 4-30. The basis of the modal splits and parking capacity requirements is a reference document (Data Collection/Ridership Analysis) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. Except for New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield the final layout of the station, pedestrian access, bus stalls, auto access, and parking layout will be determined during final design. As noted in Table 4-30, parking for New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield would not be constructed as part of this project but will be addressed and advanced by the local parking authorities to be compatible with their downtown development plans.

Visual Resources and Quality is an environmental resource included in Section 4.4.6 that the project intends to maintain. There will be public meetings during design phase at which time decisions regarding the architectural appearance and final site layout will be made.

Response to Comment 4.4.15-1

Section 4.4.15 of the EA, "Secondary and Cumulative Impacts", discusses the beneficial cumulative impacts relative to potential new local development or redevelopment adjacent to or in the proximity of new or improved train stations; the State of Connecticut is encouraging and assisting towns and cities along the corridor to consider and incentivize transit-oriented development (TOD) near the train stations to optimize the benefits of transit, improve the local economy and provide jobs – the table "Summary of Economic Environment and Potential Development" in Appendix 5 of the EA provides information on planned or potential TOD for each of the stations in the corridor.

CTDOT welcomes initiatives from stakeholders that leverage the transportation investment to make the overall region more vibrant and productive. During the design process CTDOT will continue to work with communities to integrate their needs into the constructed facility as well as the operating plan of the service.

Connecticut League of Conservation Voters Education Fund

The Connecticut League of Conservation Voters Education Fund supports the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield rail project as an environmentally beneficial public transit project. Once completed it will decrease vehicle miles traveled, reduce congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The recently released Environmental Assessment and Impact study reports annual reduction of over 100 million vehicle miles driven, annual savings of over 3.5 million gallons of fuel, and a reduction of over 25,000 metric tons of carbons released per year. This is a significant step to achieving the state's goal of reducing green house gas emissions by the year 2020 while promoting smart growth and responsible land use.

Additional environmental and economic benefits will be realized if the state focuses its investment policies around the current and proposed train stations to spur dense, mixed-use, development and re-development that encourages walking and biking. A comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian access plan, that provides safe, convenient pedestrian and bicycle enhancements in and around the stations, is critical to optimizing the environmental benefits of the rail project. Getting more people to walk or bike to the stations will reduce single vehicle usage and minimize the need for expansive parking lots.

As the station planning and design continues, it is imperative that Connecticut DOT works to incorporate best practices for green infrastructure along the rail line and at the rail stations. Engaging outside experts for peer review of the plans and working collaboratively with other environmental and transportation organizations will help ensure that the rail project is economically and environmentally sustainable. Specific environmental recommendations for the NH-H-S rail project should include the following:

See
Response
to
Comment
4.2.4-1

1. **Low impact development (LID)** principles to preserve or re-create the natural landscape features around the stations and minimize impervious surfaces to create functional and appealing site drainage that treat stormwater as a resource rather than a waste product. By implementing LID practices, water can be managed in a way that reduces the impact of built areas and promotes the natural movement of water within an ecosystem or watershed. Specific consideration should be given to incorporating bioretention facilities, rain gardens, vegetated rooftops, rain barrels, and permeable pavements.

See
Response
to
Comment
3.3-1

2. **To protect streamflow over watercourses and waterways, bridges instead of culverts** should be constructed wherever feasible. In places where culverts are deemed necessary, DOT should consider utilizing a recently developed UMass modeling program to survey and review the specific stream crossings regarding interaction with habitat in order to determine best means of constructing the culvert.

3. **Landscaping should be designed using organic land care** best practices as used in other states such as the Rose Kennedy Greenway in Boston, MA. Use of native and New England grown species and protection of mature trees around the work sites should also be a priority.

See Response to
Comment 4.4.6-1

See Response to
Comment 4.4.11-1

4. Use of renewable energy such as solar and geothermal should be the preferred energy source throughout the station design and planning process. A cost benefit analysis of various renewable energy sources during the planning stage may provide valuable guidance for choosing the most economically and environmentally beneficial energy source over the life cycle of the project.

Incorporating these practices during the planning and design stages of the project will significantly increase the environmental benefit of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield rail line. We commend the Connecticut DOT on its recent efforts to collaborate with DEEP and other transportation and environmental organizations to 'green' the CTfastrak Bus Rapid Transit project. We strongly recommend that the DOT continues and expands on that model of collaboration to improve the NH-H-S rail project as the DOT moves toward an environmentally and economically sustainable 21st Century transportation system for Connecticut.

Respectfully submitted,

Kirsten Griebel

Education Program Director

Connecticut League of Conservation Voters Education Fund

kirsten.griebel@ctlc.org

860.236-5442

Response to Connecticut League of Conservation Voters (undated)

Response to Comment 3.3-1

Section 3.3 indicates the improvements to bridges and culverts. All structures over waterways are designed to provide adequate hydraulic capacity for storm water flow without impacting upstream or downstream waters. Impacts to wetlands will be mitigated in accordance with DEEP requirements.

Response to Comment 4.2.4-1

Thank you for your support of the project. Be assured that during final design CTDOT will coordinate with DEEP to implement LID and other innovative techniques to reduce storm water runoff and mitigate water quality impacts. As indicated in Volume II, final design will follow Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual which would include applicable appendices.

Response to Comment 4.4.6-1

Visual Resources and Quality is an environmental resource included in Section 4.4.6 that the project intends to maintain. There will be public meetings during design phase at which time decisions regarding landscaping will be made.

Response to Comment 4.4.11-1

To the degree practical at the EA level of analysis, Section 4.4.11 of the EA indicates that the project will have a positive impact on energy requirements due to a reduction in personal automobile and reduced fossil fuel consumption. During final design CTDOT will continue to select materials and design details that promote sustainability while providing quality facilities for extended life at a reasonable cost. Section 4.4.17 of the EA also discusses the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources in the constructed facility to be reasonably certain, at this level of study, that the long term sustainability and transportation energy savings justify the initial resources.



To: ConnDOT
From: Connecticut Fund for the Environment
Re: Environmental Assessment/Environmental Evaluation for the NH-H-S High Speed Intercity Rail Program
Date: 6/22/12

We are writing to express our strong support of the New Haven to Hartford to Springfield High Speed Intercity Rail Line. Connecticut Fund for the Environment believes that there are many benefits that improving and expanding our transit infrastructure will bring to the state; these benefits will help our economy, environment, and most of all, our residents.

There are many economic benefits associated with the New Haven to Hartford to Springfield Intercity Rail Line. Construction of the rail line will create new direct jobs in the construction industry and for engineers and planners as well as indirect jobs for those who produce the metal and other materials needed for the project. Service on the rail line will enable employees to get to their jobs without dependence on a car and will offer employers a larger labor pool from which to choose. Additionally, with a growing transit network, Connecticut has an unparalleled opportunity to develop our communities. Transit-oriented development (TOD) is a proven economic growth strategy that combines mixed-income housing, employment, amenities, and recreational opportunities within close proximity to our transit stations. By doing so, Connecticut could create a housing and commercial supply that meets the demands of the 21st century, while generating an influx of new business that would produce new revenue to the state and local municipalities. We appreciate the involvement of Tom Maziarz and Commissioner Redeker on the Growing Connecticut Around Transit (GCAT) workgroup, and look forward to their support of developing interagency technical resource teams to help communities overcome the complexities of infill development, brownfield remediation, mixed-use, and mixed-income communities.

There are also many environmental benefits that will be associated with the New Haven to Hartford to Springfield rail line. Affordable, efficient and reliable rail service offers an appealing alternative to driving in a car, thus alleviating congestion on our roads and decreasing the demand for gasoline. Less congestion also means a reduction in harmful pollutants emitted into the air and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Development around the stations to make the areas more walkable and livable will encourage residents to be more active, to walk places instead of drive and subsequently help foster a healthier, less sedentary lifestyle. Additionally, by including green infrastructure, low-impact development practices, energy efficient buildings, and distributed and renewable power generation in transit-oriented development areas, TOD has the potential to repair the local ecology and environment.


Connecticut Fund for the Environment and Save the Sound
142 Temple Street • New Haven, Connecticut 06510 • (203) 787-0648
www.ctenvironment.org • www.savethesound.org


CFE is a long-time supporter of the new *CTfastrak*. We learned from the *CTfastrak* experience that transit must be accessible to residents living in adjacent communities. A transit system needs an organized and overall plan for marketing and branding that includes outreach to residents along the line and to current and future rail users. In addition, state and local economic development and planning strategies should be integrated in order to produce strong and lasting development activities.

We also stress that the environmental impact of the construction and operations of the rail line be as minimal as possible. We urge ConnDOT to review critical areas such as stormwater runoff and to implement low-impact development (LID) standards and other green infrastructure techniques to help offset the environmental impact of the new high-speed rail. ConnDOT's ongoing involvement in workshops with DEEP and LID experts to explore improvements to *CTfastrak* plans has been heralded as a promising new model of collaboration, one in which we look forward to continuing on the NH-H-S project as the design process moves forward.

We look forward to working with ConnDOT as this exciting project moves forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

 ^{KB.}
Karen Burnaska
Transit for Connecticut
Connecticut Fund for the Environment


Chris Cryder
Growing Connecticut Around Transit
Connecticut Fund for the Environment

Response to Connecticut Fund for the Environment June 22, 2012

Thank you for your support of the project. Be assured that during final design CTDOT will coordinate with DEEP to implement LID and other innovative techniques to reduce storm water runoff and mitigate water quality impacts. As indicated in Volume II, final design will follow Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual which would include applicable appendices.

Regarding construction related activities note that Section 4.4.16 of the EA provides a substantial list of requirements so that CTDOT can mitigate impacts to environmental resources during construction.

ROBERT FROMER

EJD, MSEE, P.C., P.E., R.E.P.

P. O. Box 71, Windsor, Connecticut 06095-2205

E-mail: saintrobert@comcast.net

June 21, 2012

SENT AS AN E-MAIL ATTACHMENT TO: Mark.W.Alexander@ct.gov

Mr. Mark W. Alexander
Transportation Assistant Planning Director
2800 Berlin Turnpike
Newington, CT 06131-7546

Re: **Comments on the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation (EA/EIE) for the New Haven-Hartford- Springfield Rail Program (NHHS)**

Dear Mr. Alexander:

I. Project Description¹: The proposed rail service enhancement in the NHHS rail corridor would provide for up to 25 daily round-trip trains (up to 50 one-way trips per day) by 2030. The proposed service plan would provide one-seat or cross-platform transfers on service from Washington, D.C., and New York to Springfield, Boston and the Knowledge Corridor, as well as bi-directional, 30-minute peak-hour service and hourly midday service in the NHHS rail corridor. Related operational improvements include an increase in the capacity of the line to accommodate additional trains, an increase in the maximum train speed to 110 miles per hour (mph), service to future new regional train stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield (to be constructed with Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) funding), and reduced scheduled travel times. These operational improvements, in turn, require rail infrastructure improvements. Therefore, Connecticut has proposed the NHHS Rail Program, a program of capital projects to support enhanced passenger rail service in the NHHS rail corridor. The proposed project’s infrastructure improvements in the NHHS rail corridor consist of:

- restoration of sections of track;
- construction of new passing sidings;
- construction of a layover and light maintenance facility;
- at-grade crossing upgrades;
- facility-specific bridge and culvert rehabilitations, replacements and removals;
- installation of new crossovers and signal upgrades;
- improvement or relocation of existing passenger rail platforms for Amtrak intercity service, as well as additional station parking and improved station access;
- improvements to platforms, track configuration and sidings in the Springfield Terminal area; and construction of future FTA-funded new regional rail stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield.

¹ The project description appears in the June 5, 2012 edition of the *Environmental Monitor*.

II. APPLICABLE LAW

Section 22a-1b(c) of the Connecticut General Statutes ("G.S.") requires that:

Each state department, institution or agency responsible for the primary recommendation or initiation of actions which may significantly affect the environment shall in the case of each such proposed action make a detailed written evaluation of its environmental impact before deciding whether to undertake or approve such action. All such environmental impact evaluations shall be detailed statements setting forth the following:

1. [T]he environmental consequences of the proposed action, including cumulative, direct and indirect effects which might result during and subsequent to the proposed action. Section 22a-1b(c)(2);
2. [T]he effect of the proposed action on the use and conservation of energy resources. Section 22a-1b(c)(7); and
3. [T]he General Assembly declares that it is the policy of the state of Connecticut to (1) conserve energy resources by avoiding unnecessary and wasteful consumption; (2) consume energy resources in the most efficient manner feasible . . . (8) maintain planning and preparedness capabilities necessary to deal effectively with future energy supply interruptions; and (9) when available energy alternatives are equivalent, give preference for capacity additions first to conservation and load management. The state shall seek all possible ways to implement this policy through public education and cooperative efforts involving the federal government, regional organizations, municipal governments, other public and private organizations and concerned individuals, using all practical means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to promote the general welfare by creating and maintaining conditions under which energy can be utilized effectively and efficiently. The General Assembly further declares that it is the continuing responsibility of the state to use all means consistent with other essential considerations of state policy to improve and coordinate the plans, functions, programs and resources of the state to attain the objectives stated herein without harm to the environment, risk to health or safety or other undesirable or unintended consequences, to preserve wherever possible a society which supports a diversity and variety of individual choice, to achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit the maintenance of adequate living standards and a sharing of life's amenities among all citizens, and to enhance the utilization of renewable resources so that the availability of nonrenewable resources can be extended to future generations. The General Assembly declares that the energy policy is essential to the preservation and enhancement of the health, safety and general welfare of the people of the state and that its implementation therefore constitutes a significant and valid public purpose for all state actions.

“[T]he purpose of the [National and Connecticut] Environmental Policy Act[s] is to ensure systematic consideration of environmental risks at the early stages of planning before the state commits its resources to the particular use of a site.” Westport v. State, 204 Conn. 212, 220 (1987). “An environmental impact evaluation shall be prepared as close as possible to the time an agency proposes an action. The evaluation shall be prepared early enough so that it can practically serve as an important contribution to the decision-making process and shall not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already made.” Id.

The National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (“CEPA”) “require public agencies to undertake programmatic pursuit of environmental assessments of their actions so as to “conserve, improve and protect [Connecticut’s] natural resources and environment and to control air, land and water pollution in order to enhance the health, safety and welfare of the people of the state.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) Id. at 221.

“Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that the agency has made the necessary environmental analyses.” (Emphasis added.) 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1502.1. “An environmental impact statement is more than a disclosure document.” Id. “It shall be used by Federal officials in conjunction with other relevant material to plan actions and make decisions.” Id.

My comments will show that the content of the EA/EIE jointly prepared by the Federal Railway Administration (“FRA”) and Connecticut Department of Transportation (“DOT”) is contrary to the planning purposes embodied in NEPA/CEPA and Westport. Both NEPA and CEPA require facts in the EA/EIE to form the basis for system design and construction.

III. COMMENTS

The pertinent and appropriate statements in the EA and associated comments are as follows:

DOT Claim #1: Improved rail service offers a safer, greener and healthier alternative to highway travel - one that requires 35 percent less energy per passenger-mile and generates correspondingly lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions. Introduction, Section 1.1, paragraph 1.

Fromer Comment #1: There is no energy analysis to support the claimed “35 percent less energy per passenger-mile and generates correspondingly lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions.” These are unsubstantiated statements taken as true.

DOT Claim #2: The Northeast is projected to be a robust market for Intercity travel estimated to reach 200 million medium-distance trips (between 100 and 400 miles) across all major transportation modes - auto, air and rail - by 2025. With expected demographic growth, and increased capacity constraints on the study area's highways and at major airports, Amtrak's preliminary estimates are that Intercity passenger rail ridership in the Northeast could double by 2030 to 28 million and quadruple by 2050 to 60 million riders, depending on future network

configuration options. Moreover, a substantial portion of this growth is expected in small- to medium-sized markets, as well as those linking outlying areas of the region to the core urban markets between Boston and Washington, D.C. The current rail infrastructure between Springfield, Massachusetts, and New Haven, Connecticut, is insufficient to handle the growth expected in the Northeast market. Purpose and Need, Section 2.0, Need, paragraph 1.

Fromer Comment #2: The statement and the EA/EIE fail to account for the limiting factors of peak fossil fuels and peak raw materials to support such growth in intercity rail transportation. Further the statement does not address the error in the claimed growth in ridership. Nor does the statement provide the percentage of motor vehicle traffic expected to be diverted from area highways and airports as a function of time. This information is essential to support the conclusionary statements.

DOT Claim #3: Along with increased congestion along the corridor is a corresponding reduction in air quality. CTDOT's Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis, dated March 2, 2009, based on CTDOT's Travel Demand Model, predicts that greenhouse gas emissions would increase about 20 percent by 2030. Purpose and Need, Section 2.0, Need, paragraph 3.

Fromer Comment #3: I was unable to find DOT's Greenhouse Gas Emission Analysis, dated March 2, 2009 and DOT's Travel Demand Model as either a reference or appendices. These documents should be a part of the EA/EIE.

DOT Claim #4: In section 3.0, DOT evaluated the no build and (preferred) build alternatives including. The No-Build Alternative represents conditions in the future analysis year (2030) absent implementation of the proposed project, and serves as the future baseline against which anticipated effects of the Build Alternative are compared to identify any significant project-related impacts. The Build Alternative (the proposed project) would provide for enhanced passenger rail service in the NHHS rail corridor; related rail capacity and train speed improvements; and rail infrastructure improvements (NHHS Rail Program), which are necessary to support the service enhancement. Alternatives Evaluation, Section 3.1.

Fromer Comment #4: The FTA and DOT failed to consider the following feasible and prudent alternative within the scope of the NHHS, which is graphically presented in the attachment. I suggest the following three (3) alternatives, which the FTA and DOT should consider:

- (1) Retaining the Elmwood, Newington Junction and Berlin stations on the NHHS, and during rush hours eliminate those station stops. This would reduce transit times north and south. Also, CTfastrack (aka Busway) in the Amtrak corridor should be eliminated while retaining overpasses and new bridges – partial CTfastrack, and
- (2) (a) Creating two parallel, double track rail corridors between Hartford and Berlin. Currently, a mix of single and double tracks exists between New Haven and Berlin. Upgrade the current mix to double track. The same applies to the track system from Hartford to Springfield,

(b) Dividing, at Berlin, the double track corridor into two parallel, double track rail corridors from Berlin to Hartford. For descriptive purposes, name the western corridor: the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line and the eastern corridor: the New Haven-Springfield Amtrak Line,

(c) Moving local station stops (with the exception of Newington Junction) between Meriden and Hartford to the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line. Those stops include Berlin and Elmwood. The Newington Junction station would be replaced by two stations, CCSU-Newington and Downtown New Britain. Newington Junction is poorly located because it was specifically situated as a transfer stop for the CT *fastrack* and should be eliminated,

(d) Running two parallel services south from Springfield to Hartford-New Britain-New Haven-New York; the other as an express service south from Springfield to Hartford-Meriden–New Haven-New York. Same services would be provided for the northbound directions. These two services should not terminate in New Haven, but continue to Stamford and Greenwich as express trains and as soon as the dual-powered equipment (locomotives that also run on 3rd rail) is available the trains should terminate in Grand Central Terminal,

(e) Eliminating CT *fastrack* in the Amtrak corridor and on Newington Secondary tracks (Newington Junction to downtown New Britain). Sacrificing CT *fastrack* and replacing it with rail service through New Britain allows for more frequent service between New Haven-Hartford-Springfield. New overpass and bridgework that enhances grade separation of railroad tracks from streets and roads should be retained in the Amtrak corridor.

DOT Claim #5: Direct and indirect water quality impacts to surface and groundwater resources were assessed for the corridor by overlaying the proposed project onto GIS-based maps depicting water resources and surface and groundwater quality classifications.

Station locations where impacts to water quality may be anticipated include:

Newington Station

Runoff from impervious surfaces at the proposed surface parking lot would ultimately be discharged into Piper Brook. There also is the potential for increased sedimentation to Piper Brook and its tributary stream. Thus, impacts to water quality are possible from the proposed Newington Junction Station. The new station, with a fully compliant stormwater drainage design, would be an improvement over the quality of runoff that currently enters Piper Brook from the existing site.

Windsor Station

There is a potential for water quality impacts to nearby surface water resources (the pond) during the period of active construction as well as from stormwater runoff from the site once it is fully developed and operational.

Windsor Locks Station

Due to the proximity of the Connecticut River to the proposed station site, there is a potential for water quality impacts during the period of active construction as well as from stormwater runoff from the site once it is fully developed and operational.

Windsor Locks (new alternate station location - historic former station site)

Due to the proximity of the Connecticut River and Kettle Brook to the proposed station site, there is a potential for water quality impacts during the period of active construction as well as from stormwater runoff from the site once it is fully developed and operational.

Enfield Station

Due to the proximity of the Connecticut River and Kettle Brook to the proposed station site, there is a potential for water quality impacts during the period of active construction as well as from stormwater runoff from the site once it is fully developed and operational.

Mitigation

In order to avoid or substantially reduce potential water quality impacts associated with the proposed project, design details will be developed to avoid adverse impact. Final designs will be coordinated and permitted with the CT DEEP and MADEP and other resource agencies. All construction activities will comply with the CT DEEP 2004 Stormwater Quality Manual and the CT DEEP 2002 Erosion and Sedimentation Control Guidelines, as well as the 2008 Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook and 2003 Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Urban and Suburban Areas. These measures will minimize potential water quality impacts associated with the proposed project.

Water Resources and Water Quality, Section 4.3.2., Impacts, Proposed Project

Fromer Comment #5: (A) First, DOT should determine the pollutant concentrations in the receiving water bodies at the various locations instead of just citing the WQS classifications and making unsupported conclusionary statements. DOT failed to state the reason(s) that the watercourses appear on Tables 3-3 and 3-7 of the 2011 Integrated Water Quality Report ("IWQR") list for impaired waters. DOT, also, omitted stating that the watercourses, also, appear on the Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL"), Priority Ranking List of Impaired Waters found in Table 3-8 of the IWQR.

(B) Second, DOT should determine the types of pollutants expected to be generated and deposited on impervious surfaces from traffic and in the road bed from trains.

(C) Third, DOT should calculate the projected increase in each pollutant load generated and deposited in parking areas and onto the train ballast. This is a recommendation in Chapter 9 of the Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual ("CTSWQP").

(D) Fourth, DOT should calculate the pollutant concentrations in stormwater for specifically selected storm events, which would be discharged to each of the first treatment facility for surface runoff. A similar calculation would apply to the ballasted road bed.

(E) Fifth, DOT would determine using the International Best Management Practices Database ("IBMP"), the final pollutant concentrations discharged from the final treatment facility

in a treatment train. A copy of the IBMP is attached, which is, also, available on the Internet at: www.bmpdatabase.org.

(F) Sixth, DOT would assess the impact of pollution from the NHHS on the cumulative pollution to the affected watercourses.

(G) Seventh, DOT would then fashion a Stormwater Quality Plan as recommended in the CTSWQP based on the information gleaned from the above suggestions. The above recommended calculations and the Plan should appear in the EA/EIE.

(H) My experience with DOT in the contested case hearing on its application for an inland wetlands and watercourses permit from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection is that the agency will neither perform the calculations nor prepare a SWQP. It will offer unsubstantiated statements of improved water quality, which will be taken as true even though it is false until proven otherwise since DOT has the burden of minimizing environmental harm as a trustee of natural resources.

DOT Claim #6: Based on the preliminary Passenger Service Plan, the proposed project would result in a total reduction of 92.65 million miles in VMT of light-duty vehicles and an increase of 760,000 gallons of diesel fuel used for train locomotion. Overall energy consumption would be reduced (Table 4-31) with increased regional rail ridership, particularly during peak hours of travel. The resulting reduction in regional consumption of fossil fuels would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Table 4-31- Energy Requirements

Change in Fuel Consumption in Design Year (2030)					
	Reduction in MVT	Fuel Quantity (Gal)	Fuel Type	Energy Content (BTU/Gallon)²	Energy Consumption (1,000,000,000 BTU's)
Light Duty Vehicles	- 92,650,000	3,369,090 ¹	Gasoline	120,215	-405
Locomotive	N/A	760,000	Diesel	132,915	101
		Net Reduction in Energy Consumption			-304

Source: CDM Smith, 2011

1: Fuel quantity is based on an average consumption of 27.5 miles per gallon. (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 2010 CAFE Standards)

2: US Department of Energy, Alternative Fuels and Advanced Vehicles Data Center (AFDC) 2011, Average of Lower and Higher BTU Values.

Mitigation

Utility service disruptions during construction would be minimized through close coordination of construction activities, scheduling with utility providers and advanced notice of any anticipated

outages to nearby customers. Project engineers would coordinate with utility providers to minimize environmental and community impacts to the greatest extent practicable.

Public Utilities and Energy, Section 4.4.1, Impacts, Build Alternative

Fromer Comment #6: (A) Neither the Passenger Service Plan nor any other section of the EA/EIE provides the calculations for the “total reduction of 92.65 million miles in VMT of light-duty vehicles and an increase of 760,000 gallons of diesel fuel used for train locomotion” and the reduction in “greenhouse gas emissions.” This lack of analyses is contrary to the NEPA requirement for evidence that the agency has made the necessary environmental analyses, *supra*.

(B) When evaluating projects, FTA and DOT should perform a net energy analysis for each proposal. Such analysis shall include calculations of all embodied energy requirements used in the materials for initial construction of the facility over its projected useful lifetime. The analysis shall be expressed in a dimensionless unit as an energy profit ratio of energy generated by the facility to the calculated net energy expended in plant construction, maintenance and total fuel cycle energy requirements over the projected useful lifetime of the facility. The boundary for both the net energy calculations of the fuel cycle and materials for the facility construction and maintenance shall both be at the point of primary material extraction and include the energy consumed through the entire supply chain to final, but not be limited to, such subsequent steps as transportation, refinement and energy for delivery to the end consumer. The results of said net energy analysis shall be included in the results forwarded to the client. For purposes of this paragraph, "facility net energy" means the heat energy delivered by the facility contained in a fuel minus the life cycle energy used to produce the facility. "Fuel net energy" means the heat energy contained in a fuel minus the energy used to extract the fuel from the environment, refine it to a socially useful state and deliver it to consumers, and "embodied energy" means the total energy used to build and maintain a process, expressed in calorie equivalents of one type of energy.

All train sets, new track, rail sidings, new and upgraded stations, bridges and culverts, etc. require the consumption of energy with the associated production of greenhouse gases. No magician waves a magic wand and poof the product or service is produced. Each product or service requires numerous processes from the extraction of raw materials to product production transportation, assembly and associated externalities to recycling. Such energy consumption requires accounting in the EA/EIA for the purpose of reducing energy expenditures and gases. Operational energy reduction is not a complete analysis and evaluation of energy requirements.

Consider the life cycle steps requiring energy at each step to produce simple pencil.²

² The standard pencil begins when a cedar is cut down. Ropes and gear tug it onto the bed of a truck or a rail car.

Think of all the numberless people and skills involved in mining ore to produce steel and refine the steel into saws, axes and motors.

V. CONCLUSION

The EA/EIE is incomplete and inadequate to support the numerous presumptive conclusions.

Cordially,

Think of all the people who grow hemp, then transform it, through various stages, into a strong rope.

Think of the untold thousands of people who produce the coffee the loggers drink!

The logs are shipped to a mill and cut into slats. The slats are kiln-dried, tinted, waxed, then, kiln-dried again.

How many skills were needed to produce the tint and the kilns. What about electric power? What about the belts, motors and other parts at the mill?

The pencil slats are shipped to a factory. A complex machine cuts grooves into each. A second machine lays lead into every other slat. Glue is applied. Two slats are sealed together as one, then, cut into lengths that form pencils.

The lead alone is complex; it's not really lead. To produce it, graphite is mined in Ceylon. The graphite is, packed and shipped, then mixed with clay from Mississippi. It is treated with wetting 'agents — such as sulfonated tallow, which is formed when animal fats chemically react with sulfuric acid.

The pencil receives six coats of lacquer. Lacquer has numerous ingredients,' including castor oil. Think of all the chemists needed to create the paint — think of all the castor bean growers needed to produce, refine and ship the oil.

The brass end that holds the eraser in place is a marvel. Miners need to first extract zinc and copper from the earth. Experts transform those materials into sheet brass, which is then cut, stamped and affixed to the pencil.

That brings us to the eraser. It is made from "factice," a rubber-like product that is produced by rapeseed oil from the Dutch East Indies reacting with sulfur chloride.

To be sure, an awe-inspiring amount of work goes into producing a pencil. Millions of people collaborate to produce it — millions ply their unique trades and skills — yet they have no idea they are collaborating.

Each is merely changing his small piece of know-how for the money he needs to buy the goods and services he wants.

More amazing is this: No one person is capable of making a pencil. Not even the president of the pencil company.

No one person could possibly manage the millions of people — and the millions of decisions they make — who produce the ingredients that become a pencil.

Despite the absence of a mastermind, billions of pencils are made every year. They're produced with such humdrum efficiency that every one of us takes pencils for granted.

It is a folly for any, man, or group of men, to think of producing something as incredibly complex as a pencil. How much harder must it be to produce a car — one that consumers will want to buy, anyhow?

NHHS
Comments of Robert Fromer
June 21, 2012
Page - 64 -

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Fromer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent flourish at the end.

Robert Fromer

Attachment: International Best Management Practices DataBase

Overview of Performance by BMP Category and Common Pollutant Type

International Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database
[1999-2008]



Prepared by:

Geosyntec Consultants
Wright Water Engineers, Inc.

Prepared for:

Water Environment Research Foundation
American Society of Civil Engineers (Environmental and Water Resources
Institute/Urban Water Resources Research Council)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Federal Highway Administration
American Public Works Association

June 2008

Analysis of Treatment System Performance Disclaimer

The BMP Database ("Database") was developed as an account of work sponsored by the Water Environment Research Foundation (WERF), the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Environmental and Water Resources Institute (EWRI), the American Public Works Association (APWA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (collectively, the "Sponsors"). The Database is intended to provide a consistent and scientifically defensible set of data on Best Management Practice ("BMP") designs and related performance. Although the individuals who completed the work on behalf of the Sponsors ("Project Team") made an extensive effort to assess the quality of the data entered for consistency and accuracy, the Database information and/or any analysis results are provided on an "AS-IS" basis and use of the Database, the data information, or any apparatus, method, or process disclosed in the Database is at the user's sole risk. The Sponsors and the Project Team disclaim all warranties and/or conditions of any kind, express or implied, including, but not limited to any warranties or conditions of title, non-infringement of a third party's intellectual property, merchantability, satisfactory quality, or fitness for a particular purpose. The Project Team does not warrant that the functions contained in the Database will meet the user's requirements or that the operation of the Database will be uninterrupted or error-free, or that any defects in the Database will be corrected.

UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING CLAIMS OF NEGLIGENCE, SHALL THE SPONSORS OR THE PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES INCLUDING LOST REVENUE, PROFIT OR DATA, WHETHER IN AN ACTION IN CONTRACT OR TORT ARISING OUT OF OR RELATING TO THE USE OF OR INABILITY TO USE THE DATABASE, EVEN IF THE SPONSORS OR THE PROJECT TEAM HAVE BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

The Project Team's tasks have not included, and will not include in the future, recommendations of one BMP type over another. However, the Project Team's tasks have included reporting on the performance characteristics of BMPs based upon the entered data and information in the Database, including peer reviewed performance assessment techniques. Use of this information by the public or private sector is beyond the Project Team's influence or control. The intended purpose of the Database is to provide a data exchange tool that permits characterization of BMPs solely upon their measured performance using consistent protocols for measurements and reporting information.

The Project Team does not endorse any BMP over another and any assessments of performance by others should not be interpreted or reported as the recommendations of the Project Team or the Sponsors.

Analysis of Treatment System Performance Overview of Performance by BMP Category and Common Pollutant Type

The following one-page tabular summary provides analysis results from available monitoring data drawn from the International Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Database as of October 2007 to determine whether any differences in treatment performance may be determined based on BMP category (e.g. detention basin, media filter, wetland basin, etc). Summary statistics are provided for the median and upper and lower 95th percentile confidence limits for the median for each BMP study's average influent and effluent event mean concentrations (EMCs) over the entire respective monitoring period, grouped by BMP category. For each water quality constituent examined, only those BMP studies reporting at least three influent and effluent EMCs were included in the analysis data set. Additionally, the Database may contain additional studies not included in these analysis results due to unique site features or monitoring designs that may also be useful in assessing BMP performance.

Note on Hydrodynamic Devices:

For this overview-level analysis, BMPs have been grouped into broad categories. These categories may mask distinctive differences in design and performance in subcategories for multiple BMP types. This is particularly true for the Hydrodynamic Device (HD) category, which represents a wide range of various proprietary and non-proprietary device types. Each of the BMPs categorized as HD device types incorporates or emphasizes a number of different unit processes and design elements (e.g., storage versus flow-through designs, inclusion of media filtration, etc.) that vary significantly throughout the category. These design features likely have significant effects on BMP performance and the underlying detailed data analysis for each HD device (available from www.bmpdatabase.org) should be referenced before drawing conclusions on the performance of Hydrodynamic Devices (and to some extent other BMP types.) At this time it is not possible to identify which unit processes or design elements represent key differentiators in performance, nor to further subdivide this category. Any interpretation or use of the results presented herein should fully acknowledge the widely varied nature of Hydrodynamic Devices, as well as other BMP categories. We recommend that for HD devices in particular that more attention be paid to the observed ranges in performance than median or mean effluent values. The Project Team's future plans include developing additional BMP categories (and subcategories) as more studies become available.

Median of Average Influent and Effluent Concentrations of Best Management Practices

Constituents	Sample Location	Detention Pond (n=25) ^a	Wet Pond (n=48) ^a	Wetland Basin (n=16) ^a	Biofilter (n=67) ^a	Media Filter (n=28) ^a	Hydrodynamic Devices (n=32) ^a	Porous Pavement (n=6) ^a
Suspended Solids (mg/L)	Influent	72.65 (41.70-103.53)	34.13 (19.16-49.10)	37.76 (18.10-53.39)	52.15 (41.41-62.88)	43.27 (27.25-59.58)	39.61 (21.95-76.27)	xx
	Effluent	31.04 (16.07-46.01)	13.37 (7.29-19.45)	17.77 (9.26-26.29)	23.92 (15.07-32.78)	15.66 (9.74-21.98)	37.67 (21.28-54.02)	16.96 (5.90-48.72)
Total Cadmium (µg/L)	Influent	0.71 (0.45-1.26)	0.49 (0.20-0.79)	0.36 (0.11-0.60)	0.54 (0.40-0.67)	0.25 (0.12-0.49)	0.34 (0.17-1.11)	xx
	Effluent	0.47 (0.25-0.67)	0.27 (0.12-0.61)	0.24 (0.11-0.55)	0.30 (0.26-0.35)	0.19 (0.1-0.37)	0.57 (0.25-1.33)	xx
Dissolved Cadmium (µg/L)	Influent	0.24 (0.15-0.33)	0.19 (0.10-0.29)	xx	0.25 (0.21-0.28)	0.16 (0.11-0.21)	0.33 (0.11-0.55)	xx
	Effluent	0.25 (0.17-0.36)	0.11 (0.06-0.15)	xx	0.21 (0.19-0.23)	0.13 (0.10-0.18)	0.31 (0.13-0.71)	xx
Total Copper (µg/L)	Influent	20.14 (8.41-51.79)	8.91 (5.29-12.52)	5.65 (2.67-8.61)	31.93 (25.25-38.61)	14.57 (10.87-18.27)	15.42 (9.20-21.63)	xx
	Effluent	12.10 (5.41-18.66)	6.36 (4.70-8.01)	4.23 (0.62-7.83)	19.66 (7.68-13.68)	10.25 (8.21-12.29)	14.17 (8.33-20.01)	2.79 (0.88-6.78)
Dissolved Copper (µg/L)	Influent	6.66 (0.73-12.58)	7.33 (5.40-9.26)	xx	14.15 (10.14-18.16)	7.75 (4.55-10.96)	13.59 (9.62-17.36)	xx
	Effluent	7.37 (3.26-11.45)	4.37 (3.73-5.73)	xx	8.40 (5.65-11.45)	9.00 (7.28-10.72)	13.92 (4.40-23.44)	xx
Total Chromium (µg/L)	Influent	7.36 (5.49-9.88)	6.00 (3.58-10.08)	xx	5.63 (4.49-7.05)	2.18 (1.66-2.88)	4.07 (2.39-6.91)	xx
	Effluent	3.18 (2.10-4.84)	1.44 (0.79-2.68)	xx	4.64 (3.06-6.98)	1.48 (0.82-2.70)	3.52 (2.14-5.80)	xx
Total Lead (µg/L)	Influent	26.01 (12.06-37.95)	14.36 (8.32-20.40)	4.62 (1.43-11.89)	19.53 (10.11-29.95)	11.32 (6.09-16.55)	18.12 (5.70-30.53)	xx
	Effluent	15.77 (4.67-26.87)	5.32 (1.63-9.01)	3.25 (0.31-4.22)	6.70 (2.81-10.59)	3.76 (1.06-6.44)	10.56 (4.27-16.85)	7.68 (1.64-37.96)
Dissolved Lead (µg/L)	Influent	1.25 (0.33-2.17)	3.40 (1.12-5.66)	0.50 (0.33-0.67)	2.25 (0.77-3.74)	1.44 (1.05-1.82)	1.89 (0.63-2.95)	xx
	Effluent	2.06 (0.93-3.19)	2.48 (0.96-5.38)	0.67 (0.65-0.69)	1.96 (1.26-2.67)	1.18 (0.77-1.60)	3.34 (2.22-4.47)	xx
Total Zinc (µg/L)	Influent	1.1156 (51.50-171.63)	60.75 (45.25-76.27)	47.07 (24.47-90.51)	176.71 (128.26-225.15)	92.34 (52.29-132.40)	119.08 (73.50-164.67)	xx
	Effluent	60.20 (20.70-99.70)	29.95 (21.13-37.56)	30.71 (12.80-66.66)	39.63 (28.01-51.58)	37.63 (16.80-58.46)	80.17 (52.72-107.61)	16.60 (5.91-46.64)
Dissolved Zinc (µg/L)	Influent	28.11 (5.20-75.10)	47.46 (37.65-57.27)	xx	5.631 (32.46-79.16)	69.27 (37.67-100.58)	35.93 (4.96-66.90)	xx
	Effluent	25.94 (10.75-40.93)	32.86 (17.70-48.01)	xx	25.40 (18.71-32.09)	51.25 (29.04-73.48)	42.46 (10.36-74.55)	xx
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	Influent	0.19 (0.17-0.22)	0.21 (0.13-0.29)	0.27 (0.11-0.43)	0.25 (0.22-0.28)	0.20 (0.15-0.26)	0.34 (0.01-0.48)	xx
	Effluent	0.19 (0.12-0.27)	0.12 (0.09-0.16)	0.14 (0.04-0.24)	0.34 (0.26-0.41)	0.14 (0.11-0.18)	0.26 (0.12-0.48)	0.09 (0.05-0.15)
Dissolved Phosphorus (mg/L)	Influent	0.09 (0.06-0.13)	0.09 (0.06-0.13)	0.10 (0.04-0.22)	0.09 (0.07-0.11)	0.09 (0.03-0.14)	0.06 (0.01-0.11)	xx
	Effluent	0.12 (0.07-0.18)	0.06 (0.04-0.11)	0.17 (0.05-0.31)	0.44 (0.21-0.67)	0.09 (0.07-0.11)	0.09 (0.04-0.13)	xx
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	Influent	1.25 (0.63-1.66)	1.64 (1.39-1.94)	2.12 (1.58-2.66)	0.94 (0.94-1.69)	1.31 (1.19-1.42)	1.25 (0.33-2.16)	xx
	Effluent	2.72 (1.61-3.63)	1.43 (1.17-1.68)	1.15 (0.82-1.62)	0.78 (0.53-1.03)	0.76 (0.62-0.89)	2.01 (1.37-2.65)	xx
Nitrate-Nitrogen (mg/L)	Influent	0.70 (0.35-1.05)	0.36 (0.21-0.51)	0.22 (0.01-0.47)	0.59 (0.44-0.73)	0.41 (0.30-0.51)	0.40 (0.06-0.73)	xx
	Effluent	0.58 (0.25-0.91)	0.25 (0.13-0.37)	0.13 (0.07-0.26)	0.60 (0.41-0.79)	0.82 (0.60-1.05)	0.51 (0.08-1.34)	xx
TKN (mg/L)	Influent	1.45 (0.97-1.94)	1.26 (1.03-1.49)	1.15 (0.81-1.48)	1.80 (1.62-1.99)	1.52 (1.07-1.96)	1.09 (0.52-1.67)	xx
	Effluent	1.69 (1.56-2.19)	1.09 (0.87-1.31)	1.05 (0.82-1.34)	1.51 (1.24-1.78)	1.55 (1.22-1.83)	1.48 (0.87-2.47)	1.23 (0.44-3.44)

^aActual number of BMPs reporting a particular constituent may be greater or less than the number reported in this table, which was based on number of studies reported in database based on BMP category.

Notes: xx: Lack of sufficient data to report median and confidence interval. Values in parentheses are the 95% confidence intervals above the median. Differences in median influent and effluent concentrations does not necessarily indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between influent and effluent. See "Analysis of Treatment System Performance, Metropolitan Stormwater BMP Database (1997-2007)" (Geosyntec and WVE 2007) for more detailed information. Source: Metropolitan Stormwater BMP Database June 2008 (www.bmpdatabase.org)

Response to Comments from Mr. Fromer June 21, 2012

Fromer Comment No. 1

The energy reduction of passenger service vs. automobile usage is a general average. Section 4.4.11 of the EA Table 4-31 indicates the energy savings for this proposed project due to diverting passengers from the automobile to trains and exceeds the general average value stated in Section 1.1. Table 4-31 is based on the travel demand models prepared by both Amtrak and CTDOT.

Fromer Comment No. 2

The long range growth projections in the Northeast market are taken from Amtrak's document "The Northeast Corridor Infrastructure Master Plan". Ridership projections for the proposed project are based on travel demand models prepared by both Amtrak and CTDOT; the results are included in the technical report "Service Development Plan" listed in Section 8.0 of the EA.

Fromer Comment No. 3

The Green House Gas Emission Analysis can be made available from CTDOT upon request.

Fromer Comment No. 4

Regarding your comments about the Hartford-New Britain busway; that project was studied under a separate NEPA document and is, therefore, a different project with a different purpose, need, and logical termini than NHHS.

After coordination with Amtrak and the freight railroads and studying railroad operation models based on the future passenger and freight service it has been determined that the tracks improvements proposed for the NHHS Rail Project are adequate to provide the future railroad service without causing adverse impact to on-time performance or delay; more than two mainline tracks are not required.

Fromer Comment No. 5

The EA/EIE is a document to allow FRA to make a decision about the proposed project. It, therefore, does not generate the level of detailed information that is needed during final design and construction. During the final design process CTDOT will meet all of the regulatory and permitting requirements in order to identify and properly mitigate impacts to ground and surface water.

Fromer Comment No. 6

Section 4.4.11 of the EA Table 4-31 indicates the energy savings for this proposed project due to diverting passengers from the automobile to trains. Projections of ridership, modal splits, and reductions in VMT for the proposed project are based on travel demand models prepared by both Amtrak and CTDOT; the results are included in the technical report "Service Development Plan" listed in Section 8.0 of the EA.

2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses

Throughout the public process from May 8 through June 22, 2012 comments were received through the NHHS project website or via emails directly to CTDOT. The following is a summary of comments received with the corresponding response. The comment number references the section of the EA to which it applies. For clarity and brevity, some comments were paraphrased or excerpts were created that capture the principal concerns or issues. Where multiple comments were received on the same topic, the comments provided in this listing may be a composite of two or more commentators. A full version of the comments received, arranged by author, is provided in this appendix as “3. List of Specific Public Comments Keyed to Responses”.

Summary of Comment 1.1 A:

A number of comments strongly support the New Haven Hartford Springfield rail line. They comment that many people are excited for real rail travel in the region and that project would bring much needed economic development to our region, increase options for travelers, and reduce traffic congestion....and reduce automobile air pollution. One person stated that “It would be wonderful to hear more trains and fewer cars” and another asked “Please provide the anticipated project cost.”

Response to Comment 1.1 A:

Thank you for your comments in support of the project. Regarding projected price, Section 1.1, pg. 2 of the EA indicates that the NHHS Rail Program will cost approximately \$650 million to implement.

Summary of Comment 1.3 A:

“I have proposed on a local news website bridging the canal next to the train station platform and closing River Bank Road next to the old Montgomery mill to motor vehicle traffic wishing to access the south entrance of the canal trail. (Pedestrians and bicycles would still be allowed as well as emergency vehicles.) Redirecting visitors with cars to this new access point for the canal trail may obviate the need to place a barrier on Bridge Street that may impact trucks entering Ahlstrom’s entrance. My proposal calls for a federal, state and local (Windsor Locks) partnership to pay for the expense of constructing the canal bridge.”

Response to Comment 1.3 A:

The additional scope recommended in the comment is not currently included in the NHHS High-Speed Intercity Rail Project being constructed by CTDOT. The recommended additional scope item(s) could be pursued as a separate project by the appropriate agency.

Summary of Comment 1.3 B

Three comments were received requesting that the improvements proposed for New Haven’s State Street Station be prioritized and constructed as soon as possible. The following comment from a representative of the City of New Haven is representative of these comments:

- “The New Haven City Plan Department and others would like to know why State Street project has been pushed to Phase 4 since New Haven has second highest forecasted ridership (1,450 daily riders) as indicated in the EA on Page 15. The EA also does not show exact timelines for the completion of the project. New Haven is one of the dense urban areas in CT with several people (nearly 40%) using non-motorized transportation. New Haven deserves to be included in the current construction project for station and track improvements. Also, New Haven population increased by 5% from 2000-2010 and is further expected to increase by another 5% from 2010-2015 according to CT Data Center and by 11% from 2010-2020. Several on-going developments promoting economic 2020 growth are currently happening in New Haven this indicating a strong need for the use of the proposed service in the immediate future.”

Response to Comment 1.3 B:

As indicated in Table 1-1 and in Sec. 1.3 (on page 10) of the EA, the available funding for the project cannot be used for the construction of regional rail stations; CTDOT must therefore apply for future funding from the FTA for improvements to New Haven's State Street Station, and proposed new stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford and Enfield.

Summary of Comment 1.3 C:

Two people commented that "Currently, a mix of single and double track exists between New Haven and Berlin. Upgrade the current mix to double track. The same applies to the track system from Hartford to Springfield."

Response to Comment 1.3 C:

Section 1.3 of the EA, Figure 1-2 (Page 11) indicates that double track will be provided at all single track locations between New Haven and Springfield except for the Hartford viaduct and the Connecticut River Bridge. These two segments, listed on Page 10 of the EA, are beyond the NHHS Rail Program, not necessary for the currently planned NHHS rail corridor service enhancements, and will be advanced as separate projects as necessary.

Summary of Comment 1.3 D:

Two people commented or expressed concern for coordination of this project with the proposed CT FastTrack busway project and the proposed reconstruction or replacement of the I-84 viaduct, specifically:

- "The New Britain-Hartford Busway aka CT Fasttrack, Amtrak High Speed Rail Project and the anticipated I-84 Highway Viaduct replacement project essentially use the same right-of-way. The consideration, coordination and discussion of these projects are essential to the economic vitality of the region. We ask that better coordination among the related projects and other City initiatives be considered and included in the report and planning efforts going forward."
- "Finally the CT DOT has just committed to a study of the feasibility of relocating both the rail and highway viaducts. The EA/EIE document commits to a 20 year life of the existing conditions. We strongly believe that the moment to carry out this vision is within build out of the rail project and not 20 years down the road. We look forward to working together on these interconnected projects."

Response to Comment 1.3 D:

Section 1.3 of the EA, Figure 1-2 (Page 11) indicates this project does not include double track in the area of the Hartford viaduct. This segment, listed on Page 10 of the EA, is beyond the NHHS Rail Program, not necessary for the currently planned NHHS rail corridor service enhancements, and will be advanced as a separate project as necessary. At that time it will be completely coordinated with the City of Hartford. The 20 year planning horizon is for the rail operations (passenger and freight service) and does not preclude advancing the improvements to the Hartford viaduct and I 84 viaduct as a separate project earlier than the planning horizon.

Summary of Comment 2.0 A:

Several people either questioned the need to the project altogether or gave their strong support for the project. On the former point, some called the project a waste of tax dollars or a boondoggle or questioned the need for high speed rail; on the later point, some were in favor of the project because it will alleviate traffic congestion and will be "absolutely vital to economic, cultural, recreational, educational development and expansion."

Response to Comment 2.0 A:

Thank you for your comment expressing your concerns for advancing and funding the project. Section 2.0 of the EA identifies the project's "Purpose and Need" which qualitatively and quantitatively define the transportation problems that the project addresses and identifies the need for the project. The EA acknowledges the positive economic benefits of the project in Sec. 4.5, pg. 194 (Cost Benefit Analysis).

Summary of Comment 2.0 B:

Several people questioned the geographic extent of improved passenger rail service and suggested that the sponsors of the project should extend service to other towns, cities or destinations not currently included in the project (including Bradley International Airport, New Britain, Waterbury); and/or expanding physical improvements at new or existing stations to provide more convenient access to nearby properties.

Response to Comment 2.0 B:

Thank you for your support of the project. Regarding options for increasing the scope of the project, Section 2.0 of the EA identifies the purpose and need for the project which calls for the focus of transportation investment in the New Haven to Springfield corridor and does not include diverting trains to other destinations not on the history Springfield Line. This proposed action does not preclude future investment in other corridors or adjacent projects

Summary of Comment 2.0 C:

“Operation Concern; Amtrak is moving to E-ticketing this summer. The interface to Amtrak at New Haven must allow for this.”

Response to Comment 2.0 C:

Section 2.0 of the EA identifies the purpose and need for the project which calls for addressing the future transportation needs of the region for intercity and commuter service. Modern fare collection and a unified fare structure is anticipated to be integrated into the system.

Summary of Comment 3.3 A:

“Briefly reviewing the EA, it confirms the need and demand for the North Haven station. Also the maps show no new lines need to be constructed between New Haven and North Haven, only renovations. Consideration should be given to funding the North Haven station construction to provide an immediate benefit to commuters in the overly congested New Haven area.”

Response to Comment 3.3 A:

Thank you for your support of the North Haven Station location alternative. The EA has analyzed the need for rail infrastructure to support the increased passenger rail traffic and determined that two tracks are adequate providing that the system also has two tracks north of North Haven. Those analysis results are included in Section 4.4.11 of the EA. The construction timeline for proposed new stations (including North Haven) will be dependent upon receipt of future funding from state and federal sources.

Summary of Comment 3.3 B:

Over three dozen people submitted correspondence stating strong support for moving the Windsor Locks train station from its current location on South Main Street to an alternate location in the center of town that is adjacent to the town’s historic train station on Main Street. They cited a variety of reasons why the move would benefit the town, region and state including:

- The train station would act as a catalyst to revitalize the downtown business district and spur economic development (including transit oriented development) and retail along Main St. and the revitalization of the old Montgomery Mills.
- This opportunity should not be squandered as we will never get another opportunity to correct the ills of the past.
- Job growth will be a result of this move.
- The downtown location would increase the ridership on the trains in this area.
- There is a density of housing in the downtown area that is within walking distance of the proposed alternate downtown station location; residents of this housing could walk to the station and have better access to jobs and medical services in the region.
- Downtown is a better location to connect to Bradley International Airport.

- The move would build on the reputation of the town being the "Gateway to New England".
- The existing train station site is remote, dark and is poor for personal security.
- Traffic will adapt to the new location and traffic mitigation measures will offset impacts.
- The downtown location will support efforts to preserve the historic train station.
- The downtown location is more visible and convenient; people will view public transportation as part of daily lives rather than some out of the way thing that doesn't concern them.

Response to Comment 3.3 B:

Windsor Locks Station: Two alternative station site options, each including improvements to support a bus shuttle connection to Bradley International Airport, were considered for this station. One alternative site is the current rail station. The Town of Windsor Locks has stated its preference for relocating the station north of the Town's Central Business District, as part of a proposed renovation and expansion of the Windsor Locks Commons development and adjacent to an existing historic station structure. Future (2030) additional parking demand at Windsor Locks Station is estimated to be 107 spaces.

During the public comment period and at the Public Hearings, there was overwhelming support from the Town of Windsor Locks and the public to relocate the train station north of the Town's Central Business District (CBD) in the vicinity of its original historic site. Both the Town of Windsor Locks and many Windsor Locks' residents expressed their opinion that such a decision would result in the train station becoming a catalyst for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and the re-vitalization of the CBD. A few residents expressed concerns relative to unacceptable traffic congestion and the perceived viability of a re-vitalized CBD.

CTDOT supports the Town's goal of TOD and re-vitalization. Insofar as Phase 3B (which includes the Windsor Locks station) is not currently funded, future funding sources would need to be identified in order to construct any station improvements in Windsor Locks.

Summary of Comment 3.3 C:

A representative of the Housing Authority of the Town of Enfield (EHA) stated support of the project and requested attention to the need to repair an undersized stormwater culvert located on railroad property that is apparently causing flooding on EHA property.

Response to Comment 3.3 C:

The improvement being proposed under the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (NHHS HSIPR) Project are directly related to making improvements to the existing infrastructure to allow for increased capacity and higher speeds. Since Amtrak is the owner of the railroad right of way, CTDOT is not responsible for maintenance or state of good repair items that are not directly related to increasing the speed and capacity of the railroad.

Many of the bridges and culverts along the corridor require rehabilitation or replacement because they cannot withstand the additional loading of a second track in their present condition. These bridges are included in the scope of work. Also, certain culverts along the corridor are undersized to the point where they are causing flood waters to overtop the rail, thereby reducing the speed that trains can operate.

These culverts are also included in the scope of work. However the culvert at Milepost 52.92 is in good condition; and, although its limited capacity is causing flooding in the area, the flooding is not severe enough to cause flooding of the track structure. Therefore, the culvert at Milepost 52.92 is not included in the scope of work for the NHHS HSIPR Project.

You are encouraged to contact Amtrak directly to discuss possible solutions to the flooding problems in Enfield under a separate action.

Summary of Comment 3.3 D:

Several people questioned why the passenger rail service associated with this project could not be extended west to New Britain and Waterbury and some suggested or stated that the proposed New Britain to Hartford busway project (CT FastTrack) should be cancelled since it would obstruct rail freight service or would preclude the future extension of passenger rail service to these central Connecticut cities located southwest of Hartford.

Response to Comment 3.3 D:

Thank you for your support of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield (NHHS) Rail Project. Regarding your comments about the Hartford-New Britain busway; that project was studied under a separate NEPA document and is, therefore, a different project with a different purpose, need, and logical termini than NHHS.

Regarding your recommendation that rail service be provided to New Britain, the NHHS Rail Project is funded as an intercity rail initiative rather than a commuter rail program. Therefore, providing commuter service to New Britain would have to be part of a separate project.

After coordination with Amtrak and the freight railroads and studying railroad operation models based on the future passenger and freight service it has been determined that the tracks improvements proposed for the NHHS Rail Project are adequate to provide the future railroad service without causing adverse impact to on-time performance or delay; more than two mainline tracks are not required.

Summary of Comment 3.3 E:

"While the Judd Square Station site would be close to my home, and therefore personally desirable, my constituents have expressed some fear of traffic harming their children at the bus pull-in. If you select Judd Square, please use fencing to protect pedestrians of the Judd Square complex. The Town Council prefers North Cherry Street to avoid construction of a parking garage and to keep Ward Street open for emergency vehicles to cross the tracks when train is in the station."

Response to Comment 3.3 E:

Thank you for your comment stating your opinions regarding the alternative locations for the Wallingford Station. The Town of Wallingford has formally recommended that the station be constructed at Parker St as the locally preferred alternative. Based on this input CTDOT has decided to follow the public's recommendation and locate the station at Parker St.

Summary of Comment 3.3 F:

"In Wallingford, please use the historic downtown station location, perhaps creating car overpasses or underpasses so the trains do not block car traffic."

Response to Comment 3.3 F:

Section 3.3 of the EA (Page 17) indicates that the existing station location is not compatible with the addition of high-level platforms, which would block streets. Overpasses or underpasses to avoid grade crossings would require significant acquisition of property; homes and businesses.

Summary of Comment 4.1 A:

Two communications were received urging the sponsors of the project to minimize environmental impacts of the construction and operations of the rail line to the extent possible.

Response to Comment 4.1 A:

The project will largely consist of reestablishing the historic second track and that all of the possible impacts and mitigation is outlined in the document, attachments, and appendix on the web site.

Summary of Comment 4.2.1 A:

"I am concerned about additional trains in this corridor running on diesel fuel. New Haven is considered an environmental justice community by the state of Connecticut because of its combination of heavy pollution and socio-economic deprivation. Residents are subjected to pollution from two interstate highways, a sludge incinerator, a major regional port with diesel traffic, multiple cement batching facilities, transfer stations, and chemical manufacturers. 20% of New Haven children have asthma, the highest rate in the state. We cannot bear the burden of any increased toxic air emissions."

Response to Comment 4.2.1 A:

Section 4.2.1 of the EA (Page 38) indicates that the proposed project would not result in any local or regional short-term or long-term adverse air quality impact. Also, Section 4.4.11 of the EA (Page 169) indicates that the project would reduce overall energy consumption by 304 billion BTU's per year because of the reduction of automobile usage. The reduction in energy consumption is directly proportional to a reduction in greenhouse gas emission.

Summary of Comment 4.2.2 A:

A few people who live adjacent to or close to the rail line expressed concern about noise associated with increased train service.

Response to Comment 4.2.2 A:

Most of noise impacts associated with the project are due to train horn noise as trains approach and pass through grade crossings along the corridor. As noted on pg. 52 in Sec. 4.2.2 of the EA, "As part of the project, Amtrak will install supplemental safety devices required for Quiet Zone designation at all public crossings along the NHHS corridor, enabling mitigation of train horn noise. Amtrak and the local municipalities affected would need to jointly sponsor Quiet Zone applications for FRA approval."

Summary of Comment 4.4.3 A:

Some people expressed concern and/or had questions about legislation, policies and procedures related to the EA or the acquisition of property required to undertake the actions identified in the EA.

Response to Comment 4.4.3 A:

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (CTDOT) appreciates your concerns relative to the proposed rail station in West Hartford.

This site is one of the four new regional stations being planned. It should be noted that currently there is no funding in place to move forward with this station or any of the new station locations. The project is being funded by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) through the American Recoveries and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) as High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Service from New Haven to Springfield. Because the station at Flatbush Avenue is considered a regional station (it would increase the benefits of improved rail service by also accommodating commuter service) it is not eligible for FRA funding. CTDOT intends to apply for future Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding to construct the four new regional stations at North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield, as well as, provide an additional platform at the State Street station in New Haven.

No Rights-of-Way action for the West Hartford station is pending at this time. The applicable law and mitigation of impacts related to any property acquisitions associated with the project is as follow:

Section 4.4.3 of the EA (Pages 96 and 98) states that:

- Applicable Law: CTDOT is required to comply with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970 and provide monetary and other relocation assistance to displaced property owners whose properties are acquired for the implementation of federally funded projects.

- Mitigation: In order to mitigate the acquisition of properties for station construction, affected property owners will be afforded relocation assistance through the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policy Act of 1970. CTDOT is authorized and required to provide monetary and other relocation assistance to displaced property owners whose properties would be acquired for implementation of the proposed federally funded project.

Section 5.2 of the EA (Pages 201 and 202) identifies meetings held with West Hartford local officials on 4/29/2011 and 7/27/2011 to review the proposed project including the site selection process for proposed new train stations as well as parking layout.

Summary of Comment 4.4.6 A:

“...Will we be notified if the landscaping along the tracks and our homes will be altered?”

Response to Comment 4.4.6 A:

Visual Resources and Quality is an environmental resource included in Section 4.4.6 that the project intends to maintain. There will be public meetings during design phase at which time decisions regarding landscaping will be made.

Summary of Comment 4.4.6 B:

“What is the reason the historic train station (at Windsor Locks) cannot be used as a train station again - is it solely cost?”

Response to Comment 4.4.6 B:

Cost is a consideration but not the prevailing consideration in determining if an existing structure can or should be renovated and adapted to meet the demands of a modern transportation facility. Other considerations include building code issues and challenges and life-safety systems that often make adapting old structures to modern functions impractical, especially if the structure is listed on the state or national registers of historic places (the Windsor Locks historic station is nationally listed as indicated in Sec. 4.4.6 of the EA). Improvements that would negatively affect the historic integrity or character of such buildings might be considered an unacceptable impact; also, the construction of high-level platforms and pedestrian overpass has the potential for adverse visual impact on this historic station.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 A:

“I think this project is a good thing, especially for commuters who do not have access to a car or cannot drive due to disability related reasons. I would like to see if any of the stops will connect to universities (CCSU, Naugatuck Valley, University of Hartford, UCONN Hartford Campus, etc.) and major workplaces in those areas that attract a lot of jobs. That may have even more appeal for people like me who have even more difficulty finding a job because of a disability.”

Response to Comment 4.4.10 A:

Thank you for your comment in support of the project. Discussion of the existing and proposed train stations that will experience increased passenger rail service under this project is provided in Sec. 4.4.1 of the EA. Discussion on transit, parking and pedestrian access to existing and proposed train stations is provided in Sec. 4.4.10 of the EA.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 B:

One commentator indicated that he approves the high speed rail program but does not approve of the location for the Meriden Train Station and platforms. He suggested that a location north of the present station next to State Street Extension would be better since he believed that “no street crossings would be blocked by gates” since “...Camp Street has a bridge that goes over the (railroad) right of way.”

Response to Comment 4.4.10 B:

Section 4.4.10 of the EA details the anticipated impacts that increased train service would have on traffic operations at existing at-grade crossings and improvements that will be implemented to mitigate these impacts. Page 164 contains statement "Intersections adjacent to the Meriden Station will not deteriorate in LOS (level of service of traffic operations) due to grade crossings compared to the no-build conditions and there are no adverse impacts.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 C:

"Why will the track speed rating be restricted to a 110 MPH limit when many European nations have trains traveling at much higher speeds on rails with ratings well above that on a regular basis?"

Response to Comment 4.4.10 C:

Train speeds are a function of many factors including distance between stops, frequency of at-grade crossings and track alignment. The proposed train speeds along the corridor are shown in Appendix D of the reference document "Service Development Plan". Section 8.0 of the EA provides instructions for reviewing reference documents.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 D:

"Can the old and new track lines handle heavy and oversized freight trains and at what times since there eventually is going to be 25 round trips by the commuter trains traveling on them?"

Response to Comment 4.4.10 D:

Section 4.4.10 of the EA, Tables 4-25 through 4-27 indicate that the anticipated delay to freight service in the future build case would be about the same as the future no-build case. Therefore, the infrastructure has enough capacity to accommodate all of the projected freight and passenger service. Oversized trains are operated under a special permit and schedule; the track configuration would be designed to accommodate such movements.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 E:

"Will commuter parking at the rail stations be free or are fees going to be imposed on the traveling public and if there is a fee how will it be regulated and where will the moneys collected go towards?"

Response to Comment 4.4.10 E:

Section 4.4.10 of the EA, Table 4-30 indicates the number of parking spaces required at each station and that parking at New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield stations would be administered by local parking authorities. All other station parking would be administered by CTDOT where no parking fees are anticipated at this time.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 F:

Several people questioned the degree to which bicycle accommodations will be provided at stations and on trains and requested unboxed, roll-on bicycle access onto all trains running on the New Haven-Springfield corridor and sheltered or covered bicycle parking slots at stations.

Response to Comment 4.4.10 F:

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pg. 167) includes bicycle access to stations and bicycle storage. It does not identify facilities on the train. Such decisions could be made during final design and equipment selection.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 G:

One commentator criticized the proposed alternative to move the Windsor Locks station to the town center of Windsor Locks citing concerns about traffic congestion and delay that may occur along Main St and Bridge St. when trains stop at the station and gates at at-grade crossings remain closed during passenger exiting and boarding; especially considering greater frequency of train service. He indicated that "this significant traffic congestion would be discouraging to any prospective developers looking to invest in construction of commercial and business enterprises along Main St....".

Response to Comment 4.4.10 G:

Thank you for your comments expressing concerns for the traffic operations associated with the alternative to move the Windsor Locks train station to Main Street. Future traffic operations under the Build Condition (proposed action) have been studied in detail for all station sites and for all alternative station sites. Key findings of these studies is summarized in Sec. 4.4.10 of the EA including anticipated traffic impacts and proposed mitigation measures to bring traffic operations to an acceptable level of service.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 H:

Many commented or questioned the proposed passenger rail schedule or frequency of service to and from specific stations along the corridor as well as stations that the new service will connect to, such as stations along the Connecticut shoreline and in New York City. One commentator questioned whether passenger service could be provided to Boston.

Response to Comment 4.4.10 H:

A Passenger Service Plan is provided in Appendix 2 of the EA document. The seven day conceptual schedule includes the last southbound train leaves Springfield at 7:59 PM and the last northbound train leaves New Haven at 9:15 PM. The conceptual schedule also indicates the train through to New York City and other points south. A detailed schedule including weekends will be developed when operations begin. The current conceptual schedule does not include trains to Boston. Trains to Boston are part of a program being advanced by MassDOT.

Summary of Comment 4.4.10 I:

Several people noted that improved rail transit and new train stations present an opportunity for Connecticut to implement transit oriented development (TOD) or dense mixed-use development which would be less auto-oriented and would create more walkable and livable towns and cities along the corridor. Some questioned the need for parking lots surrounding train stations and expressed concern that such parking was not consistent with TOD strategies of encouraging development and improving walkability at and near the stations and that some of that parking could be either built by the private sector or eliminated if better bus connections or shuttles could be provided to and from the stations.

Response to Comment 4.4.10 I:

Section 4.4.10 of the EA (Pages 153, 165, and 166) discusses that the existing parking in the area of the stations is not adequate to support the projected ridership for 2030. The travel demand models completed by CTDOT and Amtrak were used to determine the modal split (riders getting out of their autos and boarding the train). Specific parking capacity requirements, based on those models, are included in Table 4-30. The basis of the modal splits and parking capacity requirements is a reference document (Data Collection/Ridership Analysis) which can be made available as described in Section 8.0 of the EA. Except for New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield the final layout of the station, pedestrian access, bus stalls, auto access, and parking layout will be determined during final design. As noted in Table 4-30, parking for New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield would not be constructed as part of this project but will be addressed and advanced by the local parking authorities to be compatible with their downtown development plans.

Summary of Comment 4.4.11 A:

Two people spoke in favor of the project and noted that improved mass transit will provide positive impact of fewer cars being used and a resulting reduction of carbon emissions.

Response to Comment 4.4.11 A:

Thank you for your comment in support of the project. The EA acknowledges the positive impacts associated with the reduction of vehicles miles traveled by cars in Sec. 4, pg. 169 (Energy) and in Sec. 4, pg. 194 (Cost Benefit Analysis). Section 4.4.11 of the EA (pg 169) identifies the anticipated annual reduction of over 90 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) due to people using the train in lieu of automobiles.

Summary of Comment 4.4.12 A:

“The EA contains several errors on the identification of Windsor sites in the HazMat and Leachate Waste maps of Vol. II. ...”

Response to Comment 4.4.12 A:

The reference data sources have been reviewed and determined that there are a number of sites incorrectly placed on the mapping as well as locations where the town of "South Windsor" is incorrectly noted. After revisiting the hazardous material sites in the study area we have determined that there are no CERCLIS or waste water leachate sites in Windsor. Revised mapping will be available after the comment period closes.

Summary of Comment 4.4.13 A:

“...There is no fence next to some of the property along the tracks, will you be upgrading the old fencing?”

Response to Comment 4.4.13 A:

Discussion on fencing existing and proposed along the NHHS rail corridor is provided in Sec. 4.4.13 of the EA. As mitigation a fencing policy would be established to provide protection in areas of known trespassing and at recreation and school locations.

Summary of Comment 4.4.13 B:

Several people had questions or concerns about safety or personal security on trains and at the stations and as well as questions about the ownership, management and maintenance of the new improvements, such as:

- “Will there be security scanning implementation at all rail stops to keep passengers safe on the trains...? – “Who will own, manage and secure the rail stations as well as the parking around them?”
- “As traffic usage increases on all these tracks then please provide some details as to how maintenance will be improved from past practices which will prevent bridges, culverts, rail beds, etc., to decay into a state of disrepair and keep the lines fully operational?”

Response to Comment 4.4.13 B:

Safety and security measures of the project are identified in Section 4.4.13 of the EA document. Applicable laws address safety, security, and maintenance. The NHHS Rail Program would conform to all applicable requirements. These measures would be incorporated into a comprehensive NHHS System Safety Program that ensures the development and coordination of responsibilities for implementing key safety and security policies.

Summary of Comment 4.4.13 C:

The following questions relate to crossings shown on Dwg. No. PLN-19 “Concept Design” – Plan, MP 39.5 to MP 41.7”:

- a) Do the labeled crossing gate improvements reflect existing or proposed conditions?
- b) If the later, the Wilson Ave. crossing at MP 39.8 is labeled “Flashers” and does not indicate Gates.
- c) Does CTDOT or Amtrak intend to close this crossing? If a crossing is labeled “Flashers and Gates” does that indicate that the gates will be full quad gates with median island (i.e. meet the standard for Quiet Zone designation)?

Response to Comment 4.4.13 C:

Section 4.4.13 of the EA, Table 4-34 identifies the Proposed Action at grade crossings. Per Table 4-34 Wilson Avenue is a Private at Grade crossing to be closed. Other grade crossings in Windsor will receive either two quad gates and a median or four quad gates. These improvements make them eligible to be designated as "Quiet Zones".

Summary of Comment 4.4.15 A:

Three individuals had questions or comments about the type of equipment that will be used for the new service: diesel or electric locomotives, summarized as follows:

- “Did planners of this project look at the possibility of using Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) to serve the New Haven-Springfield Line since they are a good type of train to use because of the noise factor and efficiency and that way the electrification of the line could be put off for some time?”
- “When will new modern electric locomotives be put into service here on this route?”
- “The real benefit of this project would be if the line is re-electrified to provide a one seat ride to and from Grand Central Terminal.”

Response to Comment 4.4.15 A:

Future electrification of the line is presented in the EA on page 185; the opening service intends to use diesel equipment. At this time Amtrak is planning to use locomotives (Appendix 2 of the EA) for the intercity trains with only a locomotive change at New Haven to provide intercity passengers a "one seat" ride. Using DMU's would require that intercity passengers change trains. The final equipment decision for the non-intercity trips has not been completed and DMU's are a potential choice.

Summary of Comment 4.5 A:

A few people questioned costs of the project versus its benefits, for example:

- “Your web site makes many claims about growth in ridership, reduction in car trips, etc. Where can I find a copy of the economic impact analysis?”
- “Please explain how commuter rail service will be managed to pay for itself and stay solvent and sustainable at any duration?”
- “What can be done to make riding the rail more affordable for more riders?...How many will ride when it becomes more expensive?”

Response to Comment 4.5 A:

The economic impact of the project is presented in the Cost Benefit Analysis provided in Sec. 4.5, pg. 194 and Appendix 7 of the EA.

Summary of Comment 4.5 B:

“The Bicycle touring companies and organizations are losing business because of the lack of an adequate rail system.”

Response to Comment 4.5 B:

Section 4.5 of the EA (Page 194) identifies benefits of the project. One of these benefits is to create more livable and sustainable communities by integrating compact, mixed-use TOD with pedestrian and bike-friendly design at station areas to allow people to use their cars less, and walk, bike and use transit more. TOD contributes to a more active, healthy lifestyle and more vibrant communities.

3. List of Specific Public Comments Keyed to Responses

Throughout the public process from May 8 through June 22, 2012 comments were received through the NHHS project website or via emails directly to CTDOT. The following is a listing of those comments in alphabetical order by the author's last name. The numerical portion of the response number references the portion of the EA to which it applies. The responses to the comments are included in "2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses".

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Windsor Locks Economic and Industrial Development		<p>Due to the proposed bus link to Bradley International Airport, Windsor Locks is slated to be a stop on all three proposed rail components: high speed, inter-city, and commuter rail. Four years ago we requested that Amtrak and DOT investigate relocating the train station stop from its current location at the outskirts of downtown back to its historic location at the heart of Main Street. The Town of Windsor Locks is bound and determined to relocate the Amtrak stop as it will be the catalyst to the revitalization of our Main Street. We appreciate DOT's support for our initiative over the last year.</p> <p>Relocating the train station would help in the redevelopment of a vacant mill complex, the Montgomery Building, into residential condominiums, as well as the restoration of the historic train station that has remained vacant for three decades. Unlike the current train platform location, the proposed relocation site has adjacent land that can be developed into residential and commercial uses that would complement the rail service. This project furthers several state development goals: Main Street revitalization; redevelopment of brownfields; Transit Oriented Development; and mass transportation.</p> <p>The Town, at its cost, hired a nationally recognized firm in railroad signalization, Campbell Technologies, to study the feasibility of relocating the train platform. Campbell Technologies concluded that the station could be relocated with some signal enhancements. DOT was provided the results of the Town's study and embarked on a review of its own concluding with traffic management enhancements the relocation is feasible.</p> <p>We are passionate about this project because we believe our Main Street would be a poster-child for Transit Oriented Development. We urge your continued assistance in making this revitalization effort a reality.</p>	3.3 B
Jonh		I think you need to move extension to New Britane, Waterbery and eliminated busway to New Britane.	2.0 B
Bob	Anderson	<p>Dear Sir: I would like to add my voice in encouraging that the train station platform be returned to the center of downtown Windsor Locks. If you have ever taken or returned to the existing location you would know how desolate and unattractive this location is. It is not conducive to encourage anyone to take the train from this location or to get off from a late arrival. I would have to believe that passenger location closer to downtown would help sway potential clients to use the rails system with a feeling of security as well access to the businesses located near there. The original location of the train station was chosen for reason's I have stated above and I believe that it should be returned.</p> <p>Yours Truly, Bob Anderson</p>	3.3 B
Mart	Andryzeck	<p>Re: Windsor Locks Train Station What is the reason the historic train station cannot be used as a train station again - is it solely cost? Marti</p>	4.4. 6 B
Thomas	Arroyo	Great idea!!!! It should pass, it will benefit the state in many ways. I strongly support this project. T. Arroyo	1.1 A
John	Asp	The State's plan demonstrates a long cherished tradition in Connecticut Government, spend the taxpayers money on whatever stupid idea comes along, regardless of the need. We are broke and yet you idiots spend like you just won the lottery, shelve this scheme.	2.0 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Susmitha	Attota	<p>I represent the New Haven City Plan Department. I am curious to know why State Street project has been pushed to Phase 4 since New Haven has second highest forecasted ridership (1,450 daily riders) as indicated in the EA on Page 15. The EA also does not show exact timelines for the completion of the project. New Haven is one of the dense urban areas in CT with several people (nearly 40%) using non-motorized transportation. New Haven deserves to be included in the current construction project for station and track improvements.</p> <p>Also, New Haven population increased by 5% from 2000-2010 and is further expected to increase by another 5% from 2010-2015 according to CT Data Center and by 11% from 2010-2020. Several on-going developments promoting economic 2020 growth currently happening in New Haven this indicating a strong need for the use of the proposed service in the immediate future.</p>	1.3 B
Mike	Barile	<p>Hi Mark, I want to voice my support for the relocation of the existing train station to be relocated in the towns downtown center. I am also in favor of the high speed project that would stop over in Windsor Locks.</p> <p>The relocation of our existing station would add spark and vitality back into the main street corridor. It would be good for business, It would attract new business. As a business owner who operates on Main Street, I would love to see the downtown area vibrant again, just like I did as a kid growing up here in the 60's. The "foot" traffic would increase. New apartments and condos could possibly spring up all around the area, bring in young people, and eliminate the ghost town feeling that our urban renewal project delivered to us in the 70's. This is our one chance to right that wrong, and at the same time make our downtown area a section to be proud of again. Please convey my feelings, and do everything possible to make this work.</p> <p>Regards, Mike Barile, Alaimo & Barile Real Estate</p>	3.3 B
Carl	Barnes	<p>Re: Windsor Locks train station</p> <p>Good morning. I am writing this quick note as I am unable to attend the meeting this week as I will be away on vacation. I am a board member on the W.L. chamber and believe the move of the railroad station to the center of town is crucial to the town being able to revitalize main street. Hopefully you will hear from the many people that I have talked with regarding this move. I have not heard one person who had anything negative on this subject. Sorry for not being their in person for the meeting, but Lake Champlain and 8 days of fishing is awaiting us.....thanks for your time and effort in making this a reality in in our town.....thanks.....Carl.</p>	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Eric	Barz, AICP	<p>1. The EA contains several errors on the HazMat and Leachate Waste maps of Vol. II. Here are the issues, listed by Map No.:</p> <p><u>Map 18A:</u> Two labels inaccurately state "South Windsor"...they should state "Windsor". The "Bristol Babcock inst" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor. The Leachate Waste Water symbol for "Taylor & Fenn" is located on the wrong side of 291. The Leachate Waste Water symbol for "Stanadyne Inc." is located under the bridge of 291 and in the river. The "caruso property" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor.</p> <p><u>Map 18B:</u> The symbol for the "bristol babcock inst" HazMat label should be removed. The Leachate Waste Water symbol for "Taylor & Fenn" is located on the wrong side of 291. The "ashland chemical/kyova corp" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor.</p> <p><u>Map 19A:</u> Question: Does the "Loomis Institute" really have a Leachate Waste Water site in the woods? The "ability machine and tool company" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor.</p> <p><u>Map 19B:</u> The "ability machine and tool company" HazMat label should be removed. The Leachate Waste Water symbol for "The Town of South Windsor" is located in the woods, Town officials suspect that the symbol could have something to do with Windsor's former Public Works Garage, which is closer to the street; James Burke, Windsor's Economic Development Director, may have further information about this site.</p> <p><u>Map 20A:</u> The "Kenyon Building" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor. The "chestel incorporated contel ipc" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor. The "deep river manufacturing company" HazMat label is a reference to a company that does not exist in the Town of Windsor.</p> <p>2. There are apparent errors on other map sets of Vol. II of the EA: Error on the "Community Facility" (Map No. 8A): Label inaccurately states "South Windsor"...it should state "Windsor". Error on the "Farmland Soils" (Map No. 18A): Two labels inaccurately state "South Windsor"...they should state "Windsor".</p>	4.4.12 A
Eric	Barz, AICP	<p>The following questions relate to crossings shown on Dwg. No. PLN-19 "Concept Design" – Plan, MP 39.5 to MP 41.7":</p> <p>a) Do the labeled crossing gate improvements reflect existing or proposed conditions?</p> <p>b) If the later, the Wilson Ave. crossing at MP 39.8 is labeled "Flashers" and does not indicate Gates.</p> <p>c) Does CTDOT or Amtrak intend to close this crossing? If a crossing is labeled "Flashers and Gates" does that indicate that the gates will be full quad gates with median island (i.e. meet the standard for Quiet Zone designation)?</p>	4.4.13 C
David	Bedell	Provide rail service to New Britain so we don't have to build the proposed busway.	3.3 D
David	Bedell	In Wallingford, please use the historic downtown station location, perhaps creating car overpasses or underpasses so the trains do not block car traffic.	3.3 F
David	Bedell	I hope you will provide state-of-the-art bicycle parking facilities at all stations, like in New Haven, and allow bicycles on all trains (hanging racks like on the new rail cars are the best option).	4.4.10 F
David	Bedell	Include some train service extending to Northampton in the north and to NYC in the south, to accommodate long distance travel without transfers.	4.4.10 H
Barbara	Bertrand	I have a grandson that we brought to Windsor Locks to take the train to Springfield. The station that exists is in no mans land and really needs to be moved to the center of Windsor Locks. The economic impact for that town would be tremendous and the ripple affect of this move would bring vibrancy to a depressed area. I would like nothing better than to go to Windsor Locks, have lunch on a spring day at an outside restaurant and watch the trains come and go. It would be exciting. I also have a son that lives in Manhattan and have taken the train from the station that exists. If you haven't come in later in the evening and had one of the lights out and the darkness it is terrible. I don't take the train anymore because they run late and the stations location.	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Scott	Bertrand	<p>The Housing Authority of the Town of Enfield (EHA) is stakeholder in the proposed railroad upgrades. It is our understanding that the proposed improvements to the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield rail corridor will have a positive impact on the EHA's moderate rental housing developments that borders both sides of the existing railroad line in Enfield.</p> <p>The EHA owns and manages 174 duplex townhouse style units of State of Connecticut financed moderate rental housing on Green Valley Drive, Laurel Park, Nutmeg Avenue, and Pearl Street. The Laurel Park property abuts the railroad right of way. The area of land that our buildings occupy has specific drainage issues that we are addressing with the civil engineering consultant firm, Weston & Sampson, (W&S). About 60% of the water runoff flowing onto our property and, through the town storm sewer system is from adjacent properties and town road surfaces including a bordering high school and also private lands on Nutmeg Avenue. All of this water flows to an undersized railroad owned culvert; (C 52.92) located near the junction of Green Valley Drive and Laurel Park. This culvert is only 24" in diameter. Weston & Sampson has determined that the size of this culvert is grossly inadequate to handle significant storm events.</p> <p>During significant storms we have observed water backing up to the degree that the pressure has lifted storm sewer manhole covers. We often experience ponding water at the bottom of Nutmeg Avenue where it meets Laurel Park Drive. The back yards of our units at the lower end of the property flood with ponding water evident in many yard areas. Weston & Sampson has determined that the EHA overall watershed calculations for a 2 year storm event is; 53.04 cfs; a 5 year storm event is 74.26 cfs and a 10 year storm event is 82.21 cfs. The culvert, according to Weston & Sampson, has a capacity of only 41 cfs with a headwater elevation of 72 feet. Anything higher will flood the backyards of our properties.</p> <p>It is our understanding that culvert; C52.92 will be replaced and/or upgraded as part of the proposed improvements. Therefore, the Housing Authority of the Town of Enfield supports proposed upgrades to the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield rail corridor. Please feel free to contact me should you need any additional information.</p> <p>Sincerely, Scott C. Bertrand, Executive Director</p>	3.3 C
Kevin	Brace	Please save our Main Street and bring the platform back to the center of Town. Thank you.	3.3 B
Leonard	Brace	I am excited about the prospect of the train station moving back to the center of our town. I believe this would be a positive move to bring our downtown back to life. Many of our residents are talking about this in hopes that it will finally happen. Please relocate the train station back to the center of town as it once was. Thank You, Leonard Brace	3.3 B
Marsha	Brace	I fully support the relocation of the train station into town where it used to be. This is one of the last historical landmarks we have left and we need to preserve it.	3.3 B
Eric	Buhrendorf	Please run late trains at least Friday and Saturday nights.	4.4.10 H
Eric	Buhrendorf	<p>Subject: NH H S Comments and requests</p> <p>Hi Mark, I have written letters to Amtrak and government leadership in towns along the rail. I was excited to hear about this effort. I moved to Berlin in summer '10 and was excited to find the train station as an available resource. One thing that deeply saddens and frustrates me however is that there are no late trains running. This means Friday or Saturday night we can't take the train into the city for dinner, theatre or cocktail hours and get home. Please comment this to the powers that be. I think being able to have night life on the weekends at least would take more drunk drivers off the road and boost economic activity in the cities.</p> <p>Thanks, Eric Buhrendorf – Berlin Town Council member</p>	4.4.10 H
Margaret	Byrne	I would like to see the train stop moved to the original location, north of the Route 140 bridge. There is opposition complaining of delays crossing the bridge. However I have heard that the loading of passengers onto forward or rear cars could alleviate that. Is that true? Having ridden MetroNorth to NYC, there are many stations at which only certain cars open for embarkation and disembarkation.	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Sue	Caldon	It is my pleasure to write a letter in support of relocating the Windsor Locks Amtrak Station from the south end of Main Street back to the heart of our downtown district. This move will be the beginning of the revitalization of Main Street in Windsor Locks and serve as a catalyst to build on the reputation of our town being the "Gateway to New England". If there is anything that I can do to help facilitate the relocation of the Windsor Locks Amtrak Station, up to and including knocking on doors to acquire petition signatures, please let me know.	3.3 B
Craig	Carr	This is needed more than ever and better rail between Springfield and Boston and is a way overdue must.	1.1 A
Chance	Carter	I was wondering if the planners of this project looked at the possibility of using Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) to serve the New Haven-Springfield Line. From what I have gathered, they are a good type of train to use because of the noise factor and their efficiency and that way the electrification of the line could be put off for some time.	4.4.15 A
Ann	Charbonneau	As a resident of town and located behind the plaza that includes newly opened CJ's Ranch restaurant I hope every day to see improvements in the area. I believe that moving the train station to the center of town would be the first step to improving this area of town. There are so many old run down abandoned buildings in the area, it would be such a boost for the town to get these cleaned up. Being on a main route I am sure the impressions that people passing through town get are far from positive.	3.3 B
Jason	Cirino	I've been a Hartford commuter for a number of years and feel the inadequate public transportation availability and convenience has reached a boiling point. Simply, there are just too many cars on our roads and highways. This project should be given high priority within the state and must be completed offering new, frequent channels to our great capitol city. This will not only benefit weekday traffic pressures, but also enable convenient weekend visits to Hartford's entertainment, museums, and restaurants! Get this done! Thank you	1.1 A
Mr. and Mrs. Richard	Clark	Mr. Alexander, We are a family from Windsor Locks who are very interested in the railroad station. We think it would add to the Main Street, and help people who need to use the trains to get to work and hospitals and other needs in Hartford and Springfield. We are retired and hope it can be returned to its original use. Sincerely, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Clark	3.3 B
Robert	Cleary	Your web site makes many claims about growth in ridership, reduction in car trips, etc. Where can I find a copy of the economic impact analysis?	4.5 A
Chris	Cryder	To: ConnDOT; From: Connecticut Fund for the Environment (CFE) Re: Environmental Assessment/Environmental Evaluation for the New Haven to Hartford to Springfield (NHHS) High Speed Intercity Rail Program; Date: 6/22/12 We are writing to express our strong support of the NHHS High Speed Intercity Rail Line. CFE believes that there are many benefits that improving and expanding our transit infrastructure will bring to the state; these benefits will help our economy, environment, and most of all, our residents. There are many economic benefits associated with the NHHS Intercity Rail Line. Construction of the rail line will create new direct jobs in the construction industry and for engineers and planners as well as indirect jobs for those who produce the metal and other materials needed for the project. Service on the rail line will enable employees to get to their jobs without dependence on a car and will offer employers a larger labor pool from which to choose. Additionally, with a growing transit network, Connecticut has an unparalleled opportunity to develop our communities. Transit-oriented development (TOD) is a proven economic growth strategy that combines mixed-income housing, employment, amenities, and recreational opportunities within close proximity to our transit stations. By doing so, Connecticut could create a housing and commercial supply that meets the demands of the 21st century, while generating an influx of new business that would produce new revenue to the state and local municipalities. We appreciate the involvement of Tom Maziarz and Cmmsr. Redeker on the Growing Connecticut Around Transit (GCAT) workgroup, and look forward to their support of developing interagency technical resource teams to help communities overcome the complexities of infill development, brownfield remediation, mixed-use, and mixed-income communities. There are also many environmental benefits that will be associated with the NHHS rail line. Affordable, efficient and reliable rail service offers an appealing alternative to driving in a car, thus alleviating congestion on our roads and decreasing the demand for gasoline. Less congestion also means a reduction in harmful	1.1 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
		pollutants emitted into the air and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Development around the stations to make the areas more walkable and livable will encourage residents to be more active, to walk places instead of drive and subsequently help foster a healthier, less sedentary lifestyle. Additionally, by including green infrastructure, low-impact development practices, energy efficient buildings, and distributed and renewable power generation in transit-oriented development areas, TOD has the potential to repair the local ecology and environment. CFE is a long-time supporter of the new CTfastrak. We learned from the CTfastrak experience that transit must be accessible to residents living in adjacent communities. A transit system needs an organized and overall plan for marketing and branding that includes outreach to residents along the line and to current and future rail users. In addition, state and local economic development and planning strategies should be integrated in order to produce strong and lasting development activities.	
Chris	Cryder	We also stress that the environmental impact of the construction and operations of the rail line be as minimal as possible. We urge ConnDOT to review critical areas such as stormwater runoff and to implement low-impact development (LID) standards and other green infrastructure techniques to help offset the environmental impact of the new high-speed rail. ConnDOT's ongoing involvement in workshops with DEEP and LID experts to explore improvements to CTfastrak plans has been heralded as a promising new model of collaboration, one in which we look forward to continuing on the NH-H-S project as the design process moves forward. We look forward to working with ConnDOT as this exciting project moves forward. Thank you for your consideration. Karen Burnaska Chris Cryder; Transit for Connecticut; Growing Connecticut Around Transit; CFE.	4.1 A
Neal	Cunningham	I strongly support moving the Windsor Locks train station to the north end of Main Street. It is far more accessible and will be of far greater value in developing that area. Already there is renewed interest in business property there. It is ideal for transit oriented development.	3.3 B
John	DeFrancesco	Rail line is absolutely vital to economic, cultural, recreational, educational development and expansion.	2.0 A
R.	DeGray	Move up New Haven State Street Station improvements (including direct pedestrian access to Strauss-Adler, Smoothie building in Wooster Square) to phase 2 of project.	1.3 B
R.	DeGray	As an addendum to my previous submission incorporation RailTec, please include: Currently, a mix of single and double track exists between New Haven and Berlin. Upgrade the current mix to double track. The same applies to the track system from Hartford to Springfield.	1.3 C
R.	DeGray	[1] traffic congestion in Connecticut is greatest on I-95 in New Haven and Fairfield Counties. That's where most traffic mitigation is needed; I-84 has two-thirds of the Average Daily Traffic of I-95. A one seat ride from Hartford County to Stamford/Greenwich/GCT will alleviate crowding across the whole state.	2.0 A
R.	DeGray	At Berlin Junction, split the double track corridor into two parallel rail corridors from Berlin to Hartford. For descriptive purposes, let's name the western corridor - the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line and the eastern corridor - the New Haven-Springfield Amtrak Line. The New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line would have a single track plus a multi-use bike trail between downtown New Britain and Hartford; the New Haven-Springfield Amtrak Line would be double tracked. Move local station stops (with the exception of Newington Junction) between Meriden and Hartford to the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield corridor. Those stops include Berlin and Elmwood. The Newington Junction station would be replaced by two stations, CCSU-Newington and Downtown New Britain. Newington Junction is poorly located because it was specifically situated as a transfer stop for the CTfastrak and should be eliminated.	2.0 B
R.	DeGray	Upgrade existing freight railroad track in Windsor & Suffield that go to Bradley Airport, so that airline passengers may have a one-seat ride to Bradley Airport.	2.0 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
R.	DeGray	CTfastrack should be eliminated in the Amtrak corridor and on Newington Secondary (Newington Junction to downtown New Britain. Sacrificing CTfastrack and replacing it with rail service through New Britain allows for more frequent service between New Haven-Hartford-Springfield. New overpass and bridgework that enhances grade separation of railroad tracks from streets and roads should be retained in the Amtrak corridor.	3.3 D
R.	DeGray	Add environmentally-preferred alternative in EA/EIE to current build, no build alternatives.	4.4. 3 A
R.	DeGray	Establish an active campaign to encourage bicyclists to bike to stations, roll their bikes on the trains and bike to destinations. Also provide high quality, sheltered (e.g. New Haven Union Station) bike parking at train stations for those who have no need to bike on the other end of their trip.	4.4.10 F
R.	DeGray	Run two parallel services south from Springfield to Hartford- New Britain - New Haven - New York; the other as an express service south from Springfield to Hartford-Meriden–New Haven-New York. Same services in northbound directions. These two services should not terminate in New Haven, but continue to Stamford and Greenwich as express trains and as soon as the dual-powered equipment (locomotives that also run on 3rd rail) is available the trains should terminate in Grand Central Terminal (“GCT”)[1]. On the New Haven to GCT segment of New Haven Springfield service create a 3-stop super express with a 1 hour 30 minute trip time.	4.4.10 H
R.	DeGray	Terminate New Haven-Springfield service in Northampton-Amherst to allow for a one-seat ride for college & university students.	4.4.10 H
R.	DeGray	To stimulate ridership, all stations should have rail accessible development (RAD) - comprised of housing & mixed use commercial rather than parking lots. The revenue garnered by developing these land lots now slated for subsidized parking should be utilized to operate subsidized time-transfer bus shuttles to the stations. Also use revenues, along with FTA safe routes to transit funding, to design complete streets in safe routes to transit bike sheds.	4.4.10 I
R.	DeGray	Bicycle touring companies and organizations are losing business because of the lack of an adequate rail system.	4.5 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Ron	DeGray	<p>3) implementing complete, livable streets within 3-mile radius ("safe routes to transit") of existing & planned New Haven-Springfield train stations - instead of car-first roads that Connecticut residents suffer with today. 4) new longer platform at New Haven State Street Station to accommodate Springfield-bound trains.</p> <p>5) extending the New Haven State Street Station cross-over from State Street to the Strauss-Adler (Smoothie) building in Wooster Square. This would significantly improve the walkability and bikability index for New Haven State Street station.</p> <p>6) Lowering & grade-separating the tracks in Wallingford & retaining the use of the current historic Amtrak station.</p> <p>7) upgrading existing freight railroad track in Windsor & Suffield that go to Bradley Airport, so that airline passengers may have a one-seat ride to Bradley Airport.</p> <p>8) inclusion of railroad tracks & station stops through downtown New Britain & Central Connecticut State University (the 3rd largest university in Connecticut) & a 9.4-mile bike (multi-use) trail from New Britain to Hartford. The bike trail, track & train stations would have an approximate price tag of \$75 million. This would obviate the need for the \$550 million "CT Fastrack" highway, a misnomer because it is neither fast, nor has tracks.</p> <p>9) termination of New Haven-Springfield service in Northampton-Amherst, which would allow for a one-seat ride for college & university students in New Haven and the 5 Colleges in the Pioneer Valley. New Haven-Springfield is known as the Knowledge Based Corridor - let this train service actually connect the universities and colleges.</p> <p>10) that all New Haven-Springfield trains terminate in Manhattan & operate as 3-stop super-express trains between New York & New Haven with stops in Greenwich, Stamford & Norwalk. Please consider EA/EIE include these elements in a third environmentally-preferred alternative that is in addition to the build, or no build scenarios currently outlined.</p> <p>Our transportation system needs to be multi-modal where rail, bicycling and pedestrians receives the highest priority. Comparing Connecticut with other progressive states and countries, it is shocking to see how far behind we have become. These points have an direct and indirect effects on transportation between neighboring states, the U.S. in general, Canada and Mexico. Please promote the above points by RailTEC.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ron DeGray, 120 Cricket Lane, Glastonbury, CT 06033-1851</p>	2.0 B
Ron	DeGray	<p>Dear Mr. Alexander, I absolutely support the points of Richard Stowe of RailTEC in regard to NHHS:</p> <p>1) unboxed, roll-on bicycle access onto all trains running on the New Haven-Springfield corridor.</p> <p>2) covered upside down U bicycle parking slots (think New Haven Union Station) adjacent to all NHHS stations including the New Haven State Street Station - instead of the car-first parking lots planners & the public have focused on to date.</p>	4.4.10 F

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Ronald W	DeGray	<p>g) implementing complete, livable streets within 3-mile radius ("safe routes to transit") of existing & planned NHHS train stations - instead of car-first roads that Connecticut residents suffer with today.</p> <p>h) new longer platform at New Haven State Street Station to accommodate Springfield-bound trains.</p> <p>i) extending the New Haven State Street Station cross-over from State St. to the Strauss-Adler (Smoothie) building in Wooster Square. This would significantly improve the walkability and bikability index for New Haven State St. station.</p> <p>j) Lowering & grade-separating the railroad tracks in Wallingford & retaining the use of the current historic Amtrak station.</p> <p>k) upgrading existing freight railroad track in Windsor & Suffield that go to Bradley Airport, so that airline passengers may have a one-seat ride to Bradley Airport.</p> <p>l) inclusion of railroad tracks & station stops through downtown New Britain & Central Connecticut State University (the 3rd largest university in Connecticut) & a 9.4-mile bike (multi-use) trail from New Britain to Hartford. The bike trail, track & train stations would have an approximate price tag of \$75 million. This would obviate the need for the \$550 million "CT Fastrack" highway, a misnomer because it is neither fast, nor has tracks.</p> <p>m) termination of New Haven-Springfield service in Northampton-Amherst, which would allow for a one-seat ride for college & university students in New Haven and the 5 Colleges in the Pioneer Valley. New Haven-Springfield is known as the Knowledge Based Corridor - let this train service actually connect the universities and colleges.</p> <p>c) that all New Haven-Springfield trains terminate in Manhattan & operate as 3-stop super-express trains between New York & New Haven with stops in Greenwich, Stamford & Norwalk.</p> <p>Also consider that EA/EIE include these elements in a third environmentally-preferred alternative that is in addition to the build, or no build scenarios currently outlined.</p>	2.0 B
Ronald W	DeGray	<p>Please support the points of RailTEC: e) unboxed, roll-on bicycle access onto all trains running on the New Haven-Springfield corridor. f) covered upside down U bicycle parking slots (think New Haven Union Station) adjacent to all NHHS stations including the New Haven State Street Station - instead of the car-first parking lots planners & the public have focused on to date.</p>	4.4.10 F
Thomas	Deller	<p>The City of Hartford reviewed the EA/EIE documents for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail. We are pleased to see this project moving forward and are strongly supportive of high speed rail though the City of Hartford.</p>	1.1 A
Thomas	Deller	<p>The New Britain-Hartford Busway aka CT Fastrack, Amtrak High Speed Rail Project and the anticipated I-84 Highway Viaduct replacement project essentially use the same right-of-way. The consideration, coordination and discussion of these projects are essential to the economic vitality of the region. We ask that better coordination among the related projects and other City initiatives be considered and included in the report and planning efforts going forward.</p>	1.3 D
Thomas	Deller	<p>Finally the CT DOT has just committed to a study of the feasibility of relocating both the rail and highway viaducts. The EA/EIE document commits to a 20 year life of the existing conditions. We strongly believe that the moment to carry out this vision is within build out of the rail project and not 20 years down the road. We look forward to working together on these interconnected projects.</p>	1.3 D
Thomas	Deller	<p>Aggregate usage estimates at Union Station are not included in the assessment of impacts. We believe the modal split calculation between bus and rail be included in the document. TOD and parking demand calculations scenarios and related impacts should also be included in the report. The report refers to DOT ridership analysis for the rail line. The City of Hartford has not received this analysis, and the regional transportation entity, the CRCOG is also unaware of this analysis. It would be helpful going forward if such analysis would be made available to the city and the region. The financing necessary to create the required parking at Union Station should be the responsibility of the State of Connecticut Department of Transportation and not the City of Hartford. Viable alternates other than creating more surface parking under the existing viaduct exist.</p>	4.4.10 I
Linda	Desarro	<p>Adding the New Haven to Springfield line just makes sense.</p>	1.1 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Nancy	Descrisantis	3) New Longer platform at New Haven State Street Station to accommodate Springfield-bound trains. 4) Extending the New Haven State Street Station cross-over from State Street to the Strauss-Adler building in Wooster Square. This would significantly improve the walkability and bikability index for New Haven State Street Station. Thank you for your consideration, Nancy Decrisantis, New Hartford, CT	2.0 B
Nancy	Descrisantis	Dear Mr. Alexander, The following are the most important issues for consideration, as rail advocates urgently need accommodations in order to use trains with bicycles. I consider these the most urgent, with immediate action needed. Please include them on your agenda. 1) Unboxed, roll-on bicycle access onto all trains running on the New Haven-Springfield corridor. 2) Covered upside down U bicycle parking slots adjacent to all NHHS stations including the New Haven State Street Station - instead of car-first parking lost focused on to date. The time has come for bicycles to be taken seriously as transportation in combination with public transportation, especially rail service. Additionally, there are many commercial bicycle touring companies and joining these commercial tours is near impossible unless one can take a bicycle via public transportation. This is always a huge problem. Not allowing bicycles on trains hinders one's access to many of these tours.	4.4.10 F
Chris	Ferrero	Moving the Windsor Locks station from its current location to the downtown area is a very positive initiative that will help revitalize the downtown area. I strongly support this relocation and look forward to a revitalized downtown area.	3.3 B
Emily	Freed	High speed rail/mass transit is a great way to reduce carbon emissions. Please support this project.	4.4.11 A
Maria	Giannuzzi	I have proposed on a local news website bridging the canal next to the train station platform and closing off River Bank Road next to the old Montgomery mill to motor vehicle traffic wishing to access the south entrance of the canal trail. (Pedestrians and bicycles would still be allowed as well as emergency vehicles.) Redirecting visitors with cars to this new access point for the canal trail may obviate the need to place a barrier on Bridge Street that may impact trucks entering Ahlstrom's entrance. My proposal calls for a federal, state and local (Windsor Locks) partnership to pay for the expense of constructing the canal bridge.	1.3 A
Maria	Giannuzzi	<p>In support of the proposed train station platform location north of the Windsor Locks' central business district, as part of a proposed renovation and expansion of the Windsor Locks Commons development, Environmental Assessment Impact Evaluation for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Project</p> <p>Dear Director Alexander: I wholeheartedly support the location of the planned train station platform north of the Windsor Locks' central business district, as part of a proposed renovation and expansion of the Windsor Locks Commons development. I am convinced that a downtown location will be the route to renewal not only for the community of Windsor Locks but for all of Connecticut.</p> <p>I'm sure you are already aware of the economic importance of a downtown train station not only to Windsor Locks, but all the towns of north central Connecticut. A downtown train station platform can literally be the jumping off point for a vibrant economic and cultural scene.</p> <p>DOT has the expertise and Windsor Locks a committed leadership to overcome any potential problems. I am confident that current thru-traffic along Main Street in Windsor Locks will quickly adapt if the train station platform is located downtown. As you know, there are three alternate routes including I-91, Route 5 and Route 75 that motor vehicles can use that will help prevent or limit any potential traffic congestion.</p>	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Maria	Giannuzzi	<p>Downtown Windsor Locks is fortunate to have the Connecticut River next door. The Connecticut is perhaps the most beautiful river in the Eastern United States. I have traveled many times by train from Boston and Washington, D.C. to Windsor Locks and have often been struck by the look of delight and wonder I see on the faces of fellow passengers, especially children, as the train slowly crosses the Connecticut River near King's Island and then rumbles alongside Main Street in Windsor Locks and its historic canal. Passengers traveling by rail in the Northeast are rarely treated to such a lovely sight. A downtown train station is a "natural" stopping place for visitors and commuters who wish to acquaint themselves with the history, wildlife, recreational areas and breathtaking river vistas of north central Connecticut.</p> <p>Director Alexander, there is no doubt in my mind that relocating the train station platform to our downtown area will reinvigorate the town of Windsor Locks and surrounding communities—and when communities prosper, Connecticut prospers. Sincerely, Maria Giannuzzi, 21 Spring Street, Apt. C-3, Windsor Locks, CT 06096</p>	3.3 B
Douglas C.	Glazier	<p>Subject: Windsor Locks Train Stop Mark, I would like to expand on the WL train-stop relocation a bit more, as there is so much history behind the change in WL Main St. area, economically and culturally. This I can discuss with firsthand experience as I was on the WL Redevelopment Agency during the 70's, 80's & 90's and saw much of the reconstruction of the WL downtown area. I've also been a member of the WL Board of Finance for the last 12 years and my term ends in 2015. Thus, I am well aware of where the town's revenues come from and I'm always hoping new business developments, as I know this will increase the town's revenue.</p> <p>I moved to WL in 1958 as I took a job with Hamilton Standard when I was separated from active duty in the US Army. I remember WL during those years (58-60's) and saw the entire downtown area demolished as part of town's revitalization/ redevelopment, funded by the federal government. Before the demolition, the downtown area was a one stop shopping center with a gas station, drug stores, hardware stores, banks, a theater, and a bar & grille with pool tables. Demolition took place during the late 60's & 70's and all the businesses that were displaced never returned, except for a drugstore for a few years that folded. Reconstruction of Main St. started in the 70's with two small shopping complexes running along most of the downtown area. Also during the 70's and on, the surrounding towns constructed these mega shopping complexes that had most of the WL residents going to these shopping areas as they were made for one-stop shopping. At the same time, this town became acclimated to having one or more cars as this became necessary for shoppers going to the mega shopping centers. The amount, size and variety of shops, being established in WL, was quite skimpy. Thus, the old days of Main St. being a one-stop shopping center, was gone, and will not come back to what existed many years ago. Then in the 80's, the WL Commons was constructed (that's the shopping center just north of the Old Train Station at the bend), and the builder went bankrupt as it was years before he got enough tenants to help pay the mortgage. And that has been a problem with these three shopping centers along WL Main St., in that there are always shop vacancies. They never get filled up as business developers do not see a good potential for a thriving business in the WL downtown area. I also do not see any new development taking place, in the downtown area, as there is no open land for development. There is the large Montgomery building, on the narrow strip of land between the WL Canal and the CT River, that was considered, on three different occasions, for converting the building to apartments, but was turned down each time, as not being feasible or practical. I doubt if any developer would buy that building to demolish it and construct businesses. Regards, Douglas C. Glazier, 167 Taft Lane, Windsor Locks, CT 06096</p>	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Douglas C.	Glazier	<p>Mark, There is not much time left to the June 22, 2012 deadline for input on the proposed upgrades to the RR system. Would you be willing to have me stop at your office to discuss why I believe the relocation, of the train-stop, would not trigger any economic development in the WL Main St area. I know Steve Wawruck and Patrick McMahon have visited your office (not sure of all the DOT personnel he met with) to make the case for relocation of the train-stop. I don't think anyone has met with DOT personnel to discuss another viewpoint on why the train-stop should remain at the south end of town, and I think it's important for DOT to see another perspective. My background in WL is more than sufficient to provide good insight on another viewpoint. I have been a member of the WL Redevelopment Agency that was responsible for the reconstruction of the WL downtown area.</p> <p>I've also have been a member of the WL Board of Finance for the last 12 years and no one, in town, knows better than I, the importance of economic development, as that is where the bulk of town revenue is generated. Steve Wawruck keeps stating that the train-stop relocation to the north area, would trigger big economic development along the downtown area. I strongly disagree with this concept as there is NO open space, for any economic development, along the downtown Main St. area. There is the Montgomery Building sitting on that narrow strip of land between the Canal and the CT River, that was turned down on 3 separate occasions for converting the building into apartments, as not being feasible or practical, which then says what would be done with that building. There is no good answer and no one is sure what will be done in that area that is so narrow, making vehicle entrance and egress very inconvenient. Economic developers would not see that area as conducive for development. It would be investing much money in an inconvenient location.</p> <p>I see no good reason to relocate the train-stop as it would NOT trigger major economic development as professed by First Selectman Wawruck and would cause major traffic congestion, causing much inconvenience to motorists, resulting in daily frustrations for motorists crossing the Bridge St. bridge, which has the RR Gates. I very much hope you would agree for me to meet at your office, this week for about an hour, to discuss the importance of not relocation the train-stop. Please feel free to call me anytime on 860-623-2272 or my cell phone on 860-478-0771.</p> <p>Thank you. Douglas C. Glazier, 167 Taft Lane, Windsor Locks, CT 06096.</p>	3.3 B
Douglas C.	Glazier	<p>CRITIQUE OF CHANGING THE RR TRAIN-STOP TO THE NORTH END IN WINDSOR LOCKS</p> <p>In Windsor Locks (WL), if the train-stop is relocated from its present location at the south end of Main St., to an area in proximity to the Old Train Station at the north area of Main St., serious traffic congestions will occur along Main St and Bridge St., making this relocation undesirable. This congestion problem occurs as the train-stop relocation requires the RR Gates, at Bridge St. & Main St., to drop when a train, coming from Springfield, stops at WL. As the train approaches the proposed WL station, the Bridge St. Gates will drop and stay down until the train has stopped, unloaded passengers, loaded new passengers, then proceeds to start and travel past the Bridge St. Gates, whereby the Gates will go up and vehicle traffic can proceed. CT DOT thinks this Gate down time to be about 2.5 minutes (very optimistic) and I think it will be more like 3-4 minutes, depending how many passengers unload & load. When this occurs, vehicles will be backed up on Main St. going south past Elm St. Also, vehicles will be backed up on Bridge St. all the way past Warehouse Point's Main St., and probably further. When the Bridge St Gates go up, imagine how long it will take these long traffic lines to clear through the Main St/Bridge St. intersection, considering some vehicles will have to wait for several traffic light changes before getting through that intersection. I expect this may take up to 7 or 8 minutes for all traffic to clear through that intersection.</p> <p>I experienced an interesting observation at this intersection a few months ago, as I was on Bridge St. when the Gates dropped (I was a few cars from the Gates). Then a freight train came through, so I timed the freight train and it was 1.5 minutes for the freight train to clear and the Gates opened. I looked back and saw vehicles backed up to Warehouse Point Main St. I had the green light so I proceeded across the tracks and turned left onto Main St., WL, and I saw vehicles backed up all along Main St., and past Elm St. by 3 or 4 vehicles. That was for a Gate down time of 1.5 minutes. Can you imagine how much further back vehicles will be stopped, with a 3 minutes Gate down time. These long traffic lines would be most objectionable by all of us.</p> <p>As already stated, with the proposed train-stop relocation to the north area, and an estimated time of 7-8 minutes for all backed up vehicles to clear the Main St- Bridge St. intersection, after a train goes through, can you imagine this occurring every 30-40 minutes a day, with 20 trains going through this intersection every day, when DOT has</p>	4.4.10 G

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
		<p>completed the dual tracks and has all 26 trains per day become operational. We all know this horrendous traffic congestion will be objectionable to the WL community as motorists will avoid crossing the CT River at Bridge St. It would also cause the people of East Windsor to avoid going into WL at Bridge St., and may have a negative impact on the businesses on WL Main St.</p> <p>Most importantly, this significant traffic congestion would be discouraging to any prospective developers lookin+M67g to invest in construction of commercial and business enterprises along Main St., WL. Eventually, the people of WL & E. Windsor would be requesting the train-stop to be relocated back to the south area of town. Keeping Gate down times to an absolute minimum can only be done with keeping the train stop in its present location, at the south end of town. Thank you.</p>	
Jean	Glazier	<p>To: Alexander, Mark W Subject: Relocation of train platform in Windsor Locks, CT.</p> <p>I want to comment on the above subject. I am very much opposed to relocating the platform. It has been at it's current location for well over 20 years and the location is fine. There is plenty of parking, it's right near I-91N or I-91S and Rte 159. To spend the necessary dollars to just move it to Main Street is ridiculous when funds are needed to do necessary things in other towns. It will be worthwhile to have a train platform in Enfield, CT. There is no room on Main St. near the old railroad station for parking, etc.</p> <p>I cannot fathom how it will benefit anyone to move the train platform. It definitely will cause traffic problems when the gates have to stay down longer to discharge and load passengers. I see NO BENEFIT AT ALL to the proposal to relocate the train platform. I cannot see why a developer would consider this an asset if he could find any space on Main St. to develop. If the thinking is that this move would benefit the development of the old Montgomery Building, I don't agree. This building should just be torn down - to get emergency vehicles (fire, ambulance, police, etc.) to the site is nigh impossible and if the train platform were moved, it would make it that much worse. I hope that when all the facts are considered, i.e. cost, need for improvements in other towns, etc.; that the train platform will stay where it is presently. There is not need for any change.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. My name is Lois Jean Glazier and I have resided in Windsor Locks since the last part of 1958. Currently I reside at 167 Taft Lane and my phone number is 860-623-2272 if you wish to discuss this. I have been very active in Windsor Locks. I was the Executive Director of the Windsor Locks Housing Authority for over 20 years, retiring in 1999. I have been the Clerk for the Board of Finance on and off for 18 years or so. I have been a member of the Board of Finance and a Selectman in Windsor Locks for a two year term. I am very active in the Windsor Locks Congregational Church on Main Street. I feel I am very qualified to offer my opinion on this matter and I thank you for your time.</p>	3.3 B
Peter	Gongola	<p>j. There are a few places in Enfield, Connecticut where homes are very close to the tracks especially along North and South River Streets to name a few so; are there any plans to put into place sound barrier fences along these areas of concern to reduce the anticipated increase in noise?</p>	4.2.2 A
Peter	Gongola	<p>f. Why will the track speed rating be restricted to a 110 MPH limit when many European nations have trains traveling at much higher speeds on rails with ratings well above that on a regular basis?</p>	4.4.10 C
Peter	Gongola	<p>g. Can the old and new track lines handle heavy and oversized freight trains and at what times since there eventually is going to be 25 round trips by the commuter trains traveling on them?</p>	4.4.10 D
Peter	Gongola	<p>l. Will commuter parking at the rail stations be free or are fees going to be imposed on the traveling public and if there is a fee how will it be regulated and where will the moneys collected go towards?</p>	4.4.10 E
Peter	Gongola	<p>1. Will there be security scanning implementation at all rail stops to keep passengers safe on the trains as well as to reduce, prevent or deter any free and easy infiltration of weapons, drugs and criminal elements from ending up into the streets of any town or city along the commuter rail route?</p>	4.4.13 B
Peter	Gongola	<p>k. Who will own, manage and secure the rail stations as well as the parking around them?</p>	4.4.13 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Peter	Gongola	m. As traffic usage increases on all these tracks then please provide some details as to how maintenance will be improved from past practices which will prevent bridges, culverts, rail beds, etc., to decay into a state of disrepair and keep the lines fully operational? Thank You.	4.4.13 B
Peter	Gongola	h. Since the New Haven to Springfield Commuter Rail line will start with old broken down and so called refurbished outdated Diesel engines borrowed from the shoreline system then when will new modern electric locomotives be put into service here on this route?	4.4.15 A
Peter	Gongola	i. Please explain how commuter rail service will be managed to pay for itself and stay solvent and sustainable at any duration?	4.5 A
Aaron	Goode	I am concerned about additional trains in this corridor running on diesel fuel. New Haven is considered an environmental justice community by the state of Connecticut because of its combination of heavy pollution and socio-economic deprivation. Residents are subjected to pollution from two interstate highways, a sludge incinerator, a major regional port with diesel traffic, multiple cement batching facilities, transfer stations, and chemical manufacturers. 20% of New Haven children have asthma, the highest rate in the state. We cannot bear the burden of any increased toxic air emissions. Aaron Goode, New Haven Environmental Justice Network	4.2.1 A
Ariana	Habib	I think this project is a good thing, especially for commuters who do not have access to a car or cannot drive due to disability related reasons. I would like to see if any of the stops will connect to Universities (CCSU, Naugatuck Valley, University of Hartford, UCONN Hartford Campus, etc.) and major workplaces in those areas that attract a lot of jobs. That may have even more appeal for people like me who have even more difficulty finding a job because of a disability.	4.4.10 A
George	Haikalis	Dear Mr. Alexander: Please include the attached letter to Governor Malloy in the record on the Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Evaluation of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail project. Sincerely, George Haikalis, President, INSTITUTE FOR RATIONAL URBAN MOBILITY, INC. June 13, 2012, Governor Dannel P. Malloy, State Capitol, 210 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106 Dear Governor Malloy: Re: Commuter Rail Yes, Busway No Your leadership in securing resources to restore the double-track rail line between Springfield and New Haven for new regional rail service as well as for enhanced Amtrak intercity passenger service is most welcome. The Interstate 91 corridor is seriously congested and continued over-reliance on motor vehicles for travel will only lead to further deterioration of the environment and curtailed economic development. However, your strong support of the Hartford-New Britain busway is inconsistent with this regional rail plan. The \$567 million busway duplicates the rail investment for half of its ten mile route. A much better plan would be to restore, rather than pave over, the remaining five mile segment of disused railroad from Newington to New Britain. Regional rail service could then use the upgraded rail line from Hartford to Newington with its two intermediate stations and continue on a restored rail line to downtown New Britain. An intermediate station near the Central Connecticut State University campus would provide an appealing new travel options for students and faculty. A subsequent phase would be to upgrade the existing rail line from New Britain to Bristol and eventually to Waterbury. A Hartford-New Britain rail service will provide an important new economic stimulus for development in the historic core of New Britain. Bus service is already available, but has shown little appeal to motorists. While busways may be important in some corridors where rail service is not feasible, this is not the case in this instance. Extension of the planned upgraded rail service avoids the wasteful duplication of resources and provides a really appealing travel option. Furthermore, the costly conversion of this rail corridor to a little-used busway will almost certainly lead to pressure to add other motor vehicles to the traffic stream, further encouraging highway-induced sprawl. The Institute for Rational Urban Mobility, Inc. (IRUM) is a NTC-based non-profit concerned with reducing motor vehicular travel in dense urban areas. Sincerely, George Haikalis, President, IRUM	3.3 D
N. Tery	Hall	Operation Concern; Amtrak is moving to E-ticketing this summer. The interface to Amtrak at New Haven must allow for this.	2.0 C

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Rosemary	Hogan	My husband and I live in Windsor Locks and support the relocation of the existing train station to the new proposed location. We feel this will be an economic stimulus for downtown Windsor Locks and cannot help but add a more positive image to the transportation link planned for the train and Bradley airport. This opportunity will not come up again - please move forward on this resolution. Thanks very much, Rosemary Hogan	3.3 B
Carol	Joyal	I am in total support of relocating the train station to the center of town, a more convenient area compared to where it is currently located. This relocation of the train station would offer endless possibilities for growth and one cannot argue how important growth is to our current economy. Looking forward to this much needed endeavor for the town of Windsor Locks!	3.3 B
Alan	Kaiser	I wish to state that I fully approve of the high speed rail program and wish to see it move along without delay. I also would like to state that I do not approve of the location for the Meriden Train Station and Platforms. I believe that a better location would be north of the present station next to State Street Extension. There is a westbound exit and eastbound entrance ramp directly off of I-691. The railroad's right of way and property is large enough for a new station to be built with possibly three tracks, North, South and a passing track in the middle. On Colony street there is an west bound entrance to I-691 and access to the platforms and stations could be had from Colony Street. There is also plenty of space for parking in the area. The biggest advantage of having the station there is when there is a train or trains at the station, no street crossings would be block by gates. The closest street that crosses the tracks, Camp Street is has a bridge that goes over the right of way. Thank you for considering my request. Alan (Al) Kaiser	4.4.10 B
Martha	Klein	This project obliterates a family business on the corner of Newfield and Flatbush Avenues, which has been in my family for decades. Your plans are built on top of the Standard Paper Co./The Party Shop, as though the business were not even there. This is typical behavior from CTDOT. Your arrogance is only overshadowed by the incompetence of your planning. THIS IS WAR. Are Hartford businesses an endangered species? We need to be protected from you.	4.4. 3 A
Pat	Kuszik	Dear Mr. .Alexander, It is very exciting to hear of the possible move of the train platform in our town to the downtown area of Windsor Locks. I have lived in Windsor Locks for 47 years and the downtown area has gone from a very busy community to a very bleak and deserted one. There are many stores in this downtown area that could benefit greatly from this move. It would also encourage investors and entrepreneurs to see our town in a new light. It would also generate travelers coming and going and perhaps taking some time to have a cup of coffee and do a little shopping and enjoying Connecticut's small home town flavor. Right now, the present platform is a generic parking lot that is a distance from our downtown area. I have recently discovered the convenience and VERY reasonable cost of train travel considering the cost of gas . Let's encourage commuter travel by train instead of gridlock. I encourage you to see this move as a very positive one for our town of Windsor Locks. Sincerely.	3.3 B
John	Lennon	It amazes me how this town for 30 or so years has ignored the welfare of commuters and their staging areas in the south end of town and yet remains an uncanny devotion to group of long unused, impractical commercial and industrial eyesores in our former downtown area. With that mouthful said, I think my position is understood that we should tear down the 18th century eyesores and build up our assets in the south end.	3.3 B
Amy	Mackey	Please move the train platform to the center of Main Street. This move would revitalize our town and make our Main Street once again something to be proud of.	3.3 B
Ruth N	Martinez	I give you my full support. In my family we have been waiting for this project to become a reality. We cannot wait! Please tell us when you planning to have it completed. Also, what is the projected price. Thank you.	1.1 A
Brendan	Maurer	Briefly reviewing the EA, it confirms the need and demand for the North Haven station. Also the maps show no new lines need to be constructed between New Haven and North Haven, only renovations. Consideration should be given to funding the North Haven station construction to provide an immediate benefit to commuters in the overly congested New Haven area.	3.3 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Lee	McKinney	Can't wait to be able to take the train from Berlin. I am anxious to see quicker progress.	1.1 A
Joseph	Michael	No need for "high-speed" rail; the stations are too close together. A "regular speed" rail line that stopped at Bradley is a good idea. To have a reliable alternative to driving to the airport would be nice. Please, forget the "high speed" element. The trains have to accelerate before they can travel at speed, and then they have to slow down again. The distances involved are too short to make the incremental extra investment for "high speed" over "regular speed." Just getting a "regular speed" rail to Bradley would be more than enough!!	2.0 A
Amy	Morales	Please move the rail platform to Main Street. It would add to our Town's revitalization efforts.	3.3 B
Sondra	Morrissey	Please have several trains from Windsor Locks for convenient day trips to NYC and Boston. There's currently only one option for direct travel to Penn Station in NYC. Missing that one train, either way, creates a nightmare. I used to live along Metro North (Poughkeepsie, NY and then Milford, CT). I LOVED all the direct train options into NYC! It was such a relaxing, stress-free way to frequently visit NYC. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE create train travel from Windsor Locks to Boston. Break Peter Pan's monopoly on commuter travel to Boston!!! It's ridiculous that there are no train options from Springfield to Boston!!! A train day trip to Boston is literally impossible!!! Windsor Locks is a convenient and safe area for me to park. Having to park in Springfield, or travel & park in New Haven are deterrents. I just don't feel safe in either location. Having to drive all the way to New Haven defeats the point of commuter travel.	4.4.10 H
Mary	Mushinsky Representative	Re: Public Meetings I fully support the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed Rail project. More frequent rail transportation will reduce congestion on I-91 and enhance the downtown Wallingford commercial and residential area. I expect the new service will bring young professional works to the downtown area.	1.1 A
Mary	Mushinsky Representative	While the Judd Square Station site would be close to my home, and therefore personally desirable, my constituents have expressed some fear of traffic harming their children at the bus pull-in. If you select Judd Square, please use fencing to protect pedestrians of the Judd Square complex. The Town Council prefers North Cherry Street to avoid construction of a parking garage and to keep Ward Street open for emergency vehicles to cross the tracks when train is in the station.	3.3 E
Eileen M.	ONeill	I am in favor of this mode of transportation for the north/south corridor of CT as long as it is environmentally sound in construction and design. I would like to review the materials prior to the decision making deadline of June 22, 2012. Where may I access these? Please advise. E O'Neill	4.1 A
Norm	Oney	I am strongly in favor of relocating the Windsor Locks train stop back to the center of town where it belongs. One of the reasons for moving the train platform is security. The location of the present platform does not give me a great sense of security; especially when dark. The most important reason I feel is to reconnect the train to the town. Our little town desperately needs some main street activity and I believe moving the train stop back to the town will be a positive step to bring about more activity on main street.	3.3 B
Adele	Patterson	My comment is that the proposed rail connections will be of great benefit to the people of Connecticut. In my family, the environmental impact would be to remove one commuter auto on a daily drive from W. Hartford/Hartford to New Haven--where the commuter rides the RR on to Stamford. We moved to the Hartford area due to the lack of practical rail commute for me from Fairfield/Bridgeport to Hartford area. In my opinion, a proper rail connection would make CT feel like the small state it is; driving our overcrowded roads deters economic activity.	2.0 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Morris	Pedersen	Safety is a major concern I have. Unless tracks are elevated where you can drive under them, I don't see how a high speed rail system can work here with numerous crossings that need upgrades and that becomes costly in more ways than one. Elevating tracks may sound extreme, like a monorail system, but it requires less real-estate, travelling above the old rails. This means the crossing upgrades are avoided. There's also less rail maintenance. This will eliminate accidents and reduce down time, making it work more efficient. If it can work for rollercoasters, it can work for a rail system, so it may not be as crazy as my idea seems. It elevates the train, so it brings it out of harms way eliminating accidents. I feel this is the long term solution to travel that should be considered.	4.4.13 B
Morris	Pedersen	The current rail system is outdated when compared to European Rail Systems. The number one issue is; it's not affordable for most people at the current time. With proposed improvements, costs are expected to rise, so how many will ride the rails when there's cheaper alternatives for travel? Although, it's a time saver to ride the high speed rails, what can be done to make riding the rail more affordable for more riders? If not many ride the rails now, due to the cost factor, how many will ride when it becomes more expensive?	4.5 A
Vic	Puia	As a past First Selectman, there is no doubt in my mind that moving of the train station stop back to the center of our Main Street will become the catalyst for the development and revitalization of our entire Main Street area. Our development of the old Montgomery Mill into retail and commercial space could result in our becoming a shopping destination, and increase ridership on the trains in this area. It would be a win /win for the town, the state, and Amtrak. Let's get this done!	3.3 B
David	Ragion	I strongly support this project, along with the idea of moving the train station in Windsor Locks back to its downtown area from its current location south of town. The current location is isolated and separated from the town itself. Movement of the station would encourage more people to use the rail lines. Its current location is uninviting and desperate. Bringing the station back downtown where it once resided will encourage more use and incorporate the rail line with the town again.	3.3 B
john	Richardson	Very excited to see project making progress! Can't wait to have alternate transportation option to and from work in Windsor Locks.	3.3 B
James	Roache, Jr.	As noted on the web site I'm writing to state my support to relocate the Windsor Locks AMTRAK train platform from its present location, down by I-91, to the north end of Main Street, Windsor Locks. I firmly believe in mass transit, and the relocation of the platform, and the resulting economic activity in that part of town, will only enhance the efforts to promote rail travel, and support an additional method of access to Bradley International.	3.3 B
James	Roche Jr.	I attended the hearing at Asnuntuck last week and listened to Mr. Glazier's comments. Years ago, when train traffic was in its heyday, the bridge intersection could experience delays, but no one objected. Now, there is an alternate route over the river on the Coffin Bridge. I use this often when I know the freight train may be coming through. Residents on both sides of the river will do this as they come to know the train schedules. I feel the comments about traffic problems are blown out of proportion, not to mention with the station platform on the south end there hasn't been any development of Main Street anyway. I fully support the relocation of the train platform to the north end of Windsor Locks and the restoration of the Historic Train Station. Thank you. James F. Roche Jr.	3.3 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
James F.	Roche, Jr.	Dear Mr. Alexander, I'm writing to express my support for the relocation of the Windsor Locks Train Platform from its present location, south of Windsor Locks center, to the location designated just north of the Historical Train Station. I firmly believe in mass transit. Furthermore I firmly believe that the relocation of the train platform and the renovation of the Historic Train Station will be the catalyst for economic development in the town of Windsor Locks. The high speed rail system is only the beginning for a mass transit system that is long overdue. I envision even more mass transit projects in the destination towns and cities that will allow people to work, shop, and visit various businesses throughout the state. I envision rail travel to Windsor Locks, where a shuttle will take passengers to Bradley International. Imagine being able to travel from Stamford to Windsor Locks and catch a plane to anywhere in the country, or overseas, and be able to leave your car at home. He town of Windsor Locks has long awaited the opportunity to begin rebuilding our Main Street area, and to compliment the efforts being made to enhance air travel. We are looking forward to a favorable decision regarding the platform relocation, and to begin the process of developing Main Street, making it the vibrant place it once was. Sincerely, James F. Roche Jr.	3.3 B
Robin	Roncari	Subject: Train Station in Windsor Locks Dear Mr. Alexander, Please consider very carefully the need to move the train platform from its present location, on the outskirts of town, to Main Street. The present location is isolated, dark, out of the way, and not conducive for people traveling with bags with no one to pick them up or drop them off. If the station were closer to the main hub, where stores, phones, banks are more accessible it would be much more "people/traveler friendly." The old train station has been an eyesore for too many years now. We need to fix it up, make it a viable option for economic growth and development for Windsor Locks. Having the line stop in the main part of town would, in my opinion, make people more apt to use the train as it would be visible, they would see the convenience and view public transportation as part of daily life rather than some out of the way thing that doesn't concern them. Moving the platform, for that is all that it is, a platform to stand on while one waits for his/her train, to a real station in the business area sends a message from Amtrak and the town; "we are here to serve your needs, show you how this can work for you." Let's bring out of hiding this platform and transform the rail line into a living, breathing option for travelers from not just Windsor Locks but surrounding towns, not on the line. Thank you for your time and effort in this very important matter.	3.3 B
Christian	Schaub	I am a strong supporter of this project and think that improved rail service (commuter and medium-distance) will be a great benefit to our communities - improving economic development, the environment, and quality of life. This is a great investment!	1.1 A
John	Seiffer	I'm in favor of the high speed rail. While there might be some environmental impact that is negative, there is also the positive impact of more people using mass transit and fewer cars being used. I hope your report addresses this.	4.4.11 A
Daniel	Silver	Your decision to specifically include my site in your report will have a deleterious effect on my business and my property-and this without your having any reasonable idea how soon-or if-funding will be approved. I urge you to replace my site in your report with a general statement indicating your objective to build a rail station close to one of the two busway stations. The stigma that would be left if you don't adjust your report might last for years, impacting on my ability to sell, lease or develop this site.	4.4. 3 A
Aimee	Sixt	Hi. My name is Aimee Sixt. I live on Spier Ave in Enfield CT. I have a few questions and comments. My house is one home away from the current rail line. My neighbors and I are concerned about the noise impact to our neighborhood and whether we will be part of the quiet zone.	4.2.2 A
Aimee	Sixt	There are currently some trees and brush between our homes and the track blocking view of passing trains that we would prefer not be cut down. Will we be notified if the landscaping along the tracks and our homes will be altered?	4.4. 6 A
Aimee	Sixt	There is a fence along the end of Spier Ave, it is an old chain link that only runs the length of the road. There is no fence next to some of the property along the tracks, will you be upgrading the old fencing? Thank you for your time.	4.4.13 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Steve	Sorrow	RAILROAD REBUID REQUESTS. Five points to be made at the hearing Wednesday evening: 1. Move Windsor Locks Station to North Main Street. The Friends will fix the turn table to be a secondary entrance to the Windsor Locks Canal Trail. People and bike accessible.	3.3 B
Steve	Sorrow	2. Add a new curve to connect to the Main Line to Bradley without backing up spur. 3. Build a bike-hike trail on same piers as the train bridge across the river – Suffield – Enfield. The bridge is the key to a trail loop from Rt. 140 at the canal bank, up the trail and returns the Rt. 140. The next trail extension will be from the RR Bridge to Rt. 190 bridge and return along the Canal Trail to Rt. 140 or Windsor Locks Train station. 5. Build a one way bridge from T'ville to Burbank Street in East Suffield to service moderate rental and purchase housing for commuter clientele. East Suffield has many moderate priced rents that would allow easy access to the rail station in T'ville- hike-bike & golf cart.	2.0 B
Steve	Sorrow	4. All commuter trains to have easy load/unload of bicycles.	4.4.10 F
Michael	Sprintz	I believe this a very noble project, with good intentions. However I'm not quite sure you're going about it the right way. The real benefit of this project would be if the line is re-electrified to provide a one seat ride to and from Grand Central Terminal. The benefits of that alone would be enough to boost economic prospects of New York, Connecticut and Massachusetts. People need alternatives Amtrak, especially when it comes to commuters and believe there's significant ridership to be gained especially between Hartford and New York. I urge you to consider this in your plans.	4.4.15 A
Donna	Starkey	I hope that the decision to relocate the Train Platform in Windsor Locks will be a yes. I feel the town needs this boost to bring some life to it again. The historical train station will be near the Platform and will complement it. Where the Platform is located now is too remote, I feel safety is an issue.	3.3 B
Stephan	Starkey	Locating the train platform to town center: Better Individual Security than location near I-91. Potential for new business on main street. A better location for Rail to Bradley IAP connection. Windsor Locks town residents are for the change in station locations.	3.3 B
Richard	Stowe	Move up New Haven State Street Station improvements (including direct pedestrian access to Strauss-Adler, Smoothie building in Wooster Square) to phase 2 of project.	1.3 B
Richard	Stowe	Currently, a mix of single and double track exists between New Haven and Berlin. Upgrade the current mix to double track. The same applies to the track system from Hartford to Springfield.	1.3 C
Richard	Stowe	[1] traffic congestion in Connecticut is greatest on I-95 in New Haven and Fairfield Counties. That's where most traffic mitigation is needed; I-84 has two-thirds of the Average Daily Traffic of I-95. A one seat ride from Hartford County to Stamford/Greenwich/GCT will alleviate crowding across the whole state.	2.0 A
Richard	Stowe	At Berlin Junction, split the double track corridor into two parallel rail corridors from Berlin to Hartford. For descriptive purposes, let's name the western corridor - the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line and the eastern corridor - the New Haven-Springfield Amtrak Line. The New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield Line would have a single track plus a multi-use bike trail between downtown New Britain and Hartford; the New Haven-Springfield Amtrak Line would be double tracked. Move local station stops (with the exception of Newington Junction) between Meriden and Hartford to the New Haven-New Britain-Hartford-Springfield corridor. Those stops include Berlin and Elmwood. The Newington Junction station would be replaced by two stations, CCSU-Newington and Downtown New Britain. Newington Junction is poorly located because it was specifically situated as a transfer stop for the CTfastrack and should be eliminated.	2.0 B
Richard	Stowe	Upgrade existing freight railroad track in Windsor & Suffield that go to Bradley Airport, so that airline passengers may have a one-seat ride to Bradley Airport.	2.0 B

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Richard	Stowe	CTfastrack should be eliminated in the Amtrak corridor and on Newington Secondary (Newington Junction to downtown New Britain. Sacrificing CTfastrack and replacing it with rail service through New Britain allows for more frequent service between New Haven-Hartford-Springfield. New overpass and bridgework that enhances grade separation of railroad tracks from streets and roads should be retained in the Amtrak corridor.	3.3 D
Richard	Stowe	Add environmentally-preferred alternative in EA/EIE to current build, no build alternatives.	4.4. 3 A
Richard	Stowe	Establish an active campaign to encourage bicyclists to bike to stations, roll their bikes on the trains and bike to destinations. Also provide high quality, sheltered (e.g. New Haven Union Station) bike parking at train stations for those who have no need to bike on the other end of their trip.	4.4.10 F
Richard	Stowe	Run two parallel services south from Springfield to Hartford- New Britain - New Haven - New York; the other as an express service south from Springfield to Hartford-Meriden- New Haven-New York. Same services in northbound directions. These two services should not terminate in New Haven, but continue to Stamford and Greenwich as express trains and as soon as the dual-powered equipment (locomotives that also run on 3rd rail) is available the trains should terminate in Grand Central Terminal ("GCT")[1]. On the New Haven to GCT segment of New Haven Springfield service create a 3-stop super express with a 1 hour 30 minute trip time.	4.4.10 H
Richard	Stowe	Terminate New Haven-Springfield service in Northampton-Amherst to allow for a one-seat ride for college & university students.	4.4.10 H
Richard	Stowe	To stimulate ridership, all stations should have rail accessible development (RAD) - comprised of housing & mixed use commercial rather than parking lots. The revenue garnered by developing these land lots now slated for subsidized parking should be utilized to operate subsidized time-transfer bus shuttles to the stations. Also use revenues, along with FTA safe routes to transit funding, to design complete streets in safe routes to transit bike sheds.	4.4.10 I
Brian	Tang	This project is one of the most exciting public works projects I can remember. I can't wait for the day it opens. If bicycles are allowed, the operation of this rail line would significantly expand the region to which I could feasibly commute (I do not know how to drive). This is important to me, as a young adult, fresh out of college, interested in sticking around New Haven long-term, but by necessity casting a wide net for employment. I know of firms who could benefit from hiring a Yale College graduate with a degree in Environmental Studies and extensive knowledge of urban transportation planning, but where I will not even bother to apply because commuting without a car would not currently be an attractive option. The opening of this line, if bicycles are allowed, will definitely improve the economic prospects of people like me and make people like me more likely to want to stay in New Haven after graduating.	1.1 A
Ted	Tofil	Yet another taxpayer boondoggle that will be a loser!!!!	2.0 A
Rebecca	Townsend	I strongly support the New Haven Hartford Springfield rail line. As founder and former president of the Pioneer Valley Advocates for Commuter Rail, I learned about the thousands of people who are tired of waiting for real rail travel in our region. We're tired of traffic. We're tired of pollution. We're tired of zero economic growth. This rail line would bring much needed economic development to our region, increase options for travelers, and reduce traffic congestion....and reduce automobile air pollution. I live on a street that overlooks I-91. I can hear an occasional train. It would be wonderful to hear more trains and fewer cars. Sincerely, Rebecca M. Townsend	1.1 A
Nancy	Urbschat	I fully support this game-changing project.	1.1 A
Anna	Vaillancourt	Thank you for adding me to your email list. Please let me know how I can support your efforts for this worthwhile project.	1.1 A

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
Steven	Wawruck	<p>As a resident and as First Selectman of the Town of Windsor Locks I am in favor of relocating the Train Platform back to the center of Town. As a result of a formal Master Plan Study of the Main Street corridor the number one catalyst to revitalize the downtown business district is to bring the train stop back to the center of Town. This would be the catalyst to spur economic development with store fronts that are now vacant becoming vibrant and people actually walking on Main St from store front to store front and doing business in Town as it was forty years ago. This opportunity should not be squandered as we will never get another opportunity to correct the ills of the past. Job growth will be a result of this move. We have already experienced a restaurant opening, inquiries into two vacant buildings and other inquiries of the vacant mill building as result of the news that was just released in the last couple days. Move the platform back to the center of town for the economic benefit of the Town, the region and the State. Thanks for allowing me to comment.</p>	3.3 B
Jason	Zheng	<p>Parking Lots do not make Livable Communities</p> <p>The NHHS Rail project is an incredible opportunity for Connecticut to address many challenges facing the auto-oriented suburban landscape of Connecticut: vehicle congestion, high cost of living (rising gas prices and expensive housing), stretched municipal finances, and the flight of young people (and their knowledge and talent) as they move away to other states. These are all important issues the State will face in the coming decades, but the success of the NHHS Rail in addressing these challenges ultimately depends on the redevelopment efforts surrounding the new train stations.</p> <p>The concepts of transit-oriented development, smart growth, and livable communities are prominent in national dialogue (especially due to the HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership), but I feel that there is still sometimes a mismatch between practitioners, state officials, and local officials. I believe this is evident in some of the train station plans.</p> <p>The most successful train stations will be those in livable and walkable communities. The streets should be lined with storefronts and apartments. Some parking is necessary, but the real boost to ridership will come from existing and anticipated development. The new train stations will generate economic growth and investment, but the redevelopment needs to be done in a concerted effort with train station design.</p> <p>A stand-alone train station with hundreds of parking spaces will not help Connecticut's future. Such a train station would still require people to drive to the station, encourage additional suburban development, generate more demand for parking, result in more parking construction, and the cycle repeats. A train station surrounded by parking lots is not transit-oriented development but rather more akin to a park and ride commuter lot.</p> <p>For examples, look to the Milford and the Branford Train Stations. The Milford Train Station is in a walkable downtown area with many nearby homes, businesses, and mixed-use buildings. The Branford Train Station must be driven to, has no nearby substantial development, and required expanding the parking lot.</p> <p>My suggestions:</p> <p>e. Design the parking lots in a manner that will leave space for potential future mixed-use development along the street front. Essentially, the parking lots should have minimal street frontage. Parking should be tucked away in the back so that the walk to the train station is attractive and inviting for pedestrians. (The West Hartford stop feels like a park-and-ride lot because there are no amenities or nearby buildings, and the Berlin stop even has some street front shops torn down for parking lots).</p> <p>f. Use "phased in" parking for all the stations. Currently, the idea to "phase in" additional parking is only for the New Haven and Hartford stations. This concept should be applied to all the stations.</p> <p>g. Really encourage TOD by engaging in a dialogue with towns, regional MPO's, property owners, and other stakeholders. Some results of this dialogue could lead to updates to long-range plans and POCD's, the use of TOD overlay zones, the development of master plans/concept plans for "TOD villages." While some practitioners understand what TOD is, there are still many others that believe TOD means surrounding the train station with parking lots.</p> <p>The need for denser mixed-use and transit-oriented development is not only beneficial for ridership along the rail corridor, but also addresses critical local and state issues. Denser development grows the tax base for municipalities without increasing the financial burden of town services (e.g.: more school bus coverage, fire/police coverage areas, road maintenance, etc). This style of development will also help the State retain and attract young people and their skills (this generation of young adults is more interested in active urban lifestyles with access to high-quality transit).</p> <p>This project is to support the knowledge corridor of Connecticut/Massachusetts. If the State wants to keep these talented individuals in the area, the State needs to support and</p>	4.4.10 I

First Name	Last Name	Submission Content	Response to Comments
		build the places that young people want to live in. Also, please note that many of these ideas are not limited to the NHHS Rail Project but are applicable to the New Britain-Hartford Bus Rapid Transit project as well.	

4. Testimony from Public Hearings Keyed to Responses

Three Public Hearings were held for the project.

- June 7, 2012 at New Britain, CT
- June 13, 2012 at Enfield, CT
- June 14, 2012 at North Haven, CT

The transcripts from each of those meetings are attached. Each comment made by the speaker is responded to as annotated or keyed to a response in “2. Summary of Public Comments and Responses”. The numerical portion of the response number references the portion of the EA to which it applies.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
EVALUATION FOR THE NEW HAVEN-HARTFORD-SPRINGFIELD
LINE HIGH SPEED, INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT

STATE PROJECT NO. 170-2296

JUNE 7, 2012

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a hearing
2 before the State of Connecticut, Department of
3 Transportation, in the matter of Environmental
4 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
5 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
6 Passenger Rail Project, held on June 7, 2012. . .

7

8

9

10 MR. ROBERT IKE: Good evening, ladies and
11 gentlemen. My name is Robert W. Ike from the Connecticut
12 Department of Transportation, and I will serve as the
13 moderator for tonight's public hearing.

14 I'd like to introduce the individuals, who
15 are here this evening to make presentations and listen to
16 your comments and concerns.

17 Mr. Mark Alexander, Transportation
18 Assistant Planning Director of the Department's Office of
19 Environmental Planning, and Mr. John Bernick,
20 Transportation Supervising Engineer of the Department's
21 Office of Facilities Design.

22 We also have Mr. Steve Degan from the
23 Office of Rights of Way. He's available to answer your
24 rights of way questions.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 We have Mr. Steve DelPapa, Supervising
2 Planner, also from the Office of Environmental Planning.
3 We also have our consultants. I don't want to be remiss.
4 Parsons Brinckerhoff. Could the staff please stand?
5 They're here in their professional capacity. Thank you.

6 And we also have C.D.M.-Smith. Can you
7 please stand in your professional capacity? These are
8 the professionals we have here to answer and listen to
9 your comments and concerns.

10 We are meeting with you this evening in
11 order to discuss the Department's Environmental
12 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
13 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
14 Passenger Rail Project, State Project No. 170. Note that
15 for the record. Note that for the record. State Project
16 No. 170-2296.

17 And, also, I don't want to be remiss. We
18 have our technicians from the Connecticut Department of
19 Transportation. Gentlemen, please wave. They're in the
20 back. They're doing a recording.

21 I would like to emphasize that no final
22 decision has been made on the document. That is why we
23 are here this evening, to gather your input, in order to
24 help us reach a final decision.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

4

1 This public hearing is being conducted in
2 accordance with the Connecticut Department of
3 Transportation's Policy, entitled "Public Involvement
4 Guidance Manual, Revised 2009."

5 The EA/EIE is being published by the
6 Federal Railroad Administration, FRA, in cooperation with
7 the Federal Transit Administration, FTA, and the
8 Connecticut Department of Transportation, DOT.

9 The EA/EIE can be viewed on the project
10 website, <http://www.nhhsrail.com>. Copies are also
11 available at each City or Town Clerk's Offices and the
12 public libraries in the affected municipalities along the
13 rail corridor, the South Central Regional Council of
14 Governments, the Central Connecticut Regional Planning
15 Agency, the Capitol Regional Council of Governments and
16 the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.

17 The municipalities are North Haven,
18 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Newington, West Hartford,
19 Hartford, Windsor, Windsor Locks, Enfield, Longmeadow,
20 Mass., and Springfield, Mass.

21 A notice has also been published in the
22 Connecticut Environmental Monitor, dated May 8, 2012.

23 I will now discuss the format for
24 tonight's hearing, then, I will turn the podium over to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 the presenters. I will, then, moderate the hearing as we
2 listen to your comments.

3 For your information, our presentations
4 should take approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

5 My intent is to conduct a fair and orderly
6 hearing tonight, by following a particular format. We
7 would appreciate your patience during my remarks, as well
8 as the presentations that follow, by holding your remarks
9 and comments until this portion of the hearing has been
10 completed.

11 We will be happy to remain here this
12 evening until everyone has had a reasonable opportunity
13 to speak.

14 Experience has shown that audible
15 recordings can only be made if the person making a
16 statement uses the microphone connected to the recording
17 equipment. Microphones have been set up. If you wish to
18 make a statement, please come to the microphone after I
19 read your name from the speaker sign-up sheet.

20 Please introduce yourself, and, if you are
21 representing an organization, please give its name, as
22 well. If you didn't sign up to speak and a question
23 comes to mind, feel free to raise your hand, and I will
24 be happy to recognize you after I go through the speaker

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

6

1 sign-up sheet.

2 For those individuals, who have prepared a
3 statement, you may read it into the record if you so
4 desire, however, if the statement is lengthy, you are
5 asked to offer a written copy of the statement for the
6 record and give a brief summary of its contents.

7 Such attachments to the record carry as
8 much weight as the transcribed verbal testimony received
9 here tonight when the transcript is reviewed.

10 If you wish to speak this evening, we have
11 a sign-up sheet at the entrance to the room. There is a
12 three-minute time limit on all first-time speakers.
13 There will be no yielding of your time to other speakers.
14 Your time is for your own comments.

15 If, after all first-time speakers have
16 finished, anyone would like the opportunity to speak
17 again, a reasonable amount of time will be allotted for
18 this purpose.

19 Anyone, who wishes to present written
20 comments for the public hearing record, should give them
21 to me before the end of tonight's hearing.

22 As a result of information that you might
23 learn at tonight's hearing, you may wish to make
24 additional comments on the EA/EIE document. Written

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

7

1 statements or exhibits concerning it can be mailed to the
2 attention of Mr. Mark W. Alexander, Transportation
3 Assistant Planning Director, P. O. Box 317546, Newington,
4 Connecticut, 06131-7546.

5 This information is available in the
6 handouts, which you should have received when you entered
7 the room tonight.

8 The deadline for receipt of comments on
9 the EA/EIE is June 22, 2012. Written statements or
10 exhibits must be postmarked by this date and must be
11 reproducible in black and white on not larger than eight
12 and a half by 11-inch paper.

13 This information will be made part of the
14 public hearing record and will be considered in the same
15 regard as oral arguments.

16 At this point, I will turn the podium over
17 to Mr. John Bernick, who will give the project overview.
18 Mr. Bernick will be followed by Mr. Alexander, who will
19 give the overview of the EA/EIE. Mr. Bernick?

20 MR. JOHN BERNICK: Thank you. I want to
21 give a quick overview of the service and the improvements
22 that we have planned and a little bit of background on
23 the project.

24 Historically, the New Haven to Springfield

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

8

1 rail corridor carried much more traffic than it does
2 today.

3 Back in the glory days of rail, there were
4 22 trains a day that ran up and down this corridor. Now,
5 only six daily round trip trains. There's only capacity
6 for the six daily round trip trains that travel now, and
7 that's largely due to the fact that a lot of the rail
8 infrastructure was taken up back in the 1980s.

9 Our program goal is to make a rebirth of
10 rail service on this corridor. We're looking for
11 enhanced regional service that accommodates both commuter
12 and inner-city travel, and it's going to be a blended
13 service.

14 We call it a high-speed, inner-city
15 regional service, because, by boosting the inner-city
16 trains, there's capacity there for people, who need to
17 make a shorter length trip to do that, and then we'll
18 adjust the fares accordingly, so that you'll pay about
19 what you would pay for a normal trip length on Metro
20 North service, for instance, if you were traveling just
21 to New Haven.

22 Of course, on the same rail corridor, you
23 can travel single-seat down to Penn Station,
24 Philadelphia, Washington, D.C. on the Amtrak service.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

9

1 Our long-term vision is to have 25 round
2 trip trains a day. It would make for half-hour frequency
3 in each direction. In the full build service, there
4 would be a connection to both Boston and possibly
5 Montreal.

6 In the shorter term, with the funding that
7 we have in place now, in 2016, we plan on launching 17
8 round-trip trains a day. That should give about 45-
9 minute peak hour service in both directions.

10 This is an overview of the corridor, and
11 it really speaks to the importance of the New Haven to
12 Springfield piece, which is the subject of the hearing
13 tonight.

14 You can see that with future service in
15 from Boston, coming down from Vermont, as far north as
16 Montreal, and then further down at New York City, and
17 then from New York City the rest of the country, you see
18 that the Springfield and New Haven piece is really a
19 critical link.

20 There's a lot of capacity constraints with
21 the shoreline route that exists now on the Acela service.
22 There's movable bridges there. There's only two-track
23 capacity. With this additional link, you can now have
24 four-track capacity effectively from Boston down to New

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 York City.

2 The service will be timed, so that you can
3 make connections in New Haven. There will be timed
4 connections to the Metro North service, so that you could
5 take a train, for instance, from Berlin down to New
6 Haven, walk cross platform onto the Metro North service,
7 and then continue on into Grand Central.

8 We're also looking to make a connection to
9 Bradley Airport via shuttle from the Windsor Locks
10 station, and, also, in the future build, we'll have
11 platforms that are co-located with the station, with two
12 of the stations on the busway, so that you have cross
13 platform access there, also.

14 Here's an overview of the rail corridor.
15 It dates back. It's one of the first rail corridors in
16 the country. It dates back to 1844, when they ran the
17 first trains. I have maps, real estate maps that date
18 back to the 1830s.

19 There's about, of the 62-mile corridor,
20 there's about 40 miles of it that needs to be double-
21 tracked. In that, there's all the bridges and culverts
22 where that second span that used to contain a track has
23 been in disrepair for so long, so there's a lot of
24 upgrades and repairs that need to happen in that regard.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

11

1 We've got two big structures, the Hartford
2 viaduct, and when I talk about the Hartford viaduct, I'm
3 talking about the elevated railway that runs in front of
4 Union Station, and, also, the Connecticut River Bridge in
5 Windsor Locks. Those will be separate breakout projects,
6 but those are two big infrastructure repair projects that
7 are part of future work. There's 180 bridges and
8 culverts along the corridor that need work.

9 We've got stations in New Haven,
10 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Hartford, Windsor, Windsor
11 Locks and Springfield.

12 Modernizing the infrastructure is going to
13 involve not only putting back the second track, but
14 upgrading the signal system. We hope to start work on
15 that in the fall to start to put in the fiber optic cable
16 that supports that signal system.

17 There's 38 at-grade crossings, and an at-
18 grade crossing is where a roadway crosses the rail line
19 at the same grade, i.e., there's gates that come down to
20 stop traffic that are programmed for safety improvements.

21 We're looking to enhance the existing
22 stations and, in the future, add new stations, and we're
23 also already looking at programming new train equipment.

24 In the short-term, for the 2016 service,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

12

1 we're going to bolster the service by bringing the
2 Shoreline East equipment that runs, the diesel equipment
3 now that runs between New London and New Haven, and move
4 that up onto this corridor, in addition to the Amtrak
5 trains that already run, but those locomotives are going
6 over into an overhaul, and we can only get so much life
7 out of them, so we're already looking at programming new
8 equipment that will run on this line.

9 The preliminary cost for the project was
10 647 million. That included all the stations, the new
11 trains. Upgrades to the Connecticut River Bridge and the
12 Hartford viaduct were not included in that. Those are
13 separate breakout projects, but we did not receive all
14 the funding for that.

15 The funding we did receive to date, 471
16 million, which consists of three federal grants and 280
17 million dollars in state bond authority that's already
18 been programmed.

19 We have enough to launch the 2016 service.
20 What it does is it allows us to do track work up until
21 Windsor, and that's enough to give the capacity we need
22 to support those 17 trains a day, so we do have all the
23 money we need to launch the service in 2016 in hand.

24 The work has been phased. The way the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

13

1 federal government doled out the money for the project
2 was in phases, and when we talk about the phases here, I
3 want to be clear that the project is really going to be
4 built as if it were one project over about a three to
5 four-year period, but the funding came in phases, and,
6 so, we talk about the phases. I want to give just a
7 quick explanation of how those break down and how the
8 money came in.

9 The first phase is the Meriden and
10 Newington piece. That's been obligated. It's 10 miles
11 of track work. The second phase takes us everything New
12 Haven to Hartford. Phase 3A is Hartford to Windsor, and
13 then we're looking for additional funding for the piece
14 north of Windsor, the additional stations that we want to
15 add, and the ongoing state of repair items.

16 So here's how it breaks down. Phase one
17 is 10 miles of track work between Meriden and Newington.
18 That's actually in final design now. It's a 60-million-
19 dollar federal grant. It's a 60-million-dollar total
20 grant, 40 in federal, 20 in state.

21 You add to that the phase two grant, which
22 is the subject of this hearing, and now you have double
23 track all the way from New Haven up to Hartford, and, so,
24 that's a 262 total million dollar job, and we're looking

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 to obligate that at the close of this environmental
2 review process. This also adds the new station, or
3 upgrades the stations, I should say, at Wallingford,
4 Meriden, Berlin, and we want to add a high-level platform
5 at Hartford, so you have level boarding there.

6 The last piece that we have funding for is
7 the piece from Hartford to Windsor. There's also the
8 rest of the cable installation project that allows for
9 the new signal system. That's a 43-million-dollar total
10 project. That's already been obligated. And, with that,
11 now we can launch in 2016, and, so, this is what we have
12 money for right now.

13 In the future, we look for additional
14 funding opportunities to take the double track north from
15 Windsor and connect it all the way up into Springfield,
16 so the entire line would then be double-tracked again.

17 We've got the new stations that we want to
18 add in the future. We're looking for FTA funding for
19 that. That's why the Federal Transit Administration is a
20 partner in this document. We'd like to add stations in
21 North Haven, Newington, West Hartford and Enfield. We'd
22 also like to add a platform to the State Street station,
23 so that you could get off close to downtown in New Haven,
24 and this will help us attract even more riders to the

1 service.

2 There's those two big repair jobs, the
3 work in Hartford, where the viaduct is in front of Union
4 Station there, and the Connecticut River Bridge up in
5 Windsor Locks.

6 So why do we do it? The project will
7 connect and integrate the transportation that is
8 occurring now along the corridor. You have bus service,
9 for instance, in Meriden. You've got a shuttle bus that
10 runs in Wallingford. You've got the busway. You've got
11 Bradley Airport. You've got the City of Hartford. All
12 these little, all these communities and cities and
13 urbanized areas are somewhat disconnected along the
14 corridor.

15 This runs a backbone with the increased
16 service that connects these more effectively and gives
17 people more travel options between all these communities.
18 It's faster service. It's more frequent service.

19 The real key is that it becomes an engine
20 for local economic development, and, so, now that you
21 have a station, people make decisions to live, based on
22 where they have their transportation opportunities, so
23 that feeds into the transit-oriented design aspect of the
24 job, where businesses and people choose to live and work

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 near the stations, because they have ready access to
2 transportation.

3 Livable, walkable communities, we're going
4 to open with parking that supports people driving to the
5 station, but really the end game is to get people out of
6 their cars and to live and work near the stations.

7 We're very proactive with our public
8 involvement process. We meet regularly with the towns,
9 coordinate our plans with their plans. The town of
10 Berlin has big transit-oriented development plans that
11 we've coordinated with.

12 The City of Meriden has got a number of
13 initiatives that they have funded for work, and we have
14 integrated our project with theirs, and this is happening
15 all up and down the corridor.

16 We have the website. There it is. It's
17 also on your handout. You can follow us on Twitter and
18 Facebook, if that's what you like to do. It's a very
19 good way to get information out to our supporters.

20 My staff and myself, I'm available if you
21 have a community organization that is looking for
22 information on this project, looking for information even
23 on rail safety, safety at grade crossings, pedestrian
24 safety, that sort of thing. We'd be happy to arrange

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 something, where we come out and talk to your
2 organization.

3 And, with that, I believe I'm handing it
4 off to Mark.

5 MR. MARK ALEXANDER: Thank you, John.
6 What I'd like to do tonight is just give us a little
7 summary of the Environmental Assessment, some of the
8 topics we've talked about, and some of the results of the
9 studies, and where we go from here, in terms of an
10 environmental process.

11 The Environmental Assessment is a
12 decision-making document. It's required by both the
13 federal government and the state governments, in terms of
14 a National Environmental Policy Act and the Connecticut
15 Environmental Policy Act.

16 This document, the Lead Federal Agency,
17 was a Federal Railroad Administration, where we worked
18 with federal transit, because there's hopes to obtain
19 additional funding in the future for some of the station
20 work. Of course, the Department of Transportation is the
21 sponsoring agency.

22 The topics within the document is broken
23 down, in terms of the purpose and need of the project,
24 and there we basically have been talking about not only

1 the Connecticut needs, but the regional needs, then you
2 go into the alternative analysis, where we've talked
3 about the build alternative, the no-build alternative,
4 and some of the station possibilities for alternative
5 locations for the stations.

6 We talked about several of the different
7 environments. We talked about the physical, the
8 ecological and the human environment. There's roughly
9 about 20 different topics broken down within those, and
10 these are looked at at the GIS level.

11 It's not a very detailed analysis, because
12 we don't have the design complete at this point, so we're
13 looking at this at more of a higher-level analysis
14 portion at this point in time.

15 Some of the key issues we looked into were
16 the wetland impacts. The analysis shows that we
17 anticipate about a four-acre wetland impact for the
18 entire corridor. That's the entire 62 miles, hoping
19 that, as the worst case scenario, because, again, looking
20 at the GS level, we've since then have done a lot of
21 field work, and we'll be refining that, along with the
22 design elements.

23 The noise analysis, we used the FRA and
24 the FTA modeling, and that analysis identifies there's

1 several areas where there's moderate and severe impacts,
2 but the important thing to note there is that the noise
3 analysis shows that the majority of the noise is from the
4 horns from the trains, and the horns aren't going to get
5 any louder, but the frequency of the horn blasts are
6 going to be more frequent. The model does show a
7 difference in impacts.

8 The endangered species, we've coordinated
9 with the DEP, as well as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
10 Service. We've identified what's in the corridor. We've
11 also conducted field surveys to identify if anything
12 physically will be impacted. At this point in the
13 design, we feel that we're free of impact from endangered
14 species.

15 The traffic analysis, the general results
16 of that is the project will produce a general overall
17 benefit to traffic, but it does identify nine
18 intersections, where there could be some impacts to the
19 local traffic.

20 Those are usually a result of the grade
21 crossings, closing, and some of the induced traffic at
22 the station locations.

23 Those will be further studied during the
24 design stages, and we're looking at signal timing on

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 traffic signals, as well as roadway improvements, to
2 mitigate some of those potential impacts.

3 Property acquisitions, throughout the 62-
4 mile corridor, it's envisioned that there's right now 31
5 properties impacted, and some of those would be total
6 acquisitions, and some would be sliver takes.

7 There's 27 located in Connecticut and four
8 in Massachusetts. Those you could be some increased
9 numbers, as the design, you know, progresses, as well as
10 we identify construction needs for temporary access and
11 things like that.

12 Cultural resources, we've undertaken quite
13 an extensive survey of the entire corridor. The entire
14 corridor has been determined to be eligible to be on the
15 National Register of Historic Places. That's the entire
16 corridor of Connecticut and Massachusetts.

17 We've entered into, or we're entering into
18 a programmatic agreement with the State Historic
19 Preservation Office and the Massachusetts State
20 Preservation Office to identify ways in which the impacts
21 will be further analyzed, as the project continues in the
22 design stages.

23 Secondary and cumulative impacts,
24 predominately, we're showing most of those have been very

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 positive. As John mentioned, this project will promote
2 TOD at the station locations. It's going to increase
3 jobs. It's going to increase the regional mobility,
4 improve air quality, consistent with the local land uses
5 at the station locations.

6 Prime farmlands, it's anticipated that
7 there could be up to four acres of impact along the
8 entire corridor. Again, this will be further refined in
9 the design stages.

10 For a 62-mile corridor, that's pretty
11 insignificant, but if there's any coordination with the
12 Farm Preservation Act, we'll undertake that through
13 completion of the rating forms.

14 Safety and security, as John mentioned,
15 the project is including safety devices throughout to
16 increase the safety over what's possibly there today,
17 because of the increased frequency of the trains, as well
18 as the speed of the trains, are going to be part of this
19 project.

20 Construction impacts, there's always
21 potential for construction impacts, but we're going to do
22 our best, through best management practices, you know, to
23 controlling releases, as well as conducting studies to
24 determine where there could be any potential contaminated

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 materials, which will be handled through the construction
2 phases.

3 The most critical part of this
4 construction impasse is going to be the proactive
5 communications that's going to be developed between the
6 residents, the business communities, as well as the
7 cities and towns, so that everybody knows what's going
8 on, when it's going to happen, so that we can avoid any
9 conflicts.

10 The near-term schedule, as Bobby mentioned
11 at the beginning of this hearing, this hearing is part of
12 the hearing process required under the Environmental
13 Policy and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

14 Tonight is one of three hearings. At the
15 conclusion of these hearings, we're going to be taking
16 any of the comments we receive, as well as we received a
17 number of comments already through the internet and e-
18 mail and by mail.

19 We'll be answering those and submitting
20 the responses to the Federal Railroad Administration, and
21 we anticipate a finding of no significant impact, will be
22 completed in July of this year.

23 Once the formal approval is obtained from
24 the Federal Railroad Administration, as well as the State

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Office of Policy and Management, we'll enter into the
2 final design phases on the remainder of the projects, and
3 we'll enter into construction, anticipated completion and
4 start of launch of service in 2016.

5 There's, again, the website, my
6 information and John's information, so any further
7 information you need you can contact us, as well as the
8 website. There's plenty of locations there to find the
9 information yourself, or to contact us directly. Bob?

10 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mr. Alexander. That
11 was Mark Alexander from the Department's Office of
12 Environmental Planning.

13 I would be remiss if I didn't recognize
14 Mr. Jankovich(phonetic), Richard Jankovich, from our
15 Rails, Office of Rails. He will be supervising and
16 managing the operator of the line.

17 Is that Ted Nazemous(phonetic)? We ought
18 to recognize Ted, too. Are there any other DOT staff I
19 missed while I'm waiting for the speaker sign-up sheet?
20 I just need the speaker sign-up sheet.

21 Please limit your time to state your
22 comments. Again, we will be here. Thank you, young
23 lady. We will stay here as long as necessary to
24 accommodate everyone, who would like to speak.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Okay. The first speaker, Bobby Berriault?
2 Just give your name and address for the record.

3 **Comment No: 1024: Mr. Berriault**

4 **Summary of Comment 1024.1:** Advocates providing a free
5 transfer from the train to a local bus especially from
6 Windsor Locks to Hartford.

7 **Response to Comment: 4.4.10 J**

8 Discussion of transit access to existing and proposed
9 train stations is discussed in Sec. 4.4.10 of the EA. The
10 specific structure and costs for fares has not yet been
11 determined. Discounted fares or free transfers between
12 connecting modes of transit can be considered by the
13 appropriate transit agencies prior to the start of the
14 new service.

15 **Summary of Comment 1024.2:** Convert the existing park and
16 ride lot right off Exit 42 (the current train station)
17 into more of a rest stop, with bathrooms, because we
18 don't have a rest stop (in Windsor Locks).

19 **Response to Comment: 2.0 D Section 2.0** of the EA
20 identifies the purpose and need for the project which
21 calls for the focus of transportation investment in the
22 New Haven to Springfield corridor and does not include
23 constructing rest areas for passengers in motor vehicles.

24 MR. BOBBY BERRIAULT: My name is Bobby
25 Berriault, and I live in Enfield. Do I have to say my
26 street address?

27 MR. IKE: Yes, sir.

28 MR. BERRIAULT: Okay. 19 Connecticut
29 Avenue in Enfield. I have two comments that I would like
30 to make. I was wondering if this is something that
31 people in the Department of Transportation could consider
32 in the future when implementing this plan, and that is if
33 people would be able -- when they hop on the commuter

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 rail line and go to another destination, if they would be
2 able to do like they do in New York City with the MTA and
3 make a free transfer from the train to a local bus, so
4 that they can continue their journey.

5 I think that would be a good idea, in the
6 sense of they would be able to make a free transfer from
7 the train to the bus, because then more people would be
8 willing to use the commuter line and not Amtrak, and it
9 would be a lot easier.

10 In current small use of public
11 transportation, the free transfers from the train to the
12 bus. That way, you could continue on your way to work,
13 without having to dig in the wallet for more money.

14 And I do have one other quick comment,
15 which is kind of related to this, or it's related in a
16 sense, but because of the commuter line from especially
17 from Windsor Locks to Hartford, the five express bus to
18 my understanding that is currently in place now won't be
19 running, because we have the train.

20 And there's going to be, once this
21 commuter rail line is implemented, there's going to be a
22 park and ride lot right at Exit 42, a park and ride lot
23 that people won't use it, because the station will be
24 moved towards Downtown Windsor Locks.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 I just want to see if -- this microphone
2 is terrible. I'm sorry. I want to ask if maybe if the
3 DOT would consider to convert that park and ride lot
4 right off Exit 42 into more of a rest stop, with
5 bathrooms, because we don't have a rest stop -- I have to
6 use the other microphone. Is there a better one?

7 About the rest stop, there aren't any rest
8 stops north of Hartford on 91, and maybe, since we won't
9 be having that park and ride use lot for buses, because
10 we have the train, it may be either part of this project,
11 or on a side project, if they can convert that big
12 parking lot right off the highway, Exit 42, into a more
13 to use rest stop with facilities. I don't know. It's
14 just two things that came to mind.

15 MR. IKE: Thank you very much, sir. Your
16 comments are noted for the record. Our next speaker is
17 Gary Burnett. Just come and give your name and address
18 again for the record, please.

19 **Comment No: 1025; Mr. Burnett**

20 **Summary of Comment 1025.1: Advocates not only high-speed**
21 **rail between cities, but also light rail service or**
22 **trolleys within cities.**

23 **See Response to Comment No 2.0 B**

24 **Summary of Comment 1025.2: Concerned about noise...can new**
25 **technologies can be utilized to mitigate the noise levels**
26 **of the train equipment and train horns?**

27 **See Response to Comment No 4.22 A**

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 MR. GARY BURNETT: My name is Gary
2 Burnett. I'm at 83 David Road, Durham, Connecticut. I'm
3 very pleased to see this assembly tonight. I'm here to
4 make a few comments, and I will do my best to stay within
5 the three-minute time limit.

6 First of all, a personal testimonial.
7 I've had extensive experience using public transit in
8 other countries, Europe, Canada, to name the two that
9 I've used the most, and I've found them to be extremely
10 user-friendly, economical, convenient, efficient,
11 wonderful, to put a few adjectives into it.

12 I've just loved the concept of public
13 transit, so any efforts that you folks are doing along to
14 make this a reality, I applaud you. I think it's
15 wonderful.

16 Knowing the extent of the infrastructure
17 in Europe, and probably some of you are familiar with it,
18 that's the model I hope that we're going to try to aspire
19 to, if not in the near future, at least maybe in the
20 long-term.

21 That is not only high-speed rail between
22 cities, but rail service, surface rail within cities, not
23 just subway service, but small light rail services, I
24 guess is how you describe it. Case in point is a city in

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Bordeaux, France. If you've ever been there, check out
2 their beautiful trolley system they got going there,
3 similar to the one in L.A. to Long Beach.

4 Okay, anyway, comment number two. This is
5 from -- I'm wearing a Public Health hat now. I think
6 that the use of public transit contributes greatly to our
7 national health outlook, if you could look at the broad
8 term of you consider our obesity epidemic that's going on
9 now. That's because we're all in our cars too much.

10 What I'd like to do is send you folks some
11 documentation that would show the linkage between more
12 public transit use and better health overall. Get people
13 out of the cars, get them on the streets, walking,
14 biking, in the trains, on the buses.

15 Whatever it is, you've got your passes to
16 get you between the buses and the trains and what have
17 you. All of those things can contribute to us moving
18 more, and, of course, that's going to make us look good,
19 too. All right?

20 The livable, walkable communities concept
21 I totally buy into. Again, you see that it's being
22 lived, and it's being done in other parts of the world.
23 Why can't we do it here?

24 And my last comment, I just have one

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

29

1 concern, and that would be the noise, the noise level.
2 Of course, all the equipment is made out of metal, so
3 you've got the same noise that we've had ever since
4 trains were around, so I'm hoping that new technologies
5 can be utilized to mitigate the noise levels of the train
6 equipment somehow, and do the horns have to be quite so
7 loud? I don't know.

8 Anyway, thank you for your time, and I
9 appreciate it very much.

10 MR. IKE: Thank you for your comments,
11 sir. Our next speaker, Molly McKay. Just come to the
12 microphone, or perhaps we can bring the microphone to
13 you. There you go, ma'am. Just give your name and your
14 address for the record. No, no, you're fine. Stay right
15 where you are.

16 **Comment No: 1026: Ms. McKay**

17 **Summary of Comment 1026.1:** The construction of the busway
18 is going to do long-term damage to the plans for this
19 wonderful high-speed rail because between Newington and
20 Hartford, there are just two tracks right now on the
21 Amtrak corridor.

22 **See Response to Comment No: 3.3 D**

23 **Summary of Comment 1026.2:** Advocates extending passenger
24 rail service to Canada.

25 **Response to Comment: 1.1 B** As stated in Sec. 1.1 of the
26 EA, the planning and design of this project is consistent
27 with the 2030 Vision Plan that was developed among the
28 states of Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont and
29 established transportation and economic development
30 objectives to significantly increase passenger rail

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

1 service along the rail corridor extending from New Haven
2 and across Massachusetts and eventually to White River
3 Junction, Vermont (and eventually Montreal, Canada).

4 Ms. MOLLY McKAY: Okay. I'm Molly McKay.

5 I live in Mystic, 8 Riverbend Drive. I've been an
6 advocate for rail for many years, for more investment in
7 rail in this country. I'm thrilled to see that this
8 project is coming to fruition relatively soon, but I do
9 have a major concern.

10 It's not something that you people can
11 solve tonight, but the construction of the busway is
12 going to do long-term damage to the plans for this
13 wonderful high-speed rail, because, and I have a flyer
14 here with pictures, that between Newington and Hartford,
15 there's just two tracks right now on the Amtrak corridor.

16 One is for freight, and one is for
17 passenger, and there's space, plenty of space for the
18 third track, which is going to be needed to have two
19 tracks for passenger and keep the freight track there,
20 but the busway is going to be built right on that space
21 that's needed for the third track, and I'm very, very
22 concerned that the long-term progress of this wonderful
23 project that you're working on is going to be inhibited
24 in Connecticut to really be the kind of service it should
25 be when you take away that space that's right in the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Amtrak corridor.

2 The other thing I wanted to say was, well,
3 I just want to make a mention about continuing service
4 into Canada. I'm working with an organization, called
5 National Corridors Initiative, and the person, the CEO
6 and Chairman of that is James RePass. He's been asked by
7 the Canadians to put on a big conference to talk about
8 getting frequent passenger rail back into Canada.

9 The stumbling block is that since 9-11 the
10 security measures have made it almost impossible to take
11 trains across the border, because you have to sit and
12 wait for so much security check, so I'll be informing you
13 about this conference, which is going to take place in
14 September.

15 If anybody would like to, I could get the
16 names of people here, if you want to hear about it, but
17 we'll be putting the word out about the conference.

18 And I also am leaving these. I will pass
19 out these flyers about the problem with the busway. I'll
20 leave some on the table out here, too, if you're
21 interested. Thank you.

22 MR. IKE: Thank you very much, ma'am.

23 MS. MCKAY: Thank you.

24 MR. IKE: The last speaker we have on the

1 sign-up sheet is Richard Stowe. Mr. Stowe? Just give
2 your name and address for the record, please.

3 **Comment No: 1027; Mr. Stowe**

4 **Summary of Comment 1027.1:** Government has collaborated to
5 create CT Fast Track which will destroy a critical,
6 unused, or underutilized historic railroad right of way,
7 a corridor that is an essential component of a diverse
8 and bold New Haven/Springfield corridor.

9 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 3.3 D-1.

10 **Summary of Comment 1027.2:** This project has a flawed
11 alternatives analysis because it only offers a choice
12 between build and no-build and is too limited because the
13 analysis needs to include an environmentally-preferred
14 alternative that is separate from and unique to the build
15 alternative.

16 **Response to Comment: 2.0 E** The Alternative Analysis of
17 the EA considered alternatives meeting the Purpose and
18 Need of the proposed project. Section 2.0 of the EA (Page
19 12) identifies the Purpose of the project to "...increase
20 the frequency and speed of passenger service along the
21 NHHS rail corridor and to address the current and future
22 transportation needs of Connecticut, Central
23 Massachusetts, Boston, and Vermont."

24 Section 2.0 further states "Intercity benefits of the
25 proposed improvements include a significant increase in
26 passenger service across the region, increased ridership,
27 diversion of automobile trips to rail, and significantly
28 enhance connectivity to other transit and transportation
29 modes. The project will serve as a catalyst for
30 integrating the existing regional transit system,
31 providing beneficial economic stimulus at existing and
32 proposed station locations, and enhancing regional
33 economic growth and transit-oriented development
34 opportunities in a way that is consistent with
35 Connecticut's smart growth and long-term sustainability
36 policies."

37 Section 2.0 of the EA (Pages 12 and 13) also identifies
38 the Need of the project which recognizes the increase in
39 intercity travel, demographic growth, and capacity
40 constraints on the study area's highways and the
41 resulting traffic congestion. "...Along with increased
42 congestion along the corridor is a corresponding

1 reduction in air quality. CTDOT's Greenhouse Gas Emission
2 Analysis, dated March 2, 2009, based on CTDOT's Travel
3 Demand Model, predicts that greenhouse gas emissions
4 would increase about 20% by 2030."

5 Section 4.2.1 of the EA (Page 38) indicates that the
6 proposed project would not result in any local or
7 regional short-term or long-term adverse air quality
8 impact. Also, Section 4.4.11 of the EA (Page 169)
9 indicates that the project would reduce overall energy
10 consumption by 304 billion BTU's per year because of the
11 reduction of automobile usage. The reduction in energy
12 consumption is directly proportional to a reduction in
13 greenhouse gas emission.

14 **Summary of Comment 1027.3:** This project has a flawed
15 alternatives analysis because it does not speak to or
16 recognize the benefits of rail freight on the New
17 Haven/Springfield corridor.

18 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 4.4.10 D
19 and 3.3 D.

20 **Summary of Comment 1027.4:** This project has a flawed
21 alternatives analysis because it does not recognize the
22 potential benefits of including CCSU in New Britain on
23 the New Haven/Hartford/Springfield corridor or allow for
24 an extension of rail out to Bristol and Waterbury and
25 does not speak to or look at the potential for grade
26 separation.

27 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 3.3 D.

28 **Summary of Comment 1027.5:** This project has a flawed
29 alternatives analysis because it doesn't analyze whether
30 the building of parking lots at rail stations is the
31 beneficial use of land; these parking lots are key to
32 transit-oriented development.

33 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 4.4.10
34 I.

35 **Summary of Comment 1027.6:** This project has a flawed
36 alternatives analysis because it doesn't allow for
37 railroad service directly into Bradley Airport. Having
38 a one-seat ride to Bradley would greatly enhance this
39 project.

40 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 2.0 B.

41 **Summary of Comment 1027.7:** Advocates not building CT
42 FastTrack and rail parking lots and redirect the monies

1 toward bus parking lots, with timed transfer bus service
2 to limit car travel. Abandoning plans for CT FastTrack
3 would also create room to build a rail and trail
4 alignment, a complete multi-use trail from New Britain to
5 Hartford, connecting the two largest cities in central
6 Connecticut.

7 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 4.4.10 I
8 and 3.3 D.

9 MR. RICHARD STOWE: My name is Richard
10 Stowe. I live at 12 Mead Street in New Canaan,
11 Connecticut.

12 I just want to let you all know I just
13 took the train from West Palm Beach up here to attend
14 this meeting this evening, so it's a great pleasure to be
15 with my fellow Connecticut residents.

16 The timing and location of this first NHHS
17 EA/EIE public hearing is ironic, ironic, because these
18 hearings take place as the forces of a cabal of
19 democratic officials, including the Governor, the entire
20 congressional delegation, the Connecticut General
21 Assembly power brokers, the Council of Governments in
22 Hartford County, mayors, a university president here at
23 CCSU, and environmental groups and unions have
24 collaborated to destroy a critical, unused, or
25 underutilized historic railroad right of way, a corridor
26 that is an essential component of a diverse and bold New
27 Haven/Springfield corridor.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 A financial package to build a highway on
2 this corridor, known as CT Fast Track, has been
3 assembled, construction contracts awarded, construction
4 commenced, and neighborhoods are being adversely impacted
5 as we speak.

6 Ironic, because this analysis, the New
7 Haven/Springfield plan corridor, is taking places years
8 after the Connecticut Fast Track highway took place, so
9 instead of having a coordinated, integrated approach to
10 plan in Connecticut, we have isolated, individual
11 projects running in temporal cavities, like separated in
12 time.

13 Ironic, because there is no station
14 planned in New Britain, and it's ironic that it's taking
15 place here at Central Connecticut State University, where
16 there's no station, you know, planning for this New
17 Haven/Springfield line.

18 New Britain, being the largest city or
19 second largest city in Central Connecticut, the largest
20 city in New Jersey, New York and Connecticut, that
21 doesn't have rail service, ironic, because Central
22 Connecticut State University is the third largest
23 University in the State of Connecticut behind UConn and
24 Yale University.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 This project presentation has like flawed
2 alternatives analysis. The choice between build and no-
3 build is too limited. This is exactly the same type of
4 environmental analysis that took place with the Merritt
5 Parkway, Route 7 interchange, in which the Merritt
6 Parkway conservancy sued the State of Connecticut.

7 We need to like -- this analysis needs to
8 include an environmentally-preferred alternative that is
9 separate from and unique to the build alternative. The
10 Department's presentation is lacking, in that it does not
11 speak to or recognize the benefits of rail freight, as
12 our previous speaker alluded to, on the New
13 Haven/Springfield corridor.

14 The Department's presentation is lacking,
15 in that it does not recognize the potential benefits of
16 including CCSU in New Britain on the New
17 Haven/Hartford/Springfield corridor, which subsequently
18 could allow, and the section between Newington junction
19 and New Britain is historically known as either the
20 Newington secondary or the New Britain secondary, and the
21 use of that would also allow for an extension of rail out
22 to Bristol and Waterbury.

23 As we drove in, we were directed to a
24 multi-story parking garage to attend this event, and as

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 we drove into that parking garage, we asked a student if
2 we could park there, and found out that she lived in
3 Waterbury and was commuting by car, creating pollution
4 every day, and mentioned we thought it would be great if
5 there would be passenger rail from Waterbury to Hartford
6 via the secondary and like with a station at CCSU, and
7 she just thought that was a wonderful idea.

8 The Department's presentation and analysis
9 is lacking, in that it does not speak to or look at the
10 potential for grade separation.

11 Also, the Department analysis, from what I
12 heard this evening in my conversations with officials at
13 DOT, doesn't like analyze whether the building of these
14 parking lots is the beneficial use of land, whether --
15 for example, in Florida, they're planning the FEC
16 corridor. They're planning a new train line there.
17 They're doing it with like state and local monies and
18 private monies, and no parking is part of that, you know,
19 initial phase.

20 They say, well, there's a lot of parking
21 already. We'll let the private forces provide the
22 necessary parking, so these parking lots are like key to
23 this transit-oriented development. I call it rail-
24 accessible development. So that needs to be looked at.

1 So, again, the busway, just for the
2 record, what was known as a busway, now known as CT Fast
3 Track, is a five-mile segment of the western half of what
4 was a four-track corridor from Hartford Union Station to
5 Newington junction, and a 4.4-mile state-owned corridor
6 between Newington junction and Downtown New Britain.

7 Joining that with a Pan Am railway
8 corridor between Downtown New Britain and Berlin
9 junction, known as the Berlin subdivision or whatever,
10 that could provide a secondary corridor, where you could
11 plan local stations between Hartford --

12 (Off the record)

13 That could provide a secondary corridor,
14 where you could plan local stations between Hartford and
15 Berlin and even locate the Berlin station on that
16 corridor, and then allow for a nonstop service, a higher-
17 speed service, high-speed, whatever those 110 miles an
18 hour, an 18-mile segment between Hartford and Meriden
19 station. That needs to be looked at.

20 The other thing is, by abandoning the
21 roadway, the highway, and if you just create one track
22 along that corridor, you also have room to build a rail
23 and trail alignment, so a complete multi-use trail from
24 New Britain to Hartford, connecting the two largest

1 cities in central Connecticut.

2 Also, with regard to the buses, instead of
3 like directing the monies toward bus parking lots, if you
4 directed it toward time transfer bus service, you would -
5 - I think that analysis needs to be done, in terms of
6 mitigating the pollution spikes that occur when you have
7 a car-oriented, you know, destination for these train
8 stations.

9 This has successfully been done in
10 California, in Irvine, in Silicon Valley, where there's
11 great service to businesses, communities, airports, so
12 that's another thing.

13 The third thing is the analysis is
14 lacking, in that it doesn't consider using -- when you
15 get to Windsor Locks, before you cross the bridge, that
16 bridge I think that was referred to earlier in the
17 presentation, the cross at the Connecticut River to go
18 toward Enfield and Springfield, there is a partly
19 privately-owned and, also, state-owned railroad track,
20 it's track in place, that would allow for railroad
21 service directly into Bradley Airport. That's something
22 that should be included in this analysis.

23 Having a one-seat ride to Bradley,
24 coordinated with the, you know, limited air travel

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 service that exists there, I think would greatly enhance
2 this project.

3 There's a lot of good things that you've
4 all done. I'm fully in favor to the limited scope of
5 this project, but I think, you know, these suggestions I
6 think there should be no at-grades crossings between, you
7 know, like the end of, you know, south end of Hartford
8 down to Meriden, and that should be looked at as a
9 continuous 110-mile, you know, like look at the potential
10 of that in your analysis as a 110-mile-an-hour corridor,
11 like they've done on Amtrak-owned track in the State of
12 Michigan.

13 MR. IKE: Mr. Stowe, we'll stay here and
14 give everybody a reasonable opportunity to speak.

15 MR. STOWE: I really appreciate.

16 MR. IKE: Okay. There's a first-time,
17 three-minute time limit. Let's see if there's any other
18 speakers, and we can come back to you. How is that, Mr.
19 Stowe?

20 MR. STOWE: Absolutely. Thank you so
21 much.

22 MR. IKE: Okay. We just want to respect
23 everyone's right to speak. Are there any other first-
24 time speakers? Yes, ma'am. You have to spell your name

1 for me, give your address, and name, please.

2 **Comment No: 1028; Ms. Ghannam**

3 **Summary of Comment:** Ms. Ghannam supports this project
4 since she uses MetroNorth to travel from central
5 Connecticut to Greenwich for work. Passenger rail service
6 will allow people to travel from New York to New Britain
7 and to enjoy things, make more diversity, improve the
8 quality of life, because people can move to find a job,
9 or they can move to go to places. She supports trains as
10 a model of transportation, rather than cars.

11 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 1.1 A

12 MS. YVETTE GHANNAM: I mean to put my name
13 down on list, and I guess I put it in maybe the people
14 that are parent. My name is Yvette, Y-V-E-T-T-E, and my
15 last name is --

16 MR. IKE: Go just a little slower. Say it
17 again, please.

18 MS. GHANNAM: Y-V-E-T-T-E, Yvette, and my
19 last name is Ghannam, G-H-A-N, as Nancy, N, as Nancy, A-
20 M, like Mary. I live at 162 Allen Street in New Britain,
21 five minutes away from here, and maybe some of what I'm
22 going to say I already say to some of you guys.

23 I've been commuting to Greenwich for the
24 last 15 years. I graduate in this University, and I was
25 one of those people privileged that got a job at the Town
26 Hall in Greenwich.

27 I got a job as a bacteriologist, and the
28 bacteriologist for the Town of Greenwich by 1997, and I'm

1 very grateful for all what the Town of Greenwich has
2 given me, and the reason what I have not moved is because
3 I cannot afford a house in there.

4 It's more about I love the Town of New
5 Britain. I love this community, so what I do in my
6 commuting is I travel to New Haven, I park, and then I
7 jump to Metro North, and Metro North is one of the best
8 in my life.

9 So, of course, I support this project.
10 Actually, four years ago, I wrote to the Chairman of
11 Metro North, because I do support Metro North to come and
12 to rescue us.

13 I used to take Amtrak, and all the time I
14 used to get stopped, because they were not responsible
15 for people that go to work. Amtrak gives great service.
16 Once you are on the train, we on track, but mostly it's
17 for people that like to commute or to go for traveling
18 and stuff like that.

19 I am one of those people that I need to be
20 in my job from 8:00 to 4:00, so I been able to do that in
21 the last 15 years, because I have Metro North. I have
22 never drove my car all the way to the Town Hall in
23 Greenwich, because Metro North was there in New Haven for
24 me.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 So I would like to support this project,
2 and I think I could second some of what the gentleman
3 here said, because I live in New Britain. Of course I
4 would love the train to come as closer to me, but I will
5 be concerned that, when you guys planning this station,
6 it should be a good parking, with good security, and that
7 you, of course, I second.

8 This is a very important University, so if
9 you could get the train to come into this University
10 somehow near, that would be great.

11 I also support the idea that I believe in
12 diversity, and I believe somehow in Connecticut we are
13 kind of pointing out the rich people. Everybody will say
14 where the rich people in Connecticut are, are this way,
15 that way, and that way.

16 New Britain is a poor city, Waterbury, all
17 these towns over here, so I would like people to
18 recognize not only that I use it to go to work, but,
19 also, that people will come from New York to our city and
20 to enjoy things, and that we can make more diversity,
21 improve the quality of life, because people, no matter
22 where they are, they can move to find a job, or they can
23 move to go to places.

24 When people -- I want to go -- I'll tell

1 you what is my day. In 2007, this was my day. At 5:30,
2 I'm on the highway, I get to New Haven, jump on the
3 train, get to the Town of Greenwich, I get there at five
4 minutes to 8:00, I start at 8:00, but once I get to the
5 train station in Greenwich, there's a shuttle bus, and I
6 jump on the shuttle bus, and I be in Town Hall Greenwich
7 at 8:00, and my bus has no problem, because I'm there on
8 time.

9 But I used to go to John Jay College after
10 finish my work for a Master's degree, so I used to finish
11 at the Town Hall in Greenwich, jump on Metro North, go to
12 New York, go to John Jay College.

13 Of course, I used to make it back at 12:00
14 midnight, and I was exhausted, but I really think I also
15 -- I think we need opportunities for jobs. We need
16 opportunity for education. I love the people from New
17 York, that they say I want to go to Central Connecticut
18 State, or the people from Central Connecticut State I
19 want to go to a conference at John Jay College, you know?

20 I want to go to New Haven. And I think
21 some of that in the wintertime is when the trouble comes,
22 and I think we need some kind of system ideas that will
23 bring safety.

24 I feel so sorry the other day -- there was

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 this gentleman on a motorcycle when I was on 91 going to
2 work. Next thing I know, I drove by Exit 10, there was
3 the gentleman, and the other side was the brain(phonetic)
4 you know? And I say we could save lives, by having trains
5 as a model of transportation, rather than cars, so I will
6 support this project.

7 I will support, also, the closer to New
8 Britain, but, in my case, I guess I will go to Berlin.

9 I want to thank Mr. Bernick and all of
10 you, Mr. Alexander, and all of you for taking your time,
11 because this is not easy, when you don't have enough
12 money to do what you wish to do, but when you're thinking
13 about your time, your extra hours that maybe your family
14 don't get that, I do want to appreciate that.

15 And I want to thank, also, the federal
16 officials. I want to thank our Governor Malloy, that I
17 know he is one that likes to support these kinds of
18 projects. It doesn't mean he can support it financially,
19 but I do know Governor Malloy he does support progress,
20 and I know the President of this University, Dr. Weiner,
21 he also will be happy for the improvement to as more
22 cities, poor cities.

23 We need to make sure those cities also
24 have opportunity to get to a good level of quality of

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 life. Thank you.

2 MR. IKE: Thank you very much. Thank you
3 for your comments. Any other first-time speakers? Any
4 other first-time speakers? Any other first-time
5 speakers? Any other second-time speakers? Yes, sir.
6 Just give your name and address for the record.

7 **Comment No: 1029; Mr. Stowe**

8 **Summary of Comment:** Trains in the corridor should travel
9 through to New York, so that the commuting public can
10 have a seamless one-seat ride from Central Connecticut
11 State University, from New Britain, from Hartford,
12 Hartford County, down to the Gold Coast. The New
13 Haven/Hartford/Springfield is an integral part of the
14 existing Metro North corridor.

15 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 2.0 B**

16 MR. STOWE: Thank you, again. My name is
17 Richard Stowe. My address is 12 Mead Street in New
18 Canaan, Connecticut.

19 I just wanted to speak to the issue of --
20 where did we leave off? The woman made some really
21 excellent points, so I wanted to speak to the issue of
22 what I have seen.

23 I've had some conversations with, very
24 excellent conversations with Mr. John Bernick over the
25 telephone. It's a pleasure to see him here in person.
26 Particularly, I expressed a concern in this planning of
27 the fact -- back when I gave a presentation at a hearing

1 in 2004 in North Haven, the plan was smaller and less
2 developed, and, at that point in time, every single train
3 was suggested to stop in New Haven, and you had to
4 transfer in New Haven to get toward New York.

5 My most recent conversation with Mr.
6 Bernick he indicated that the Amtrak trains now will go
7 through to New York, but, as the previous speaker has
8 suggested, she is traveling to Greenwich every day and
9 has done so for a number of years.

10 My conversation with Mr. Bernick is
11 exactly what I'm going to tell you, and that is that all
12 of these trains should travel through to New York, so
13 that the commuting public can have a one-seat ride from
14 Central Connecticut State University, from New Britain,
15 from Hartford, you know, all this area, like Hartford
16 County, down to the Gold Coast, if you will, is what it's
17 known.

18 And I say the Gold Coast, because there
19 were jobs lost. Between 2002 and 2009, there were jobs
20 lost, over 8,000 jobs lost in every direction for
21 Hartford County. People, employees in Hartford County
22 lost jobs in every direction, northwest, north,
23 northeast, east, southeast, south, west, every direction,
24 except for southwest.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 There, there was a gain, a job gain of
2 6,800 jobs. Those jobs were produced in Westport, in
3 Fairfield, in Stamford, in Norwalk, even in Manhattan, in
4 Greenwich, in Milford, in North Haven, in New Haven.

5 We need a seamless, one-seat ride
6 transportation system to be developed for this line.
7 Today, I took three trains. Yesterday and today. It
8 didn't take one day, unfortunately, but I started
9 yesterday in West Palm Beach, took the train to New York.

10 Fortunately, there was like a four-hour
11 built-in to my layover in New York, but we arrived an
12 hour and a half late.

13 The woman that I was sitting next to was
14 going to her son's wedding. She had an hour and a half
15 like built into her transfer in Philadelphia, where she
16 was going out to Lancaster. She missed that train by
17 four minutes, five minutes let's say, between four and
18 five minutes.

19 When I arrived in New Haven, we were
20 running a little bit late, because the train left Penn
21 Station, the second train I got on, left a little bit
22 late, so, fortunately, there was enough time to make
23 that. It was a 20-minute layover, so I did end up making
24 that transfer, but this uncertainty creates all sorts of

1 negative feedback and has an impact of reducing
2 ridership.

3 You have some transportation planners
4 here. The formula is 1.5, so if you have like this one-
5 seat ride, you get 1.5 riders. If you go to a transfer
6 system, like what you're proposing for the Connecticut
7 Commuter Rail, you go down to 1.0, so you lose like a
8 third of your potential ridership.

9 I say that, in addition, because I love
10 this area. I love the City of New Britain, and I'm so
11 happy to be here, but I will also say that the Gold
12 Coast, Fairfield and New Haven County, is a vibrant area,
13 with not enough train service.

14 In other words, they talk about congestion
15 up here. No, no. You look at the 20 busiest impacted
16 highways in the nation, I-95, Bridgeport, Fairfield
17 County, New Haven, that's like up in the top 10. Not up
18 here. Not I-84.

19 So the service is not there. We need more
20 service. We need more express service. We need to
21 shorten the train service from New Haven, which is now
22 like on Metro North, is about an hour and 50, down to
23 about an hour and a half.

24 By utilizing this super good corridor that

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 you're in the process of developing, you can allow for
2 that hour and a half service to take place, by running
3 the train to New Haven and then creating two or three
4 stops between New Haven and New York.

5 One of those stops can be Greenwich,
6 because Greenwich is the third busiest Metro North stop
7 on the New Haven line, which is the busiest line on the
8 Metro North corridor, which is the busiest commuter rail
9 line the country.

10 You have a great opportunity to like
11 significantly improve that, so your analysis is flawed or
12 not developed, I should say, in that it hasn't looked at
13 that, so I definitely would include that type of analysis
14 of a one-seat ride to unite Connecticut, to join it
15 together, by, you know, looking at it as the New
16 Haven/Hartford/Springfield as an integral part of the
17 existing Metro North corridor.

18 Two more things. I know I've said a lot,
19 but I did travel, you know, 1,500 miles, but one is that,
20 ideally, this corridor that would not end in Springfield,
21 but end like at least in North Hampton, where you have a
22 productive college community --

23 MR. IKE: Mr. Stowe?

24 MR. STOWE: Yeah?

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

51

1 MR. IKE: We'd be happy to stay here one-
2 on-one through the night.

3 MR. STOWE: No problem.

4 MR. IKE: But we want to give everybody an
5 opportunity to speak.

6 MR. STOWE: Please.

7 MR. IKE: I understand you traveled a long
8 way.

9 MR. STOWE: Would anybody else like to
10 speak? Go ahead.

11 MR. IKE: Are there any other speakers?
12 Then we'll let you have the floor, Mr. Stowe. Any other
13 speakers? Yes, ma'am. Please stand and give your name
14 and address for the record.

15 **Comment No: 1030; Ms. McKay**

16 **Summary of Comment: Will the PowerPoint you presented**
17 **tonight be available on the internet?**

18 **Response to Comment: 5.2 A Yes, CTDOT will make it**
19 **available on the project website;**
20 **<http://www.nhhsrail.com/>**

21 MS. MCKAY: Molly McKay, Mystic,
22 Connecticut.

23 MR. IKE: You have to speak into the
24 microphone, ma'am.

25 MS. MCKAY: Molly McKay, Mystic,
26 Connecticut, 8 Riverbend Drive. My question is is the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 PowerPoint you presented tonight available on the
2 internet?

3 MR. IKE: Mr. John Bernick commented that
4 they could make it available.

5 MS. MCKAY: Thank you.

6 MR. IKE: Any other speakers? Yes, ma'am.
7 Give your name and address for the record.

8 **Comment No: 1031; Ms. Ghannam**

9 **Summary of Comment:** In my job I take advantage of a
10 program that allows me to pay for Metro North service
11 pre-tax so that I don't pay taxes; this new service
12 should have a marketing plan for people that encourage
13 people to use trains to commute to work.

14 **Response to Comment: 4.4.14 A** Section 4.4.14 of the EA
15 (Page 180) confirms the need for the project to provide
16 mobility options for those who are transit dependent.
17 Federal law allows employers several ways to reduce the
18 cost of commuting via public transportation (bus, train,
19 ferry or registered vanpool) or qualified parking for
20 employees. Residents should contact the IRS or their
21 employers for more information on this program.

22 MS. GHANNAM: I just forgot to say that --
23 my name is Yvette Ghannam. I live proudly at 162 Allen
24 Street, New Britain, Connecticut, and I forgot to say
25 that during the year that I've been commuting to
26 Greenwich, actually, for the -- a year ago, for the last
27 maybe from 2010 to 2007, I was commuting with five people
28 to go to Greenwich.

29 One of them was a supervisor for the blood
30 bank at the Greenwich Hospital, the other one was a

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 supervisor of the IT at the Greenwich Hospital, and the
2 other one was working in the Town of Greenwich in the
3 Land Department.

4 Right now, he is working for the
5 Connecticut Environmental Department, and he was coming
6 all the way from Enfield, so what we did was we used to
7 meet off 91, Exit 20. There's parking there, so we used
8 to meet there and commuting.

9 I also want to say I don't know who
10 created this program, but in my job I do have a program
11 that they do take some money from me. It's Metro North,
12 that, at the end of the year, I don't pay taxes for that,
13 so they reimburse us some kind of thing, so, at the same
14 time, I think creating the facilities, having the trains,
15 I also will be maybe more attracted to some kind of
16 marketing plan for people that use this for work, that
17 they could get some kind of -- they can have their
18 dollars to long use, some kind of benefits for this.

19 Again, I just want to thank you. I think
20 2016 is too late. I would like this to be before that.
21 Thank you.

22 MR. IKE: Thank you very much. Any other
23 speakers? Any other speakers? Do we have anymore? Yes,
24 sir. Just give your name and address for the record.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 **Comment No: 1032; Mr. Burnett**

2 **Summary of Comment:** Please incorporate bicycle storage
3 facilities at all stations accommodate the bicycle riders
4 of our communities and make intermodal transportation
5 part of the plan.

6 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No. 4.4.10 F

7 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, everybody, for
8 being here. I appreciate the presentation.

9 MR. IKE: You have to give your name and
10 address for the record, sir.

11 MR. BURNETT: Oh, sorry. Gary Burnett, 83
12 David Road, Durham, Connecticut. I already spoke a few
13 minutes ago. I have to leave. I just want to thank all
14 the presenters and the whole team that presented the
15 information today.

16 I agree with the last speaker. I wish we
17 could have had this years ago, but it's in the works, and
18 I appreciate that very much.

19 One comment about the station designs that
20 I've looked at out in the hall. Could you please
21 incorporate bicycle storage facilities at all of them,
22 make that part of the plan?

23 We want to include intermodal
24 transportation as much as we can, so I hope that you'll
25 accommodate the bicycle riders of our communities, as
26 well.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Again, thank you very much, and good
2 night.

3 MR. IKE: Any other speakers? Do we have
4 any other speakers? Are there any other speakers? Do we
5 have any other speakers? Yes, sir. Give your name and
6 address for the record.

7 **Comment No: 1033; Mr. Stowe**

8 **Summary of Comment:** By cancelling CT Fast Track, you
9 could divert up to 100 million dollars of state bonding
10 money toward improving this New Haven/Hartford/
11 Springfield Line.

12 There should be an effort to communicate with our
13 congressional delegation about seeking some sort of
14 federal initiative to transfer the Amtrak property to the
15 state, so that we'd have state property on the New
16 Haven/Hartford/Springfield corridor, as well as the
17 existing New Haven line corridor, with a proviso that it
18 be used only for rail purposes, not for highways.

19 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 D**

20 MR. STOWE: Richard Stowe. I'm at 12 Mead
21 Street. I just want to say two last things. One is
22 getting back to the Fast Track highway, CT Fast Track.

23 By cancelling that project, you could
24 divert like up to 100 million dollars of state bonding
25 money toward improving this New Haven/Hartford/
26 Springfield Line. That would be certainly a great
27 benefit to the state, as you can see, that people aren't
28 just traveling between New Britain and Hartford. They're
29 traveling all over, you know, in many different counties.

1 And then the second thing is that, for the
2 record, again, there should be an effort to communicate
3 with our congressional delegation about seeking some sort
4 of federal initiative to transfer the property, the
5 Amtrak property to the state, so that we'd have state
6 property on the New Haven/Hartford/Springfield corridor,
7 as well as the New Haven, existing New Haven line
8 corridor, with a proviso that, you know, that, you know,
9 something written in there, that this corridor is not to
10 be used for building highways on. It was with the
11 proviso that it be used for rail purposes.

12 Thank you so much for giving me three
13 opportunities to speak.

14 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mr. Stowe. Do we
15 have any other speakers? Yes, ma'am. Could you please
16 give your name and address for the record?

17 **Comment No: 1034; Ms. Ghannam**

18 **Summary of Comment:** Thank you to all of you, again, for
19 **working on these great presentations and in this great**
20 **plan.**

21 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 1.1 A

22 MS. GHANNAM: I just want to finish to say
23 thank you to this gentleman and thank you to the other
24 speakers and the gentleman that left.

25 I see it moved me that many of the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

57

1 speakers from here they're not really from New Britain,
2 but the fact that people think about how can they make
3 humanity a better place to live, I'm going to be leaving
4 this place with that thought in my mind, because most of
5 the time we want things for us, but when we see people
6 that coming a little far away to put thinking about ideas
7 that can work for humanity, I just want to say to them
8 thank you with the bottom of my heart, and thank you to
9 all of you, again, for working on these great
10 presentations and in this great plan.

11 May God bless you, and, again, I want to
12 see this real fast.

13 MR. IKE: Thank you very much. Any other
14 speakers? Any other speakers? If there are no further
15 comments, I will now close tonight's hearing.

16 On behalf of Commissioner James P.
17 Redeker, I'd like to thank you for coming and expressing
18 your views tonight. Please remember that you have until
19 June 22, 2012 to submit any written postmarked comments
20 to the Connecticut Department of Transportation.

21 Additionally, the next public hearing for
22 the document will be on June 13, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. at
23 Asnuntuck Community College, 170 Elm Street, Enfield,
24 Connecticut.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

58

1 Thank you for coming, and have a good
2 evening. (Applause)
3 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned.)

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 7, 2012

59

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

	PAGE
John Bernick	7
Mark Alexander	17
Bobby Berriault	24
Gary Burnett	26, 54
Molly McKay	29, 51
Richard Stowe	32, 46, 55
Yvette Ghannam	41, 52, 56

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
EVALUATION FOR THE NEW HAVEN-HARTFORD-SPRINGFIELD
LINE HIGH SPEED, INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT

STATE PROJECT NO. 170-2296

JUNE 13, 2012

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

2

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a hearing
2 before the State of Connecticut, Department of
3 Transportation, in the matter of Environmental
4 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
5 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
6 Passenger Rail Project, held on June 13, 2012. . .

7

8

9

10 MR. ROBERT IKE: Good evening ladies and
11 gentlemen, my name is Robert W. Ike from the Connecticut
12 Department of Transportation. I will serve as the
13 moderator for tonight's public hearing. I'd like to
14 introduce the individuals to my right, who are here this
15 evening to make presentations and listen to your comments
16 and concerns.

17 Mr. Mark Alexander, Transportation
18 Assistant Planning Director of the Department's Office of
19 Environmental Planning, and Mr. John Bernick,
20 Transportation Supervising Engineer of the Department's
21 Office of Facilities Design.

22 We also have Mr. Steven Degen from the
23 Department's Office of Rights of Way. Mr. Degen will
24 answer any rights-of-way questions.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

3

1 Mr. Steve DeI Papa, Supervising Planner
2 from the Office of Environmental Planning. We have our
3 consultants, Robert Yirigian from Parsons Brinckerhoff
4 and his staff.

5 We also have, from C.D. Smith, Mr. Souza,
6 Mr. Smith and Mr. Sharat Kalluri, and they are here to
7 answer any questions that you may have. They're our
8 consultants.

9 We are meeting with you this evening in
10 order to discuss the Department's Environmental
11 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
12 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
13 Passenger Rail Project, State Project No. 170-2296.

14 I would like to emphasize that no final
15 decision has been made on this document. That is why we
16 are here this evening, to gather your input, in order to
17 help us reach a final decision.

18 This public hearing is being conducted in
19 accordance with the Connecticut Department of
20 Transportation's Policy, entitled "Public Involvement
21 Guidance Manual, Revised 2009."

22 The EA/EIE is being published by the
23 Federal Railroad Administration, FRA, in cooperation with
24 the Federal Transit Administration, FTA, and the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Connecticut Department of Transportation, DOT.

2 The EA/EIE can be viewed on the project
3 website, <http://www.nhhsrail.com>. Copies are also
4 available at each City or Town Clerk's Offices and the
5 public libraries in the affected municipalities along the
6 railroad corridor, the South Central Regional Council of
7 Governments, the Central Connecticut Regional Planning
8 Agency, the Capitol Region Council of Governments and the
9 Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.

10 The municipalities are North Haven,
11 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Newington, West Hartford,
12 Hartford, Windsor, Windsor Locks, Enfield, Longmeadow,
13 Mass., and Springfield, Mass.

14 A notice has also been published in the
15 Connecticut Environmental Monitor, dated May 8, 2012.

16 I will now discuss the format for
17 tonight's hearing, then, I will turn the podium over to
18 presenters. I will, then, moderate the hearing as we
19 listen to your comments.

20 For your information, our presentations
21 should take approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

22 My intent is to conduct a fair and orderly
23 hearing tonight, by following a particular format. We
24 would appreciate your patience during my remarks, as well

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

5

1 as the presentations that follow, by holding your remarks
2 and comments until this portion of the hearing has been
3 completed.

4 We will be happy to remain here this
5 evening until everyone has had a reasonable opportunity
6 to speak.

7 Experience has shown that audible
8 recordings can only be made if the person making a
9 statement uses the microphone connected to the recording
10 equipment, and I also want to recognize our technician
11 from the Connecticut Department of Transportation.

12 Microphones have been set up. If you wish
13 to make a statement, please come to the microphone after
14 I read your name from the sign-up sheet.

15 Please introduce yourself, and, if you are
16 representing an organization, please give its name, as
17 well. If you didn't sign up to speak, but a question
18 comes to mind, feel free to raise your hand. I'll be
19 happy to recognize you after I go through the speaker
20 sign-up sheet.

21 For those individuals who have a prepared
22 statement, you may read it into the record if you so
23 desire, however, if the statement is lengthy, you are
24 asked to offer a written copy of the statement for the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

6

1 record and give a brief summary of its contents.

2 Such attachments to the record carry as
3 much weight as the transcribed verbal testimony received
4 here tonight when the transcript is reviewed.

5 If you wish to speak this evening, we have
6 a sign-up sheet at the entrance to the room. There is a
7 three-minute time limit on all first-time speakers.
8 There will be no yielding of your time to other speakers.
9 Your time is for your own comments.

10 If, after all first-time speakers have
11 finished, anyone who would like the opportunity to speak
12 again, a reasonable amount of additional time will be
13 allotted for this purpose.

14 Anyone, who wishes to present written
15 comments for the public hearing record, should give them
16 to me before the end of tonight's hearing.

17 As a result of information that you might
18 learn at tonight's hearing, you may wish to make
19 additional comments on the EA/EIE document. Written
20 statements or exhibits concerning it can be mailed to the
21 attention of Mr. Mark W. Alexander, Transportation
22 Assistant Planning Director, P. O. Box 317546, Newington,
23 Connecticut, 06131-7546.

24 This information is also available in the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

7

1 handout, which you should have received when you entered
2 the room tonight.

3 The deadline for the receipt of comments
4 on this EA/EIE is June 22, 2012. Written statements or
5 exhibits must be postmarked by this date and must be
6 reproducible in black and white on not larger than 8 1/2
7 by 11-inch paper.

8 This information will be made part of the
9 public hearing record and will be considered in the same
10 regard as oral statements.

11 At this point, I will turn the podium over
12 to Mr. John Bernick, who will give the project overview.
13 Mr. Bernick will be followed by Mr. Mark Alexander, who
14 will give an overview of the EA/EIE. Mr. Bernick?

15 MR. JOHN BERNICK: Okay. Once again,
16 thank you. Historically, the New Haven-Hartford-
17 Springfield rail corridor has supported much more traffic
18 than it does today.

19 Back in the glory days of railroad, there
20 were 22 trains a day that ran up and down this corridor,
21 offered service not only to New York City, but Boston,
22 Albany and Montreal.

23 Today, only six round trips travel up and
24 down. There's four shuttles between New Haven and

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Springfield, and there's two round trips that are
2 associated with Regional Rail and The Vermonter.

3 Our program goals are to enhance a
4 regional rail service that accommodates both a commuter
5 and an inner-city travel, and a lot of people approach me
6 and say, well, you're working on that commuter rail
7 project, right? The commuter rail really shortchanged
8 the project. It's really more about inner-city regional
9 rail.

10 You have population centers here. It's
11 different than a normal commuter setup, where you come
12 from sort of bedroom communities into a population
13 center, then back out.

14 You have Springfield, Hartford, the City
15 of Meriden, New Haven, major population centers up and
16 down the corridor, and, so, really it's about travel
17 between regional destinations, like Boston and
18 Springfield, New Haven and New York.

19 We will accommodate commuter traffic,
20 people, who want to take shorter distance trips through
21 our ticketing structure, but, really, it's more of a
22 regional rail.

23 We're looking for seamless connections
24 with both Amtrak and Metro North down in New Haven. Our

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

9

1 long-term vision is 25 round trips a day. It includes
2 connections to Boston and Montreal and offers 30-minute
3 bi-directional peak-hour service.

4 For the startup service in 2016, we can
5 offer 17 round trips a day south of Hartford, 14 round
6 trips a day north of Hartford, and it offers
7 approximately 45-minute peak hour bi-directional travel.

8 Here's what the big picture looks like,
9 and you can see here how critical the link between
10 Springfield and New Haven is.

11 Massachusetts has a separate initiative
12 for what they call the inland corridor. It's serviced in
13 Boston to Springfield. Also, you have the service going
14 that could reach some day up to Montreal. All of this
15 funnels down to that critical link between Springfield
16 and New Haven.

17 We'll time the service, so it makes an
18 easy connection cross platform down in New Haven, gets
19 you onto the Metro North trains or onto the Acela
20 service.

21 Also, we're looking to expand service up
22 into Greenfield, Massachusetts, eventually with the
23 Boston/Springfield route. We're going to offer shuttle
24 bus service from the Windsor Locks station to Bradley

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

10

1 Airport, and, also, we'll be offering transfers to and
2 from the New Britain Busway Project.

3 The rail corridor at a glance, first
4 trains ran way back in 1844. This is one of the oldest
5 rail corridors in the country. It's 62 miles from New
6 Haven all the way up to Springfield.

7 About two-thirds of what was originally
8 double track has been torn up, and, so, two-thirds of the
9 corridor is single track, and that happened back in the
10 '80s. As a cost-saving measure, Amtrak took up that
11 second track. Now we see the need with growth in rail to
12 put that second track back.

13 There's 180 bridges and culverts that are
14 a particular challenge for us, and 38 at-grade crossings
15 that need to be upgraded as part of this program.

16 We currently have stations in New Haven,
17 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Hartford, Windsor, Windsor
18 Locks and Springfield.

19 The scope of the project is to put back
20 the two-thirds of that track that was taken up, about 44
21 and a half miles, upgrade the bridges and culverts that
22 we need to do to make that second track happen.

23 The 38 at-grade crossings will get
24 upgraded and enhanced safety. We're looking to enhance

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 the stations, so that they have high-level, what they
2 call level boarding. That speeds the boarding process,
3 allows us to run that 30-minute or 45-minute headway, and
4 is better accessed from an ADA perspective.

5 For the short-term, we're going to take
6 the Shoreline East equipment, the diesel equipment that
7 runs on the shoreline now, for the 2016 launch and move
8 it up into this corridor.

9 The M8 electric cars that are coming
10 online now will be able to run on the Shoreline East
11 voltage and take their place. Those locomotives, the
12 Shoreline East locomotives, are now going through an
13 overhaul, which will get them some life, however, we are
14 already looking and programming for new equipment that
15 will run on this line.

16 Our preliminary program cost for the full
17 build was 647 million dollars. That did not include a
18 couple of high-profile projects, including the Hartford
19 Viaduct, where the City of Hartford would like to take
20 the rail line and move it down to grade and realign it
21 with the I-84. That's a big project that's going to be a
22 separate environmental process.

23 Also, the Connecticut River Bridge, where
24 the railroad crosses the Connecticut River in Windsor

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Locks, will also be a separate environmental process, but
2 to get that 25 trains a day was 647 million dollars.

3 The federal government short-funded us.
4 We only have 471 million in funds available between the
5 federal grants and the state bond money, but that is
6 sufficient for us to launch service in 2016, so we can
7 hit that 17, 14 trains a day with the funds that we've
8 been awarded already.

9 We're looking for additional funding
10 opportunities, both through continuing high-speed rail
11 initiatives and, also, to fund the new stations, like
12 Enfield, for instance. That would be FTA funding, and
13 we're doing some of the homework now.

14 This environmental document that you see,
15 that you have before us today is part of that homework to
16 speed the way towards the obligation of future grants for
17 those new stations.

18 The project is broken up in phases, and
19 these are funding phases, rather than construction
20 phases. Because of the short time frame to make a 2016
21 launch, the project is really going to be constructed as
22 if it were one project.

23 It will be phased out more in a way that
24 makes sense from the construction perspective and a

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 timing perspective than it is from a funding perspective,
2 but this is how the federal government allocated the
3 funds for the work.

4 Phase one is a 10-mile section of track
5 between Meriden and Newington. Phase two is all the rest
6 of the work south of Hartford. And then Phase 3A is the
7 Hartford to Windsor portion. That's all we have awarded
8 to us now. Once again, that's sufficient to get to the
9 14 to 17 trains a day.

10 Phase 3B is what we're looking for for
11 future funding. That completes the track work up through
12 Windsor into Springfield. Also, we would be able to get
13 the Windsor and Windsor Locks stations into that grant
14 application.

15 Phase four is the additional stations.
16 Those would be Enfield, Newington, West Hartford, North
17 Haven, and an additional platform at the State Street
18 station. And, of course, there's always going to be
19 ongoing repair upgrades, and part of that ongoing repair
20 is also that Windsor Locks, Connecticut River Bridge, and
21 the Hartford Viaduct.

22 Here's phase one. It's 10 miles of track
23 between Meriden and Newington. It does not include
24 funding for the Berlin station. That came through in the

1 phase-two funding. It's a 60-million-dollar grant. It's
2 pretty much just track and signal work.

3 When we got phase two, that allowed us to
4 do everything south of Hartford. That's a critical piece
5 for getting those 14 to 17 trains a day. That's a total
6 cost of 262 million, and that does include the stations
7 at Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin and Hartford.

8 Phase 3A brought in the track work
9 Hartford to Windsor. Unfortunately, it does not include
10 the Windsor station, and we are looking for additional
11 funding opportunities for that and also Windsor Locks
12 station, a 43-million-dollar cost on that section of
13 track.

14 Phase 3B is we're looking for funding for
15 that, and that would complete the work all the way up to
16 Springfield and get the remaining stations at Windsor and
17 Windsor Locks.

18 The regional rail upgrades, those are the
19 stations that I mentioned. Once again, those would have
20 to be FTA funding. FRA won't fund those, because they
21 don't see them as intercity stations.

22 You would think that transit rail what's
23 the difference? Well there is, and, after the meeting, I
24 can try and go into it with you. The ongoing repair in

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Hartford and Windsor Locks bridge.

2 So why make the investment? This project
3 interconnects and integrates a lot of regional
4 transportation initiatives up and down the corridor. You
5 have bus service in each individual town, but it's very
6 difficult to go from town-to-town.

7 This corridor is the second most populous
8 corridor next to the Fairfield County corridor in
9 Connecticut, and, so, you have a lot of different
10 population centers up and down the corridor, and the only
11 way really to travel between them is car, and there's no
12 other transportation alternative.

13 You have Bradley Airport. You have the
14 busway coming online. This provides a backbone that
15 interconnects all of those things and gives you a link
16 down to the northeast corridor, which is the major rail
17 corridor.

18 There's both construction-related and
19 long-term job growth, and, so, the construction job is
20 only a small portion of it. The transit-oriented
21 development that will grow around the stations will
22 provide long-term job opportunities both from
23 construction of additional structures as people move and
24 locate their businesses, locate their homes near a

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 convenient transportation alternative.

2 It's about livable and walkable
3 communities. These are easily sustainable communities
4 that allow people to walk to the services that they need
5 in a more convenient fashion.

6 We have a very proactive public
7 involvement process. This is only one small piece of it.
8 We've been working with all the towns up and down the
9 corridor. We've had numerous meetings with them.

10 The station layout that you saw out in the
11 hallway is a product of an ongoing coordination effort
12 with each of the towns that is not over yet.

13 As we move through final design, we'll
14 continue to coordinate with the towns. That also goes
15 for the grade crossing, which can be a very touchy
16 subject. We want to make sure that our plans work well
17 with traffic and with emergency responders for each of
18 the municipalities.

19 With that, Mark Alexander.

20 MR. MARK ALEXANDER: Thank you, John.
21 Thank you, everybody, for coming tonight. What I'm going
22 to be talking about tonight is just a summary of some of
23 the information that has been developed for the
24 Environmental Assessment and the Environmental Impact

1 Evaluation.

2 This document is a decision-making tool
3 that's needed by both the federal and the state laws
4 require it, and it's covered under the National and the
5 Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

6 The LEED Federal Agency, as John
7 mentioned, is the Federal Railroad Administration, and
8 the sponsoring agency is the Connecticut DOT, and we've
9 also got a cooperating agency, the Federal Transit
10 Administration.

11 The Environmental Assessment is broken
12 down into different topics. Basically, we talk about the
13 project purpose and need. John, I think, did a great job
14 explaining the need for that project, and it's also
15 documented in the reports.

16 We looked at alternatives. We looked at
17 alternatives to, you know, as compared to the no-build.
18 We looked at different track alignments. We certainly
19 looked at different station locations.

20 And in the document we talk about
21 different attributes. We've got either physical,
22 ecological, or human environment that we're looking at in
23 the document.

24 This document is done at a high-level

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 analysis, using GIS-level information, just a limited
2 amount of field investigations for some of the ecological
3 work that's going to be done further on as we get into
4 some of the committee phases of the project.

5 Some of the key points that we looked at
6 in the assessment is their wetland impacts. Wetland
7 impacts for the entire 62 miles is estimated to be around
8 four acres. We're currently coordinating with the DEP
9 and the Corps of Engineers and developing a Mitigation
10 Plan, so that when we do move into a permitting phase,
11 we're well advanced to keep this project moving forward.

12 The assessment also looks at noise
13 impacts. We utilize the FRA and the FPA noise models to
14 analyze the predicted noise levels that this increased
15 number of trains would produce.

16 The analysis does show that there will be
17 moderate and, in some cases, severe impact. But those
18 impacts are from the horns from the trains, not
19 necessarily from the trains, themselves. And the project
20 is being designed with, you know, all safety devices, so
21 that if the towns choose and they coordinate and request
22 a quiet-zone designation, that's something that could be
23 obtained.

24 Endangered species, we've coordinated with

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 the DEP, as well as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
2 There's several species within the general quota, but we
3 have done some site-specific surveys to determine if
4 there's any impacts, you know, from the project, itself.
5 At this point in the project development, they're showing
6 no impacts to endangered species, but this coordination
7 will, again, continue as the project advances and we get
8 into the committee mode.

9 Traffic analysis, the assessment is
10 basically showing that the project will produce an
11 overall benefit to traffic, but, however, it does
12 identify nine intersections, where the level of service
13 at the at-grade intersections will be lessened, but we
14 are doing design work to look at ways to mitigate that,
15 through things like signal timing and roadway
16 improvements.

17 Property acquisitions, at this point in
18 the project, we're anticipating roughly 31 properties
19 being impacted, some of them full acquisitions, some are
20 just sliver takes. There's roughly 27 showing in
21 Connecticut and four in Massachusetts.

22 The cultural resources, we've done an
23 extensive review of cultural resources, both
24 archeological and above-ground historic information.

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 We're also working with the State of
2 Connecticut, as well as Massachusetts, State Historic
3 Preservation Office, as well as the FRA, in developing a
4 programmatic agreement on how we'll deal with these
5 resources in the design and the construction phases.

6 Secondary and cumulative impacts, as John
7 mentioned, there are plenty of beneficial impacts, as
8 seen from this project, from promoting the transit-
9 oriented development, creating jobs, region mobility and
10 improvements to the air quality.

11 Prime farmland, it's another issue that
12 has to be looked at in the Environmental Assessment.
13 We're anticipating roughly four acres of impact. We're
14 within the quota, but we're taking measures to see if
15 that can be minimized and potentially avoided as the
16 project advances, and we'll coordinate with the
17 appropriate agencies as the project moves on.

18 Safety and security, the project is being
19 designed with additional safety measures that exist from
20 what we even have today. As John mentioned, the project
21 will increase the frequency of these trains, as well as
22 increase the speed of the trains, but we're doing, we're
23 incorporating all the supplemental safety devices to the
24 project.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Construction impacts, with any
2 construction, there's always the possibility for
3 discharges during construction. We're taking steps in
4 the design, as well as planning stages, where we're going
5 to implement a best management practice in construction,
6 and we're going to develop a very proactive
7 communications program that goes to the residents, the
8 business and the town, so that they're aware of what's
9 happening, what's happening, where it's happening, and
10 when it's happening.

11 As we move forward with the project
12 through the Environmental Assessment stage, John
13 mentioned and Bob mentioned we have a 45-day comment
14 period. It ends on June 22nd.

15 So far, we've received approximately 50 or
16 so comments. Most of them have been very positive and
17 supportive of the project, but as we develop these or
18 obtain all these comments, we're going to develop
19 responses that have to be incorporated into the final
20 document, which is the final decision-making tool of this
21 process, and we're hoping it to be a finding of no
22 significant impact.

23 That will be issued by the Federal
24 Railroad Administration, as well as hoping to get sign-

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 off by the Office of Policy and Management in
2 Connecticut, so we can move ahead with the project.

3 This is one of three hearings taking place
4 on this point of the project, and once we get approvals
5 and the funding in place, we're going to be moving
6 forward with your further design, as well as getting to
7 construction as soon as we can for our implementation and
8 to launch service in 2016.

9 Here is John and myself's contact
10 information. If you have any questions today, we'll be
11 here until everybody -- we can answer most of the
12 questions, but if you have questions afterwards, you can
13 contact us either by phone or e-mail.

14 I think some of the literature out in the
15 hallway has our e-mail addresses, as well. Thank you.
16 I'll turn it over to Bob.

17 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mark. Are there any
18 public, federal, public, local or elected officials, who
19 would like to speak? Yes, sir? Just come to the
20 microphone and give your name and address for the record.

21 MR. STEVEN WAWRUCK: My name is Steve
22 Wawruck. I'm the First Selectman for the Town of Windsor
23 Locks.

24 MR. IKE: Excuse me, sir. How do you

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 spell your last name?

2 MR. WAWRUCK: W-A-W-R-U-C-K.

3 MR. IKE: And your address, please?

4 MR. WAWRUCK: 18 Burnad Road, Windsor

5 Locks, Connecticut.

6 MR. IKE: How do you spell that, please?

7 MR. WAWRUCK: B-U-R-N-A-D, W-I-N-D-S-O-R

8 L-O-C-K-S.

9 MR. IKE: Okay. Thank you, sir.

10 MR. WAWRUCK: Not a problem. I'm also on
11 your sign-up sheet.

12 MR. IKE: Okay, good.

13 Comment No: 1000; Mr. Wawruck

14 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

15 MR. WAWRUCK: I didn't realize I get to be
16 first on the list. Okay. As stated, I'm Steve Wawruck,
17 First Selectman of the Town of Windsor Locks, and I'd
18 like to take this opportunity to thank the officials at
19 DOT and Amtrak for tonight's meeting and encourage you to
20 consider our request to move the platform back to the
21 center of our town.

22 Tonight's meeting has been a long journey,
23 and, if I may, for the record, give a brief history, as
24 to the why and how that the Town of Windsor Locks has

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 come to request that the train platform be moved back to
2 our center.

3 Windsor Locks has always had the train
4 stop platform at the center of town from its inception in
5 the mid-1800s until sometime in the 1980s, when the train
6 stop was moved to its current location in the south end
7 of town.

8 It was moved, I'm told, due to
9 signalization issues that were causing inadvertent gate
10 closings and openings at inopportune times, so it was a
11 safety concern for all.

12 Fast forward to 2007, and anyone, who has
13 come through the center of town, could only describe the
14 downtown area as a desolate and unbusiness-friendly area,
15 with no catalysts to spur the type of business activity
16 that had been very vibrant and active up to the time of
17 redevelopment of the train station removal.

18 So after years of listening to our
19 residents complain about the lack of a viable Main
20 Street, and, as I stated, witnessing the continue of
21 decay of an area that was redeveloped a mere 30-plus
22 years ago, we commissioned a study to understand the
23 dynamics of the corridor and to explore short-term and
24 long-term possibilities to re-energize our main streets.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Also, about this time, there was a push
2 from the legislature in regard to transit-oriented
3 development, along with a push from the state and federal
4 government, in regards to enhancing the New Haven-
5 Hartford-Springfield rail corridor.

6 The rail initiative presented a very
7 opportune time for our town, as all the pieces seemed to
8 be there. We would just need to put together the pieces
9 in a proper manner.

10 With numerous meetings, too many to
11 remember, we have met with DOT officials and others to
12 overcome many issues and have had a few town hearings,
13 meetings to discuss the merits of the study and the idea
14 to bring the platform back to the center.

15 I have to say most everyone, not everyone,
16 but most, I have been in contact with are in favor of
17 this move. I would even venture a guess that if we could
18 roll back time, some may even say let's get the old Main
19 Street back, but we can't, so we need to move forward.

20 Tonight, we're at that crossroad. This is
21 our last meeting before a decision is made, but I will
22 say we have had positive feedback from the DOT
23 Commissioner, as to our perseverance.

24 We have had positive dialogue with the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

26

1 Amtrak Governmental Affairs Personnel with our continued
2 efforts in regards to both the relocation efforts and,
3 also, in refurbishing the historic train station.

4 We have had a positive meeting with our
5 Governor and continued dialogue with our state and
6 federal legislative leaders.

7 So, tonight, we have an opportunity to
8 correct those poor decisions of yesteryear and make the
9 smart choice of relocating the train platform back to an
10 area that can and will sustain the type of business
11 growth needed in every small town.

12 Currently, there are about 15,000
13 customers on an annualized basis, who utilize the train
14 stop in its current location. Think what that can mean
15 to an area that can grow with ridership.

16 We're very fortunate to be located along
17 this corridor, and I ask that you make the right decision
18 that will bring back life to the center of Windsor Locks,
19 by relocating the train platform back to the center of
20 our town. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

21 MR. IKE: Thank you for your comments.
22 Any other Federal, State, or local officials? Yes, sir?
23 Please come to the microphone. You have to give your
24 name and address for the record.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 Comment No: 1001; Mr. Bryanton
2 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 1.3 B
3

4 MR. PETER BRYANTON: My name is Peter
5 Bryanton. I'm the Director of Community Development for
6 the Town of Enfield, 100 High Street, Enfield,
7 Connecticut.

8 I just want to jump on what Mr. Wawruck
9 said about locating the train station downtown.
10 Unfortunately, Enfield doesn't have a train station at
11 this point in time. Ours burned back in 1979 or 1980,
12 and, so, therefore, because we don't have a station,
13 we've been pushed back to phase four with the other new
14 stations that are supposed to come online, such as West
15 Hartford and Newington, but it's very important that we
16 get a station at some point in time.

17 It's not just important for transportation
18 purposes. It's important for the economic and community
19 viability of our community.

20 Thompsonville, as you know, has been run
21 down for quite a number of years, since the Bigalow Mill
22 shutdown, and the town and community have done a lot to
23 try to resurrect it over the years.

24 Some of it has been ill-fated, such as

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

28

1 back in the late '70s, when they tried urban renewal, and
2 some of it has been a little bit more successful, like
3 operating a pond and putting in some bike paths, but, in
4 general Thompsonville is a depressed community -- and if
5 we're going to turn it around, we need something big to
6 turn it around, getting a station there, not just, as I
7 said, for transportation purposes, but to get people
8 moving, to get people on the street, and to build some
9 housing and some badly needed housing down there, and to
10 put some amenities on the river that will actually
11 attract people to the area, then you will bring back
12 things like restaurants and stores and shopping, in an
13 area that's struggling economically now.

14 I just wanted to make those comments. I
15 do thank the State for holding this in Enfield. I think
16 that's very important, and I thank you for the
17 opportunity to speak.

18 MR. IKE: Thank you. Last call for -- you
19 have to give your name and address for the record,
20 please.

21 Comment No: 1002; Mr. McMahon

22 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

23

24 MR. PATRICK McMAHON: It's Patrick

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 McMahon. I'm the Economic Developer for the Town of
2 Windsor Locks, 75 Timothy Terrace in Windsor.

3 Again, I'd like to thank DOT, as well as
4 Amtrak, for the opportunity to comment this evening.
5 Essentially, Windsor Locks, as you heard from First
6 Selectman Steve Wawruck, is looking at the two different
7 options.

8 There's an existing station in the
9 southern end of the town, and then one by the train
10 station stop. Essentially, the southern location has
11 absolutely no opportunities for transit-oriented
12 development, so it would not be a catalyst, a tremendous
13 catalyst to Main Street revitalization for the Town of
14 Windsor Locks.

15 The northern location by our historic
16 train station does have available land. There's several
17 vacant and under-utilized parcels that could be
18 redeveloped into residential housing, commercial and
19 office space.

20 We have a 250,000-square-foot former Mill
21 building, called the Montgomery Complex. We've had
22 several developers who have expressed interest in
23 converting that to residential housing. That would be
24 within walking distance of this relocated station.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Also, in this general area is our Ahlstrom
2 facility, the former Dexter Corporation. It's one of our
3 major taxpayers in the community, and, again, the
4 employees of that facility will be able to walk to this
5 station, plus the fact that the Montgomery building and
6 the Ahlstrom facility were existing there.

7 We have in the center of Windsor Locks
8 plenty of dense housing already, because it was a mill
9 village, and all of those different houses are within,
10 again, a very short walking distance of this relocated
11 station. So we urge the State, as well as Amtrak, to
12 proceed with the decision to relocate the station back to
13 our downtown area. Thank you.

14 MR. IKE: Thank you. Our first speaker on
15 the sign-up sheet is Doug Glazier. We have to go through
16 the speaker sign-up sheet first, sir, then we'll open it
17 to -- are you an elected official?

18 We'll have Mr. Glazier, then we'll go to
19 you. We'll alternate now, because you want to give the
20 general public an opportunity, so are there anymore
21 State, Local, or Federal officials? We're going to
22 alternate between the speaker sign-up sheet. Go ahead,
23 sir. Give your name and address for the record.

24 Comment No: 1003; Mr. Glazier

1 | Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.10 G
2

3 MR. DOUGLAS GLAZIER: Douglas Glazier, G-
4 L-A-Z-I-E-R, 167 Taft Lane, Windsor Locks. Good evening,
5 gentlemen from the DOT. Appreciate you having this
6 public hearing.

7 In Windsor Locks, if the train stop is
8 relocated from its present location at the south end of
9 Main Street to an area in proximity to the Old Train
10 Station at the north end of Main Street, serious traffic
11 congestion will occur on Main Street and Bridge Street,
12 making this relocation undesirable.

13 This congestion problem occurs as the
14 train stop relocation requires the railroad gates at
15 Bridge and Main Streets to drop when a train coming from
16 Springfield stops at Windsor Locks.

17 As the train approaches the proposed
18 Windsor Locks station, the Bridge Street gates will drop
19 and stay down, until the train has stopped, unloaded
20 passengers, loaded new passengers, then proceeds to start
21 and travel past the Bridge Street gates, whereby the
22 gates will then go up and vehicle traffic can proceed.

23 Connecticut DOT, Department of
24 Transportation, thinks this gate downtime will be about

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 two and a half minutes. I think that's very optimistic.
2 I think it will be more like three to four minutes, and
3 it depends on how many passengers unload and load and all
4 that stuff.

5 When this occurs, vehicles will be backed
6 up on Main Street going south past Elm Street. Also,
7 vehicles will be backed up on Bridge Street, all the way
8 past Warehouse Point's Main Street and probably further.

9 When the Bridge Street gates go up,
10 imagine how long it's going to take these long traffic
11 lines to clear through Main Street/Bridge Street
12 intersection, considering some vehicles will have to wait
13 for several traffic light changes before getting through
14 that intersection.

15 I expect this may take up to seven or
16 eight minutes of work for all traffic to clear through
17 that intersection.

18 I experienced and I observed something
19 very interesting at this intersection a few months ago,
20 as I was on Bridge Street when the gates dropped down. I
21 was a few cars from the gate, then the train, it was a
22 freight train, came through, so I timed the freight
23 train, and it was one and a half minutes for the freight
24 train to clear and the gates opened.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 I looked back and saw vehicles backed up
2 to Warehouse Point, Main Street. I had the green light,
3 so I proceeded across the tracks, turned left onto Main
4 Street in Windsor Locks, and I saw vehicles backed up all
5 along Main Street, past Elm Street by three or four
6 vehicles.

7 That was for a gate downtime of one and a
8 half minutes. Can you imagine how much further back
9 vehicles will be stopped with a three-minute gate
10 downtime? These long traffic lines would be most
11 objectionable by all of us, I'm sure.

12 With the gate times down at three minutes,
13 when a train comes into the Windsor Locks station, if
14 it's at the north end, can you imagine this occurring
15 every 40 minutes a day, with 20 trains going through this
16 intersection every day, when DOT has completed the dual
17 tracks and all 26 trains per day become operational?

18 We all know this horrendous traffic
19 congestion will be objectionable to the Windsor Locks
20 community, as motorists will avoid crossing the
21 Connecticut River at Bridge Street.

22 It will also cause people of East Windsor
23 to avoid going into Windsor Locks through Bridge Street
24 and may have a negative impact on the businesses on

1 Windsor Locks, Main Street.

2 Most importantly, the significant traffic
3 congestion will be discouraging to any prospective
4 developers looking to invest in construction of
5 commercial and business enterprises along Main Street,
6 Windsor Locks.

7 If this happens, the train station
8 relocated in the north area, eventually, the people of
9 Windsor Locks and East Windsor would be requesting that
10 the train stop be relocated back to the south area of
11 town.

12 Keeping the gate downtimes to an absolute
13 minimum can only be done with keeping the train stop in
14 its present location, at the south end of town, and will
15 give the best potential for any development, business
16 development along Main Street. Thank you.

17 MR. IKE: Thank you. Any other State, or
18 Federal, or Local elected officials? This gentleman.
19 I'm sorry, sir. This gentleman had already raised his
20 hand. You will be right after the next speaker sign-up
21 person. Give your name and address for the record,
22 please, sir.

23 Comment No: 1004; Mr. Fitzimons

24 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 1.3 B

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. JERRY FITZSIMONS: Good evening. My name is Jerry Fitzsimons. It's F-I-T-Z-S-I-M-O-N-S. 34 Walnut Street in Enfield. I'm a member of the Economic Development Commission here in Enfield, as well as the Enfield Revitalization Strategy Committee.

I'd like to echo Mr. Bryanton's comments in support of the train station here in Enfield. Additionally, the community of Enfield on a number of levels is working on transit-oriented development, bus service to interact with the train station, acquiring potential property for train stations and other transit development, riverfront development down in the area of the old train station.

There have been a number of people in the community that have come out in support of those activities. We are concerned about the timelines in relation to the funding and how quickly the service can be developed here in Enfield and are working to try to develop from the local level as many resources as we can and encourage the funding and development of the Enfield station as quickly as possible. Thank you.

MR. IKE: Yes, sir? For the record, just give your name and address, please, for the record.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Comment No: 1002; Mr. Donnelly
2 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 2.0 B
3

4 MR. JUSTIN DONNELLY: Good evening.
5 Justin Donnelly, Chairman of the Board of Finance, Town
6 of Suffield, 1321 Hill Street in Suffield, 06078.

7 I just want to applaud the State and this
8 entire project. It's about time. It's almost, perhaps,
9 too late, but let's get going with it.

10 I would also ask the State of Connecticut
11 personnel to broaden your scope. We have a rail line
12 that goes to Bradley Field. Transit of some kind over
13 rail is a no-brainer, as far as I'm concerned, and to
14 have us stopping the rail in the Town of Windsor Locks
15 and not going to Bradley Field and throwing more cars
16 onto I-91 and Route 20 just doesn't make any sense to me,
17 but, having said that, I think this is a great project.

18 I just applaud the fact that you're doing
19 this. Let's get it done, and let's get it done quick.
20 Thank you.

21 MR. IKE: Thank you. Our next speaker,
22 Mickey Danyluk. Just come to the microphone and give
23 your name and address for the record, please.

24 Comment No: 1006; Mr. Danyluk

1 | Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MICKEY DANYLUK: Mickey Danyluk, 18
Maple Avenue, Windsor Locks, 06096, Danyluk, D-A-N-Y-L-U-
K.

I'm a third generation Windsor Locks. I'm
one of the Town Historian. I support Mr. Wawruck's
comments. I concur with him. And I also think that Mr.
Glazier made some very good points, too.

I think, for the commercial benefit of the
Town of Windsor Locks, that the train stop can be
relocated, and these points can be addressed.

Of particular interest to me is the
historic train station, which I'm hoping can be part of
this new complex, either as an auxiliary building or some
use thereof.

I had co-founded a group of over 100
people. We have submitted signatures, several hundred,
to our congressmen asking for support on this project,
the historic train station, so I know that the interest
is there.

MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Our next
speaker, Jennifer Rodriguez. Please come to the
microphone and give your name and address for the record.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Comment No: 1002: Ms. Rodriguez

2 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

3
4 MS. JENNIFER RODRIGUEZ: Jennifer
5 Rodriguez. I'm the Planning Coordinator for the Town of
6 Windsor Locks at 50 Church Street in Windsor Locks,
7 06096.

8 Thank you for your time tonight. I just
9 wanted to briefly echo what our First Selectman, Steve
10 Wawruck, and, also, our Economic Development Consultant,
11 Patrick McMahon, said earlier.

12 Years ago, we did have a Main Street
13 study. It was a wonderful asset to the town, and I'd
14 like to talk a little bit about what the Planning and
15 Zoning Commission has done thus far.

16 The relocation of the train station back
17 to Downtown Windsor Locks is critical and will breathe
18 new life into Main Street.

19 The Windsor Locks Planning and Zoning
20 Commission has spent the last year developing a proposal
21 for a new Main Street and a village area and related set
22 of regulations.

23 These regulations will provide for
24 flexibility for developers, greater foot traffic,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 symbiotic with the relocated train station, maximum
2 setbacks, relaxed parking, higher standards and design,
3 all in keeping with an old Main Street feel.

4 This will encourage and accommodate mixed
5 use and transit-oriented development, largely inspired by
6 the possibility of having these improved rail services
7 and a new well-planned location of the train station
8 downtown.

9 I'd like to talk just a little bit about
10 our last meeting at the Planning and Zoning Commission.
11 They have actually resolved to have a hearing in
12 September to change some of the verbiage in our Plan of
13 Conservation and Development to include some of the
14 things that were in this Main Street study, including the
15 relocation of the train station. This is an important
16 first step for the town.

17 And, informally, I'd just like to say that
18 this already has been a catalyst, where I take the calls
19 if the developer is interested or a property owner is
20 interested in selling. And we've had a lot of calls just
21 in the past few months just once this process went
22 public, so thank you for that.

23 MR. IKE: Thank you. Our next speaker is
24 I-L-O-N-A Levitz. Levitz? Levitz? Okay. We had the

1 First Selectman of Windsor Locks. Jennifer Carrier?
2 Jennifer Carrier? Thank you, ma'am. Thank you. Give
3 your name and address for the record.

4 Comment No: 1008.1; Ms. Carrier
5 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

6
7 MS. JENNIFER CARRIER: Sure. Jennifer
8 Carrier, Director of Transportation Planning for the
9 Capitol Region Council Government, CRCOG, 241 Main
10 Street, Hartford.

11 I want to applaud the Department for their
12 efforts in completing the INO Corporation Councils
13 Government since we're very interested in getting the
14 federal dollars obligated. We've got a lot of work ahead
15 of us, particularly as it relates to the future phases.
16 But we will be submitting written comments working with
17 all of our communities and including the town of Windsor
18 Locks and we will be providing comments. We do support
19 locating the station downtown for a number of reasons.
20 Transit oriented development probably being one of the
21 largest ones. Those transit-oriented developments is an
22 initiative that the CRCOG is very active in.

23 Comment No: 1008.2; Ms. Carrier
24 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 1.3 B

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

We also will be talking with Enfield and actually trying to work with the Department and partnering with the Department to try to understand how we can get money for those new stations.

So, again, thank you, and we will be submitting written comments.

MR. IKE: Thank you. Any other first-time speakers? Do we have any other first-time speakers? Just come to the microphone, give your name and address for the record.

Comment No: 1009.1; Ms Klein

Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 D

MS. MARTHA KLEIN: Martha Klein, K-L-E-I-N.

MR. IKE: K-L-E-I-N.

MS. KLEIN: E-I-N.

MR. IKE: Your address?

MS. KLEIN: P. O. Box 542.

MR. IKE: P. O. Box 542.

MS. KLEIN: In Norfolk, Connecticut.

MR. IKE: Norfolk, Connecticut.

MS. KLEIN: I am a Public Health and

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 Environmental Advocate, so, therefore, I love rail, and I
2 really want to like this project.

3 I have two comments. There's going to be
4 problems with this project, because of the way the
5 Connecticut DOT has always functioned. They have not,
6 you have not been sufficiently open with the public, and,
7 so, there's a lot of things, there's a lot of problems
8 with this project that people don't know about.

9 So the New Britain to Hartford busway,
10 which is a separate, but connected project, and you want
11 to be able to make connections to that, that project is a
12 600 million, nine-mile project.

13 This project that we're talking about is a
14 600 million, 62-mile project. That right there, people,
15 should tell us something, so there's a lot of problems
16 with the busway project, and that's why Connecticut DOT
17 is being sued by freight companies, because you haven't
18 taken the concerns of freight into account.

19 Comment No: 1009.2; Ms Klein

20 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.3 A

21

22 This is my second comment. You also
23 haven't taken the concerns of the public into account
24 with this project, as well, so I am a member of a family

1 that has had a business in Hartford for over 50 years
2 that I'm very proud of, the Standard Paper Company and
3 the Party Shop, and I see on your plans the State has
4 already been pressuring my family to be able to take some
5 of their land, which they sold to you.

6 And I see, by looking on your plans
7 tonight, that you have completely put your project on top
8 of our business, as if it weren't even there. The
9 arrogance and the lack of planning is familiar to me,
10 because I'm aware of other projects with the Connecticut
11 DOT, but I'm really disappointed.

12 I want the rail to succeed, but you guys
13 are going to be hearing from us for many different
14 reasons, but mainly right now the fact that you're
15 obliterating Hartford businesses with sheer arrogance,
16 and it made me wonder about a comment that was made by
17 Mr. Alexander, about the hope to not interfere with
18 endangered species.

19 Are Hartford businesses an endangered
20 species, because we need some protection. Thank you.

21 MR. IKE: Thank you, ma'am. Any other
22 first-time speakers? First-time speakers? Yes, sir?
23 Just come to the microphone, give your name and address
24 | for the record.

1 Comment No: 1010; Mr. Souza

2 Response to Comment: 4.4.13 D The grade crossing
3 improvements through the Town of Windsor are included in
4 the current funding under Phase 3a. Therefore they are
5 scheduled for completion by 2016.
6

7

8 MR. PETER SOUZA: Peter Souza, Town
9 Manager, Windsor, 275 Broad Street.

10 I support the significant reinvestment.
11 It's positive for the bi-state region, and it's good for
12 Windsor Center. One concern that's been identified
13 within the Environmental Impact Statement and Assessment
14 is noise, and Windsor has seven at-grade crossings, and I
15 strongly encourage and support the efforts for a quiet
16 zone, improvements at those crossings to allow for the
17 Town to apply for quiet-zone designation.

18 I do have a question that I'd like to have
19 answered, if possible, is when those crossings would be
20 able to be improved. Would it be in the first initial
21 phases, or would it have to wait until later in the
22 phases, since Windsor is north of the Hartford funded
23 programs? Thank you very much.

24 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Mr. Bernick,
25 did you want to address that question, or take it off
26 line?

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

1 MR. BERNICK: We can take it off line.

2 MR. IKE: This is Mr. John Bernick from
3 the DOT Office of Facilities. Any other first-time
4 speakers? First-time speakers. Yes, sir? Excuse me.
5 Yes, ma'am? Just come to the microphone, give your name
6 and address for the record.

7 Comment No: 1011.1; Ms Kidwell

8 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.13 A

9

10 MS. ROBIN KIDWELL: Yes. My name is Robin
11 Kidwell. I'm a resident, who lives right next to the
12 tracks. My address is 51 Spier Avenue in Enfield.

13 I just have a couple of concerns now that
14 I think are going to be exaggerated when we get more
15 trains. There's the access to the tracks is not
16 restricted. There are no fences, except the width of the
17 road.

18 We're not too far from Enfield High
19 School. Routinely, every day, I see teenagers walking
20 the tracks. Yesterday, I think I saw a group of five or
21 six, maybe 12-year-old children with bicycles.

22 When there's people on the tracks, the
23 trains are forced to blow their horns, which increases
24 the noise, okay? So I would like access to be limited to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 the tracks. Safety, there's a lot of houses next to the
2 tracks, and it would just give you a little piece of
3 mind.

4 Comment No: 1011.2; Ms Kidwell

5 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.6 A

6 Secondly, Amtrak does not do a good job of
7 maintaining the brush, the trees, the bushes on the
8 perimeter of the property. Very overgrown, and it causes
9 the weeds, the vines to go up and kill the trees on your
10 own property.

11 I don't believe that we should have to
12 maintain the Amtrak side when we butt up next to the
13 tracks.

14 A couple of years ago, we had a fire along
15 the tracks when there was a spark that came from a train,
16 and there's dead trees that burned. I, myself, would
17 like to see a privacy fence that really, you know,
18 separates the personal property and the tracks. That's
19 it. Thank you.

20 MR. IKE: Thank you, ma'am. Any other
21 first-time speakers? First-time speakers. Any other
22 first-time speakers? Any second-time speakers? Do we
23 have any second-time speakers? Any other second-time
24 speakers? Yes, sir. Are you a first-time speaker?

1 Okay, sir.

2 Please come to the microphone, give your
3 name and address for the record.

4 Comment No: 1012; Mr. Smith

5 Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 3.3 B

6

7 MR. JASON SMITH: My name is Jason Smith.
8 I'm a resident of 55 Dove Court in Windsor Locks,
9 Connecticut. I want to speak in support of moving the
10 train station to the center of Downtown Windsor Locks.

11 As an individual who uses the train,
12 intends to bike to work as well, we are a one-car family,
13 I find it difficult sometimes, so I want to use the train
14 to go all the way, two to two and a half miles out of my
15 way to go to the train station. By moving it downtown,
16 it would make it much easier for people to access the
17 train station, who live in the area nearby.

18 It would also help businesses in the area,
19 by increasing the traffic to that region.

20 MR. IKE: Thank you. Thank you, sir. Are
21 there any other speakers? Do we have any other first-
22 time, second-time, any other speakers? Do we have any
23 other speakers?

24 If there are no further comments, I will

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 13, 2012

48

1 now close tonight's hearing. On behalf of Commissioner
2 James P. Redeker, I would like to thank you for coming
3 and expressing your views tonight.

4 Please remember that you have until June
5 22, 2012 to submit any written postmarked comments to the
6 Connecticut Department of Transportation.

7 Additionally, the final public hearing for
8 the document will be on June 14, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. at the
9 North Haven High School, 221 Elm Street, North Haven,
10 Connecticut. Thank you for coming, and have a good
11 evening.

12 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned.)

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

	PAGE
John Bernick	7
Mark Alexander	16
Steven Wawruck	22
Peter Bryanton	27
Patrick McMahon	28
Douglas Glazier	30
Jerry Fitzsimons	34
Justin Donnelly	36
Mickey Danyluk	36
Jennifer Rodriguez	37
Jennifer Carrier	40
Martha Klein	41
Peter Souza	44
Robin Kidwell	45
Jason Smith	47

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
EVALUATION FOR THE NEW HAVEN-HARTFORD-SPRINGFIELD
LINE HIGH SPEED, INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT

STATE PROJECT NO. 170-2296

JUNE 14, 2012

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 . . .Continued verbatim proceedings of a
2 hearing before the State of Connecticut, Department of
3 Transportation, in the matter of Environmental
4 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
5 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
6 Passenger Rail Project, held on June 14, 2012. . .

7

8

9

10 MR. ROBERT IKE: My name is Robert W. Ike
11 from the Connecticut Department of Transportation, and I
12 will serve as the moderator for tonight's public hearing.

13 I'd like to introduce the individuals to
14 my left, who are here this evening to make presentations
15 and listen to your comments and concerns.

16 Mr. Mark Alexander, Transportation
17 Assistant Planning Director of the Department's Office of
18 Environmental Planning, and Mr. John Bernick,
19 Transportation Supervising Engineer of the Department's
20 Office of Facilities Design.

21 We also have Mr. Steven Degen from the
22 Office of Rights of Way, who will answer your rights of
23 way questions.

24 Mr. Steve DelPapa, Supervising Planner

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 from the Office of Environmental Planning. We also have
2 Mr. Rob Yirigian, one of our consultants from Parsons
3 Brinckerhoff.

4 We also have, from C.D. Smith, we have Mr.
5 David Souza, Mr. Paul Smith and Ms. Schrif(phonetic).
6 Those are our consultants, and they're all here to listen
7 to your comments and concerns.

8 We are meeting with you this evening in
9 order to discuss the Department's Environmental
10 Assessment/Environmental Impact Evaluation for the New
11 Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line High Speed, Intercity
12 Passenger Rail Project, State Project No. 170-2296.

13 I would like to emphasize that no final
14 decision has been made on this document. That is why we
15 are here this evening, to gather your input, in order to
16 help us reach a final decision.

17 This public hearing is being conducted in
18 accordance with the Connecticut Department of
19 Transportation's Policy, entitled "Public Involvement
20 Guidance Manual, Revised 2009."

21 The EA/EIE is being published by the
22 Federal Railroad Administration, FRA, in cooperation with
23 the Federal Transit Administration, FTA, and the
24 Connecticut Department of Transportation, DOT.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 The EA/EIE can be viewed on the project
2 website, <http://www.nhhsrail.com>. Copies are also
3 available at each City or Town Clerk's Offices and the
4 public libraries in the affected municipalities along the
5 rail corridor, the South Central Regional Council of
6 Governments, the Central Connecticut Regional Planning
7 Agency, the Capitol Region Council of Governments and the
8 Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.

9 The municipalities are North Haven,
10 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Newington, West Hartford,
11 Hartford, Windsor, Windsor Locks, Enfield, Longmeadow,
12 Mass., and Springfield, Mass.

13 A notice has also been published in the
14 Connecticut Environmental Monitor, dated May 8, 2012.

15 I will now discuss the format for
16 tonight's hearing, then, I will turn the podium over to
17 presenters. I will, then, moderate the hearing as we
18 listen to your comments.

19 For your information, our presentations
20 should take approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

21 My intent is to conduct a fair and orderly
22 hearing tonight, by following a particular format. We
23 would appreciate your patience during my remarks, as well
24 as the presentations that follow, by holding your remarks

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 and comments until this portion of the hearing has been
2 completed.

3 We will be happy to remain here this
4 evening until everyone has had a reasonable opportunity
5 to speak.

6 Experience has shown that audible
7 recordings can only be made if the person making a
8 statement uses the microphone connected to the recording
9 equipment, and our DOT technicians have set up a
10 microphone. If you wish to make a statement, please come
11 to the microphone after I read your name from the sign-up
12 sheet.

13 Please introduce yourself, and, if you are
14 representing an organization, please give its name, as
15 well. If you didn't sign up to speak, but a question
16 comes to mind, feel free to raise your hand. I'll be
17 happy to recognize you after I go through the speaker
18 sign-up sheet.

19 For those individuals, who have a prepared
20 statement, you may read it into the record if you so
21 desire, however, if the statement is lengthy, you are
22 asked to offer a written copy of the statement for the
23 record and give a brief summary of its contents.

24 Such attachments to the record carry as

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 much weight as the transcribed verbal testimony received
2 here tonight when the transcript is reviewed.

3 If you wish to speak this evening, we have
4 a sign-up sheet at the entrance to the room. There is a
5 three-minute time limit on all first-time speakers.
6 There will be no yielding of your time to other speakers.
7 Your time is for your own comments.

8 If, after all first-time speakers have
9 finished, anyone would like the opportunity to speak
10 again, a reasonable amount of additional time will be
11 allotted for this purpose.

12 Anyone, who wishes to present written
13 comments for the public hearing record, should give them
14 to me before the end of tonight's hearing.

15 As a result of information that you might
16 learn at tonight's hearing, you may wish to make
17 additional comments on the EA/EIE document. Written
18 statements or exhibits concerning it can be mailed to the
19 attention of Mr. Mark W. Alexander, Transportation
20 Assistant Planning Director, Post Office Box 317546,
21 Newington, Connecticut, 06131-7546.

22 This information is also available in the
23 handout, which you should have received when you entered
24 the room tonight.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 The deadline for the receipt of comments
2 on the EA/EIE is June 22, 2012. Written statements or
3 exhibits must be postmarked by this date and must be
4 reproducible in black and white on not larger than eight
5 and a half by 11-inch paper.

6 This information will be made part of the
7 public hearing record and will be considered in the same
8 regard as oral statements.

9 At this point, I will turn the podium over
10 to Mr. John Bernick, who will give the project overview.
11 Mr. Bernick will be followed by Mr. Mark Alexander, who
12 will give an overview of the EA/EIE. Mr. Bernick?

13 MR. JOHN BERNICK: Okay. Thank you.
14 Historically, the New Haven to Springfield corridor
15 carried much more train traffic than it does today.

16 Back in the glory days of the railroad,
17 there were 22 trains that traveled up and down this
18 corridor, had service as far north as Montreal out to
19 Boston, as well as New York City. Today, there's only
20 six round trip Amtrak trains that travel up and down the
21 corridor.

22 Our program goals are to establish and
23 enhance regional rail service that accommodates both
24 commuter and inner-city travel, and a lot of people

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 approach me and say, well, you're with that commuter
2 project, right, because, originally, that's what it was
3 envisioned to be. The commuter service really
4 shortchanges this. It's really regional rail.

5 It's as much of a business, supporting
6 business as it does supporting a traveler, and, so, from
7 a station in Meriden, Wallingford, you would be able to
8 take a short trip down to New Haven or up to Hartford via
9 a subsidized ticket price to make it affordable, or you
10 could take a single-seat trip all the way down to New
11 York City, Philadelphia, D.C., eventually up to Boston,
12 possibly Montreal, and, so, it's really more of a blended
13 service.

14 Our long-term vision is 25 round trips a
15 day, additional connections to Boston and Montreal, with
16 30-minute bi-directional peak hour service.

17 For our startup service, in 2016 we're
18 envisioning 17 round trips south of Hartford, 14 round
19 trips north of Hartford, a 45-minute frequency in the
20 peak hour.

21 Here's the regional vision, and when you
22 look at this map, it becomes clear how critical the piece
23 is between Springfield and New Haven. When you look at
24 service that goes up north towards Montreal, the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 knowledge corridor, which runs Springfield up to
2 Brattleboro and realigns the rail along the Connecticut
3 River, future service from Boston, with work that
4 Massachusetts is doing, Springfield to New Haven becomes
5 the critical link for infrastructure.

6 We plan on timing the service, so we can
7 make easy connections down in New Haven to get on the
8 northeast corridor with the Amtrak Acela service or the
9 regional service. Also, time to meet Metro North trains.

10 Once again, we're looking to expand
11 service. The knowledge corridor up to Greenfield,
12 Massachusetts has already approached us about adding
13 additional train service up as far as Greenfield.

14 We plan bus shuttle service to Bradley
15 Airport at Windsor Locks, and, also, transfers to and
16 from the busway.

17 The rail corridor, itself, is one of the
18 oldest in the country. It's 62 miles long, and about
19 two-thirds of the track, which was originally the entire
20 corridor, was two-track territory. About two-thirds of
21 that second track was taken up, and that's what limits
22 the service now to six trains a day.

23 We plan on putting that second track back,
24 along with upgrading the bridges and culverts, which is

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 sort of where that second track used to be. There was no
2 reason to upgrade those bridges, and, so, they've been
3 decaying. And, also, the at-grade crossings we plan
4 safety enhancements at the 38 public at-grade crossings.

5 There's current stations at New Haven,
6 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, Hartford, Windsor, Windsor
7 Locks and Springfield.

8 Our program scope is to put that second
9 track back over 44 and a half miles, upgrade the bridges
10 and drainage structures along the corridor, as needed, to
11 do that, upgrade the at-grade crossings to enhance
12 safety, and to allow for quiet zone status, should the
13 municipalities wish it, and to enhance the stations for
14 high-level platforms, both sides of the track.

15 It allows for easy boarding, speed of
16 boarding, allows us to maintain that 30-minute headway
17 that we're looking for in the full build, and makes these
18 stations ADA compatible.

19 Eventually, we'll be looking for new train
20 equipment. For the short-term, we're going to take the
21 Shoreline East's equipment, the diesel equipment that now
22 runs at Shoreline East, the M8s.

23 The electric cars will eventually run that
24 service and relocate them up here. Those locomotives are

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 going through an overhaul now, which will get some life
2 out of them, but, eventually, we will be programming new
3 equipment.

4 Our funding status, initially it was
5 envisioned to be a 647-million-dollar project to do the
6 build necessary to get that 25 trains a day.

7 We were going to be able to do that
8 without upgrading the Hartford viaduct, which is really a
9 more complicated process in the City of Hartford that
10 involves the I-84 viaduct, and, also, without replacing
11 the Connecticut River Bridge, where the rail line crosses
12 the Connecticut River in Windsor Locks. Those projects
13 will need to be done, but they'll be part of separate
14 environmental processes.

15 We weren't given all that funding by the
16 Federal Railroad Administration. All of our funding to
17 date that we've been awarded is 471 million. That is
18 sufficient to do the 2016 launch, which gives us track
19 improvements as far north as Windsor and the stations at
20 Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin and at Hartford.

21 We're also looking for future funding
22 opportunities from both the FTA and the FRA to complete
23 the rest of the work.

24 Here's how the funding is broken down by

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 phase, and when we talk about the phases, it's important
2 to note that the project will be built as one project.
3 The construction packages will go out. They'll have much
4 more to do about timing and speed and efficiency of
5 construction than they will about how FRA chose to break
6 up the funding, but this is how FRA broke out the funding
7 that was given to Connecticut.

8 Phase one is between Meriden and
9 Newington. Phase two is everything else south of
10 Hartford, and that's what really keys in the 17 trains a
11 day. It gives us that infrastructure that we need.

12 Phase three was an additional grant that
13 came from money that Florida turned down. We took 30
14 million of that, and that gets us up to Windsor.

15 Phase 3B, which is the rest of the work
16 north of Hartford, is not funded, nor are the additional
17 stations and the ongoing state of good repair upgrades at
18 the Connecticut River Bridge and the Hartford viaduct.

19 There's phase one. It's a 10-mile section
20 of track between Meriden and Newington. It's a 60-
21 million-dollar total cost. It's just the track work.
22 The Berlin station was not funded under that, however,
23 the Berlin station construction will be timed with this
24 project, so it takes advantage of the track outages in

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 the construction process.

2 Phase two is everything else south of
3 Hartford. It's a 262-million-dollar project. The
4 federal grant has been awarded. We're looking to
5 obligate at the completion of this Environmental
6 Protection document, and that includes not only the track
7 work south of Hartford, but, also, the Wallingford,
8 Meriden, Berlin and Hartford station upgrades.

9 Phase 3A adds the track work up to
10 Windsor. Also, the grade crossings up towards Windsor
11 Locks.

12 Phase 3B, we're looking for funding for
13 that. That would be the additional track work north of
14 Windsor, and, also, we'd like to continue to fund the
15 stations at Windsor and Windsor Locks, so that we have
16 all the existing Amtrak stations now on high-level
17 platforms.

18 These are the regional rail upgrades.
19 These are the additional stations that we hope to add
20 with future funding, Enfield, West Hartford, Newington,
21 North Haven, and we'd like to get an extra platform on
22 the State Street station. It would allow us to have
23 passengers load and unload at State Street, which is a
24 big ridership driver.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 Ongoing state of repair, those are the
2 approximate locations of the Connecticut River Bridge up
3 to the north and the Hartford viaduct in the City of
4 Hartford.

5 So why make the investment? It's about
6 connecting and integrating the transportation systems
7 that exist, the segmented transportation systems that
8 exist up and down the corridor.

9 This is the second most populous corridor
10 next to the Fairfield County corridor. You have a bunch
11 of highly dense population centers that are not well-
12 connected, other than by I-91.

13 This takes and connects all those regional
14 transportation bus service, Bradley Airport, and gives
15 them a backbone that makes them work quite nicely
16 together, more frequent service, faster service.

17 It's about livable and walkable
18 communities, about allowing communities and
19 municipalities along the corridor to develop in a way
20 that doesn't bring the problems associated with more
21 traffic congestion in the center of their downtowns. It
22 now gives a way to travel in and out of town, for
23 employers to bring in employees, and for employers to get
24 their employees out to clients in a way that's all done

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 within walking distance.

2 Construction-related jobs is a small
3 portion of that. People try to hone in on, well, how
4 much construction jobs are there? Really, the real job
5 growth comes from the transit-oriented design that will
6 grow from around the stations. These are long-term jobs,
7 retail, housing. Businesses will choose to locate their
8 businesses, based on easy access to rail.

9 We have a very proactive public
10 involvement process. This is only a very small piece of
11 it. We've been meeting with the towns numerous times.
12 We meet with the Council of Governments up and down the
13 corridor. I, myself, and my staff are available. If you
14 have a community organization that would be interested in
15 this, we'd be happy to come and speak and give a
16 presentation that's tailored to your organization.

17 And, with that, Mark Alexander.

18 MR. MARK ALEXANDER: Thank you, John.
19 What I'd like to give tonight is a summary of some of the
20 impact assessment that was identified.

21 This whole process is required by the
22 National and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act,
23 and it's a decision-making tool. As John said, no
24 decision has been made yet, but we're hoping that the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 outcome of this will be favorable, and we'll move it
2 forward with the obligation of money to move forward.

3 The key agencies involved with this is the
4 Federal Railroad Administration, is the key federal
5 agency. Of course, the DOT is the lead state agency, and
6 we've been dealing with the Federal Transit
7 Administration for future funding for the future station
8 locations.

9 The EA/EIE is broken down into different
10 chapters. John, I think, did a good example of how the
11 need for this project and how we are moving forward with
12 things that are going to be helping the community, both
13 as a local and a regional benefit.

14 The EA is broken down into alternative
15 analysis, where we looked at the build versus the no-
16 build scenario. We also looked at different scenarios
17 with track layouts, as well as station locations, and
18 it's also divided into different categories of topics,
19 from the physical, the ecological and the human
20 environment.

21 Some of the key points that we looked at
22 in the analysis is one would be the wetland impacts.
23 It's anticipated there's approximately four acres of
24 impact throughout the entire 62-mile corridor. We've

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 been coordinating with the State DEP, as well as the U.S.
2 Fish and Wildlife Service, EPA and the Corps of Engineers
3 to make a determination of the impacts, as well as future
4 needs for mitigation.

5 Noise impacts, we looked at that. We
6 analyzed that, using the FRA and the FTA modeling
7 methods, and in that analysis it shows that there could
8 be some moderate to severe impacts, but most of these
9 noise impacts are the result of the horn noise from the
10 trains at the at-grade crossings.

11 It's important to note that, you know, the
12 horns aren't getting any louder. It's just the frequency
13 of the trains, you know, required to blow their horns
14 that causes this impact in the analysis.

15 The project, as John mentioned, is being
16 designed with safety features to potentially allow the
17 quiet zones, if the towns should choose to request that
18 from the federal agencies.

19 We also looked at endangered species.
20 We've coordinated again with DEP and the U.S. Fish and
21 Wildlife Service. We identified several species in the
22 general area of the corridor, but we've done some site-
23 specific surveys, and, at this point, no known endangered
24 species within the footprint of the project.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 We looked at traffic issues. Generally,
2 the analysis shows that the traffic will be beneficial to
3 the commuting population, as well as the general public,
4 but we did identify there's approximately nine locations
5 at grade crossings, where there will be an impact to the
6 local traffic.

7 Through the design phases of the project,
8 we're going to be looking at that closer and looking at
9 improvements to mitigate that, in terms of signal timing
10 and roadway improvements.

11 In terms of property acquisitions, right
12 now, we're anticipating 32 within the entire corridor, 27
13 taking place in Connecticut, and four in Massachusetts.
14 These acquisitions could change in the number, as the
15 design, you know, we get into further design, and we
16 notice requirements needed for constructability or for
17 water handling at some of the culverts and bridges.

18 We also did an extensive review of the
19 cultural resources within the corridor. The entire
20 corridor, from, you know, from throughout Connecticut and
21 into Massachusetts, has been determined eligible for the
22 National Register of Historic Places, and that
23 determination was made by the Connecticut and the
24 Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Office.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 We've entered into a process to develop a
2 programmatic agreement on how to handle these impacts or
3 these resources if impacts occur during the further
4 design and construction phases.

5 We looked at secondary and cumulative
6 impacts, as John mentioned. The analysis shows that,
7 overall, the project will have a beneficial impact by
8 promoting transit-oriented development, jobs, increased
9 mobility, improvements to air quality.

10 We looked at the prime and unique
11 farmlands statewide of important farmlands throughout
12 this corridor. It's anticipated as roughly four acres of
13 impact that could occur there, and we'll be coordinating
14 with the appropriate agencies to determine if any
15 mitigation is required as the project is advancing to
16 design.

17 Safety and security, there will be an
18 increased frequency of the trains, as well as an increase
19 in speed in some of the trains, but the design is going
20 to be implementing supplemental safety devices that will
21 mitigate those concerns.

22 Construction impacts, with any
23 construction project, there's always the opportunity for
24 some impacts from the construction activities, but we

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 will utilize best management practice to keep those to a
2 minimum, as well as we're developing a very proactive
3 communications program, so that we can keep the
4 residents, the business community and the towns apprised
5 of what's happening, where it's happening, and when it's
6 happening. That we found from previous projects to be
7 very important to keep the community involved.

8 As John and Bob both mentioned, you know,
9 this hearing is part of the public outreach required
10 under the National and the Connecticut Environmental
11 Policy Act.

12 We've got a 45-day comment period that
13 ends on June 22nd. This is the third of the three
14 hearings that we're holding for this project, and, at the
15 outcome of this hearing, as well as the close of the
16 comment period, we're going to receive all the comments,
17 and any comments will be responded to in the final
18 document that's submitted to the Federal Railroad
19 Administration, and we're anticipating that document to
20 be a FONSI, Finding Of No Significant Impact, which will
21 allow the funds to be released to move forward with this
22 project and design.

23 As John mentioned, we've got a couple of
24 milestones ahead of us, but, you know, as we move forward

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 in design and construction, with an anticipated launch of
2 service in 2016.

3 And just for everybody's information,
4 names, I believe, are in most of the handouts that are
5 out there in front of the auditorium as you came in.
6 This is John and mine's contact information. Bobby?

7 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mark. I would be
8 remiss not recognizing Mr. Jean Colonies(phonetic). Is
9 Jean still here? He's a rail administrator for the
10 Department and the Bureau of Public Transportation.

11 Do we have any elected state, federal
12 appointed, or elected officials? Please step forward if
13 you'd like to speak. We'll give you an opportunity to
14 speak first, if you so desire. Okay. I guess you don't
15 desire. All right.

16 We'll go to the speaker sign-up sheet.
17 Our first speaker is John L-E-T-O-U-R-N-E-A-U. Please
18 come to the microphone and give your name and address for
19 the record.

20 **Comment No: 1013; Mr. Letourneau**

21 **Summary of Comment:** In opposition to the alternative
22 location of the Wallingford Train Station at the Parker
23 St./Cerrito site and in favor of the Judd Square
24 alternative site because: a) Parker Street is further
25 from Wallingford downtown; b) the Parker St. site plan
26 requires an off-set platform; c) more space for expansion
27 near Judd Square; d) traffic from Cerrito site heading
28 onto Route 5 will be difficult; and, e) the active

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 business at the Cerrito site will require displacement.
2 **Response to Comment: 3.3 G** Section 3.3 of the EA
3 discusses both Wallingford Sites in general. Section
4 4.4.3 discusses the impact on property acquisition.
5 Section 4.4.10 of the EA discusses the impact on traffic.
6 The Town of Wallingford has recommended that CTDOT select
7 the Parker St/North Colony St. site. Both sites have
8 pros and cons relative to traffic impacts, parking
9 access, configuration of improvements relative to
10 existing features, and property acquisition/impacts to
11 private property. Impacts at either site can be mitigated
12 as detailed in the EA document. The traffic impacts at
13 the Parker St/North Colony St. site are more manageable
14 because the traffic mitigation measures will have fewer
15 impacts. The distances between the platforms on both the
16 Judd Square site and the Parker St/North Colony St. site
17 and the five-way intersection of Hall/Quinnipiac/Center
18 and Main Streets in downtown Wallingford are within a
19 reasonable walking distance.

20

21

22 MR. JOHN LETOURNEAU: I'm John Letourneau,
23 3 Regent Court, Wallingford. I am a resident of
24 Wallingford, I'm a business owner in Downtown
25 Wallingford, and I currently sit on the Wallingford Town
26 Council. I'm serving in my third term.

27 I'm in opposition not of the program, but
28 of the location of the station in Wallingford. There
29 were two locations that were identified. One was what is
30 known as the Parker Street site, and the other one, which
31 is known as the Judd Square site.

32 I'm in favor of the Judd Square site for
33 numerous reasons, but I'd like to get into briefly, and I

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 will submit a written report on this in detail, but, for
2 the record now, my opposition is the Cerrito property
3 site, or the Parker Street site. Number one, it's a
4 little too far away from the downtown.

5 The one site that I just mentioned, from
6 the center of town to Parker Street, is 2,300 feet. The
7 Judd Square site, from the edge of the property to the
8 center of the downtown using the same center line, is
9 1,700 feet.

10 The Parker Street site has an offset
11 platform, and from the parking lot just to the up and
12 over, from the edge of the parking lot to the up and
13 over, is roughly 600 feet, and only 200 of that is going
14 to be covered with a canopy on the platform.

15 Then, you have to go up and over, and
16 you're going to go approximately another 100, 150 feet to
17 utilize the other platform.

18 The Judd Square site, the platforms are
19 pretty much parallel, with an up and over in the middle.
20 It's user-friendly. There's room for expansion on the
21 Judd Square site. Presently, there's a proposed I
22 believe it's a two-level parking garage, but there's
23 property next to it that could be utilized for expansion.

24 On the Parker Street/Cerrito property,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 it's flat. The only place they can go is up, so you
2 would be two parking garages down the road for expansion.

3 Another piece of this that really disturbs
4 me with our traffic pattern on North Colony Street, which
5 is U.S. Route 5, the Cerrito property comes right out
6 onto Route 5.

7 There's provisions only on that property
8 for bus, and there's three, they have three bus births on
9 that property, nothing on the current Amtrak-owned
10 property on Parker Street or the Parker Street site.

11 It is extremely difficult to get out of
12 parking lots on Route 5 in other businesses. There's a
13 church there. Any time of the day, to go left or right
14 on that road, it's an extremely busy road, and I just
15 don't see how we can effectively get traffic flowing onto
16 Route 5.

17 The other site, there's alternate routes
18 on the Judd Square site to go around, and it's very close
19 to a railroad bridge that will access from the rear going
20 down South Cherry Street and then over the John Street
21 bridge, so there's more access on the Judd Square site.

22 This has been talked about in Wallingford
23 for a long time. As I said earlier, I'm not against the
24 project. I'm against the site. This is something that's

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 going to impact our town for the next hundred years, at
2 least.

3 What's happening in our town with the
4 choosing of this site is as important as the site that
5 was originally there back when the railroad came back in
6 the 1850s, and I don't believe that the true thought
7 pattern has gone into this in depth.

8 I know I sit up there with councilors that
9 are new to the council, this is their first term, that
10 haven't dug into this, and we took a vote on it last
11 evening, Tuesday evening, and, out of nine sitting
12 councilors, there were seven of us present. Two voted
13 for it, five didn't. Out of the five, we have two new
14 ones, so the lack of information that we had.

15 There was, also in town, we had a working
16 group. The council was not privy to that information of
17 the working group. That was presented to us farther down
18 towards our meeting. So I think it needs to be
19 revisited. I would like to have DOT take another look at
20 it.

21 The Cerrito property, that's a currently-
22 owned business that employs six people. That would have
23 to be purchased and/or relocate the business.

24 The Judd Square site, not at all. Those

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 are properties. There's one house, and there's a Knights
2 of Columbus hall, and two vacant warehouses, that have
3 been vacant for probably the last 40 to 50 years they
4 haven't been used.

5 So, again, I can't say, you know, why
6 should we take a working piece of property, with a
7 working business on there, with employees, and trump that
8 over vacant warehouses? So there's a lot of pieces to
9 this, and, I'm sorry, I'm trying to stay within the three
10 minutes, which is hard for me, but I will submit the full
11 report, but this is the brief report. Thank you.

12 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is
13 James P. RePass. Just give your name and address for the
14 record, please.

15 **Comment No: 1014; Mr. Repass**

16 **Summary of Comment:** Concerned that the construction of
17 the project will impinge on the future construction of
18 rail service to New Britain or Waterbury.

19 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 2.0 B

20 MR. JAMES RePASS: Hi. My name is James
21 RePass, and, for the record, my northeastern office is in
22 Mystic, Connecticut. I'm Chairman and Chief Executive
23 Officer of the National Corridors Initiative, which is an
24 organization that has a great concern in the various
25 transportation corridors in the United States.

26 This particular corridor is of interest to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 us, because it goes to Montreal, and there's quite a
2 future in the transportation system if we do it right.

3 The reason that I'm here this evening is
4 I'm very greatly concerned about not this project, which
5 I'm happy to see moving forward after many years of
6 work, but the busway, which is being built on the right
7 of way of Amtrak that's going to impinge on the operation
8 of this corridor.

9 It will impinge in several ways. One of
10 those ways is that the freight corridor will become
11 unavailable once the speeds of the passenger trains get
12 above 110 miles per hour. That's a technical thing, but
13 something to keep in mind.

14 I'd like to see the CONN DOT work more
15 closely internally to discuss internally and solve some
16 of the problems that are going to be brought about by the
17 restrictions caused by this right of way impingement.

18 It's going to be a very difficult thing to
19 deal with if we have a concrete busway on top of an
20 existing rail right of way, which should be preserved for
21 future use.

22 The effect and the impact will not happen
23 this year. It will happen five to seven years from now,
24 and that's something that's pretty close, but far enough

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 away that perhaps we are not thinking about it as much as
2 we should.

3 I think I'll leave my comments at that for
4 now. Thank you.

5 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Our next
6 speaker, Molly McKay. Please come to the microphone and
7 give your name and address for the record.

8 **Comment No: 1015; Ms. McKay**

9 **Summary of Comment 1015.1:** Ms. McKay is concerned that
10 the construction of the project will impinge on the
11 future construction of rail service to New Britain or
12 Waterbury.

13 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 2.0 B-1

14 **Summary of Comment 1015.2:** Ms. McKay is concerned that
15 property acquisitions for the construction of the West
16 Hartford Station will displace on existing business and
17 employment on Flatbush Avenue.

18 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 4.4.3 A

19 MS. MOLLY McKAY: My name is Molly McKay.
20 Address, 8 Riverbend Drive, Mystic, Connecticut.

21 I have already spoken about some of the
22 same issues that Mr. RePass brought up tonight about the
23 busway, and I have the same concerns about how it will
24 impinge on this, so I think it's a wonderful plan, to
25 bring many more trains through central Connecticut.

26 My concern tonight is what I learned
27 recently, that one of the acquisitions of property might
28 possibly be a thriving business that has been in Hartford

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 away that perhaps we are not thinking about it as much as
2 we should.

3 I think I'll leave my comments at that for
4 now. Thank you.

5 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Our next
6 speaker, Molly McKay. Please come to the microphone and
7 give your name and address for the record.

8 **Comment No: 1015; Ms. McKay**

9 **Summary of Comment 1015.1:** Ms. McKay is concerned that
10 the construction of the project will impinge on the
11 future construction of rail service to New Britain or
12 Waterbury.

13 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 2.0 B-1

14 **Summary of Comment 1015.2:** Ms. McKay is concerned that
15 property acquisitions for the construction of the West
16 Hartford Station will displace on existing business and
17 employment on Flatbush Avenue.

18 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 4.4.3 A

19 MS. MOLLY McKAY: My name is Molly McKay.
20 Address, 8 Riverbend Drive, Mystic, Connecticut.

21 I have already spoken about some of the
22 same issues that Mr. RePass brought up tonight about the
23 busway, and I have the same concerns about how it will
24 impinge on this, so I think it's a wonderful plan, to
25 bring many more trains through central Connecticut.

26 My concern tonight is what I learned
27 recently, that one of the acquisitions of property might
28 possibly be a thriving business that has been in Hartford

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 at the Flatbush Avenue site, where it's Flatbush Avenue
2 and New Park Street.

3 There's a business there, called the Party
4 Shop, owned by a company named Standard Paper, and it's
5 been there since the 1930s, and I heard, I didn't see it
6 on the chart tonight, but I heard that that's one of the
7 potential acquisitions of property, and I can't -- I've
8 been to that space, and I've seen the acres and acres of
9 land around the building where the Party Shop is, and I
10 can't believe that there isn't enough space to have
11 coffee shops and a little book store, or whatever the
12 transit-oriented development will be, which is a very
13 good thing.

14 It's very good for the economy to get
15 transit-oriented development around the stations, but to
16 wipe out a successful business, that employs many people,
17 and that is doing well, even in this terrible economic
18 turndown, I think that ought to be reviewed, and I think
19 it would be tragic to push that out.

20 It could be an enhancement to the
21 development. How many people have a thriving party shop
22 for all these products that they use, the Puerto Rican
23 community uses for their celebrations, and anybody
24 planning parties or events?

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 It's a very, very popular business, and
2 it's doing well. As I say, even though it's slowed down
3 in these years, but it's still thriving, and there are a
4 lot of jobs there, so that's my main concern to bring up
5 tonight.

6 MR. IKE: Thank you very much.

7 MS. MCKAY: I have a question.

8 MR. IKE: Yes, ma'am?

9 MS. MCKAY: I can't remember. Oh. Why is
10 there just one track going through Union Station? It
11 seems like -- I'm not a train expert, but I'm wondering
12 why there would only be --

13 MR. IKE: This is, for the record, Mr.
14 John Bernick.

15 MR. BERNICK: Over the Hartford viaduct,
16 in front of Union Station, yeah, that is --

17 Ms. MCKAY: Yeah, okay.

18 MR. BERNICK: Right, yeah. It is a pinch
19 point in the system. The problem is the structure,
20 itself, won't support two tracks. That structure dates
21 very -- it's very old.

22 It wasn't built to very high standards,
23 even when it was built. We normally build structures to
24 what they call a Cooper E80 Loading. It's 8,000 pounds

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 per linear foot, is the load rating on it.

2 When that structure was built, it was only
3 built to 2,000 pounds a linear foot load rating, so it
4 doesn't carry the load rating enough to put two tracks on
5 it.

6 The long-term plan for Hartford, and this
7 is coordinated, and this is an initiative that's being
8 driven by the City of Hartford, is to take the alignment
9 of the railway and I-84, which now twists, the railway
10 comes underneath I-84, hits Union Station, then passes
11 back underneath I-84 again, is to take and untangle those
12 and bring both structures down to grade.

13 In other words, you'd have I-84 slightly
14 sunken through Hartford, and then the rail line would be
15 cut into Asylum Hill.

16 What that does is that allows you to
17 reconnect Hartford over the top of those two alignments.
18 It's a big benefit to the City of Hartford. They're
19 looking to reconnect the City. Lots of development
20 opportunities there. It's an initiative that the City of
21 Hartford is very hot on and the region is hot on, and,
22 so, we're attempting to accommodate that plan.

23 It's a little bit more of a long-term
24 vision, because it's quite a lot of work. There's a lot

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 of, once again, property acquisitions that have to happen
2 in order to make that alignment work.

3 It is, overall, a big cost savings, when
4 you compare it to the cost of replacing what they call
5 the Aetna Viaduct, I-84 elevated through Hartford. That
6 is due for replacement. That structure is ending, is
7 approaching its end of life, and, so, to replace that
8 with another elevated structure would be hugely
9 expensive. Lowering it to grade is a big savings.

10 So between the two projects, it's a net
11 savings in that infrastructure that needs to be replaced.
12 So that's maybe a long answer, but that's all the details
13 of what happens through Hartford on single track there.

14 MS. MCKAY: Thank you.

15 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mr. Bernick. For the
16 record, Robert W. Ike. Our next speaker, Amanda Kennedy.
17 Please come to the microphone. Give your name and
18 address for the record.

19 **Comment No: 1016; Ms. Kennedy**

20 **Summary of Comment 1016.1:** Ms. Kennedy represents the
21 Regional Plan Association and strongly supports the
22 project; however, cited the following comments and
23 concerns that the project: a) needs to be constructed in
24 coordination with improvements to local transit systems.

25 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 4.4.10 A.

26 **Summary of Comment 1016.2:** b) needs to be accompanied by
27 support for land use planning (e.g. TOD).

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1 **Response to Comment:** 4.4.15 B Section 4.4.15 of the EA,
2 "Secondary and Cumulative Impacts", discusses the
3 cumulative impacts relative to potential new local
4 development or redevelopment adjacent to or in the
5 proximity of new or improved train stations; the State of
6 Connecticut is encouraging and assisting towns and cities
7 along the corridor to consider and incentivize transit-
8 oriented development (TOD) near the train stations to
9 optimize the benefits of transit, improve the local
10 economy and provide jobs - the table "Summary of Economic
11 Environment and Potential Development" in Appendix 5
12 provides information on planned or potential TOD for each
13 of the stations in the corridor.

14 **Summary of Comment 1016.3:** c) needs to promote intermodal
15 connectivity.

16 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 4.4.10 A.

17 **Summary of Comment 1016.4:** d) needs good branding and
18 marketing campaign to expand ridership.

19 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 1.3 A.

20 **Summary of Comment 1016.5:** e) needs to create a single,
21 corridor-wide economic development plan with innovative
22 financing mechanisms.

23 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 1.3 A.

24 **Summary of Comment 1016.6:** f) needs to provide support to
25 communities to assist with TOD planning and zoning.

26 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 4.4.15 B.

27 **Summary of Comment 1016.7:** g) needs a single purpose
28 entity or authority to coordinate all inter-related
29 activities.

30 **Response to Comment:** See response to Comment 1.3 A.

31 MS. AMANDA KENNEDY: I'm Amanda Kennedy.
32 I'm with Regional Plan Association, and our Connecticut
33 Office is Two Landmark Square, Suite 108, Stamford,
34 Connecticut.

35 As you may know, RPA is a 90-year-old
36 independent urban research and advocacy group that's

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 dedicated to planning the growth of the New York, New
2 Jersey, Connecticut and Metropolitan region, and a lot of
3 the work we do is in the way that transportation systems
4 shape growth, housing, commercial development.

5 I'm here to share with CONN DOT RPA's
6 strong support for the New Haven, Hartford, Springfield
7 rail corridor improvement program, which is going to
8 create faster, more frequent and more connections between
9 the important job centers, not only allowing the New
10 Haven/Springfield corridor, but connecting that region
11 with southwestern Connecticut and New York City.

12 But we want to emphasize that the rail
13 project can't just stand on its own. It needs to be in
14 conjunction with improvements to local transit systems.
15 It needs to be part of a -- have a good branding and
16 marketing scheme to attract multiple ridership groups,
17 and it also needs to be accompanied by support for land
18 use planning to maximize the benefits of the rail system.

19 So we've been working on this project for
20 awhile. Last year, we convened two workshops with
21 business and community leaders. One was in Hartford with
22 planners and economic development officials, and then we
23 had one in Rocky Hill that was more, brought more
24 business representatives in, and we looked at various

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 case studies from around the country to determine what
2 strategies need to accompany the rail projects to really
3 spur sustainable economic growth and housing.

4 At the first workshop, we brought down
5 experts from Maine's Downeaster Project, which is very
6 comparable to this one, in that it connects an
7 underdeveloped region in Maine to Boston and California's
8 capitol corridor, which connects with Sacramento, and, in
9 both places, communities have embraced rail service as
10 the cornerstone of their economic development strategies.

11 We presented those case studies with our
12 audience, developed strategies specifically for New
13 Haven/Springfield, and then tested those strategies with
14 the business audience at the second workshop.

15 And I just want to briefly mention some of
16 the strategies that we're proposing really need to be a
17 part of the New Haven/Springfield rail project.

18 Number one, we need to make sure that the
19 rail service is accessible to multiple ridership groups,
20 and one key strategy for doing that is to promote
21 intermodal connectivity, the integrating bus shuttle,
22 bike and pedestrian infrastructure, especially pedestrian
23 infrastructure, making sure that the station areas aren't
24 developed with suburban-style parking lots, but they

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 really make sure that walking connections are as quick
2 and comfortable as possible. Pedestrians should always
3 have the right of way in a station area.

4 Secondly, a good branding and marketing
5 campaign can cultivate a diverse and loyal ridership that
6 really makes -- it expands the ridership base. It makes
7 the service actually more financially feasible, because
8 you fill up trains on the reverse commute routes.

9 Maine has been really successful branding
10 the Downeaster as a Maine service, getting both commuters
11 and tourists, who come for the lobster rolls that they
12 serve on the trains in the summer.

13 Thirdly, we need to create a single-
14 corridor-wide economic development plan that really the
15 train is there to attract and retain both residents with
16 skills and to expand business growth, and we need to
17 embrace the rail service as the core of that economic
18 development plan.

19 We should develop innovative financing
20 mechanisms, like Value Capture, that enable communities
21 to extract value from the rail services and fund ongoing
22 capital improvements that improve the station areas and
23 promote TOD, Transit-Oriented Development.

24 A Transit Village Program, like the one

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 they run in New Jersey, would provide funding and
2 technical assistance to communities that want to promote
3 development in their downtown, and this has been done to
4 some extent already with TOD planning grants, but
5 definitely more work needs to be done, especially as the
6 program gets in service.

7 A corridor-wide overlay district can help
8 communities develop zoning that helps them to encourage
9 development around rail stations, but still very much
10 respects and acknowledges home rule, in terms of land use
11 planning.

12 And, lastly, the idea of forming a single-
13 purpose entity, which is what they did in Maine with the
14 Downeaster, it would be a knowledge corridor rail
15 authority that really coordinates the multiple levels of
16 a rail service, not just providing the service, but
17 providing the connectivity, working with local
18 communities on TOD.

19 We think it would provide better inter-
20 agency and state and local coordination. I did bring a
21 copy of the report that we issued after the second
22 workshop, which I guess I'll submit as part of our
23 written statement.

24 I actually am leaving now to catch Amtrak

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 to go up to Springfield, born and bred on the New
2 Haven/Springfield rail corridor, so, RPA and I, I'm very
3 eager to see this project go through. Thank you.

4 MR. IKE: Thank you very much. Our next
5 speaker is Mr. Richard Stowe. Please come to the
6 microphone, and give your name and address for the
7 record.

8 **Comment No: 1017; Mr. Stowe**

9 **Summary of Comment 1017.1: Maximize the number of bikes**
10 **on trains.**

11 **Response to Comment: See response to Comment 4.4.10 F.**

12 **Summary of Comment 1017.2: Eliminate parking at train**
13 **stations in favor of new transit-oriented development.**

14 **Response to Comment: See response to Comment 4.4.10 E.**

15 **Summary of Comment 1017.3: Improve safety at Wallingford**
16 **at-grade crossings by depressing the entire train tracks**
17 **through the town center.**

18 **Response to Comment: See response to Comment 4.4.13 B.**

19 **Summary of Comment 1017.4: Concurs with concern about**
20 **impacts to future train service to central Connecticut.**

21 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 2.0 B.**

22

23 MR. RICHARD STOWE: Hi, I'm Richard Stowe.

24 My address is 12 Main Street in New Canaan, Connecticut.

25 I am representing Rail Trains Ecology Cycling.

26 There have been a number of good

27 presentations so far, so I'll touch on a few of them.

28 Amanda Kennedy mentioned her work, her and RPA's work to

29 bring, develop this project more carefully, and she

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 mentioned the capitol corridor, in particular.

2 They have worked diligently on the capitol
3 corridor to maximize the number of bikes being brought on
4 trains, so now that every, one out of every, nearly one
5 out of every 10 riders that travel between San Jose and
6 Sacramento are bringing bicycles, are boarding bikes on
7 trains.

8 It has a similar sort of suburban -- many
9 of those stops along the way have a similar suburbanized
10 development pattern between New Haven and Springfield.

11 She talked about like parking lots. It's
12 something I strongly concur with. The desertification of
13 stations, by surrounding them with parking lots, is a
14 travesty, and this is, from what I saw outside, this is
15 kind of the pattern of land use immediately around the
16 stations.

17 That land is much more valuable as rail
18 accessible development, also known as transit-oriented
19 development.

20 So to save money for this project, I would
21 actually eliminate much of this, you know, much of the
22 parking, much, if not all, and look for investment, like
23 grants, to fund time transfer shuttles to the stations,
24 so that means a bus, in this case, that would drive to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 the train station and guarantee that the riders on the
2 bus get there before the train takes off and would meet
3 the riders when they get off the train.

4 Then we had a gentleman, Councilman John
5 Letourneau, speak about Wallingford and the two choices
6 that are available. I would submit that a third choice
7 should be entertained, and that would be to grade
8 separate Wallingford by depressing the railroad tracks,
9 keeping the original train station intact, and you would
10 go down to the tracks to catch the train.

11 The cars, the motor vehicular traffic, or
12 bicycles, or whatever, would drive at-grade over the
13 railroad tracks. That's been done. You know, I spoke to
14 a gentleman earlier. We were talking about the Alameda
15 Corridor between Downtown L.A. and Long Beach for freight
16 rail, and, also, the Solana Beach Station down in San
17 Diego County. Very successful.

18 Then there's the issue that was brought up
19 by Mr. RePass and Ms. McKay, about the problems with what
20 is now known as Connecticut Fast Track.

21 I concur with that. I would go a little
22 step further and say that that project should be
23 cancelled. It's better to do one project well, as
24 opposed to two projects sort of halfway, and if you ended

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 up using the Connecticut Fast Track Corridor, connecting
2 it with the Berlin branch, which runs from Berlin to
3 Downtown New Britain, you could then have a third track
4 between Hartford and Berlin, and that would enable you --
5 and, furthermore, you could put the local stations on
6 that track, including the Berlin station, and then free
7 up the Amtrak corridor, which you're working so hard on,
8 the two tracks on the Amtrak corridor, so that there's no
9 station stops between Hartford and Meriden, and there's
10 only two or three grade separations. They're very minor.

11 Work on like, you know, making sure that
12 those are eliminated, that those at-grade crossings are
13 eliminated, and you would then be able to maximize
14 speeds. That's an 18 or 19-mile stretch. That's similar
15 to the standard that California is using for its closest
16 spacing of high-speed rail.

17 There's the issue of Bradley Airport,
18 which was brought up by Mr. Bernick, and there's track
19 there that, freight track that goes into Suffield, and
20 then back down into the airport.

21 That should be utilized in this project,
22 and, in fact, I would put that in the early phase, so
23 that you can start trains out of Bradley Airport going
24 down to New Haven and New York. To have the one-seat

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 ride benefit is you can't say enough about that.

2 Then I want to say, finally, because I
3 know there are a couple of other speakers, I also have
4 lots of comments, but looking at a study of bridges in
5 Connecticut that are in need of repair, and all of those
6 bridges, the busiest bridges, which had like traffic
7 volumes of 112,000 to 141,000 average daily ADTs, all
8 those bridges were on I-95.

9 I'm from New Canaan, so Stamford. I look
10 at, you know, I look at the bridge, I-95 bridge in
11 Stamford every day, or have in the past. Every day is
12 too strong a word. Many days. And we're desperate for
13 alleviation of impacts to the I-95 corridor, in terms of,
14 you know, pollution, what is it having on, you know,
15 environmental injustice issues, and, so, to run these
16 trains through, these 17 trains you're talking about,
17 running them through to New York, with like a three-stop
18 express service, and you can pick your cities, whether
19 it's Westport, Fairfield and Bridgeport, or Stamford,
20 Greenwich, you know, Norwalk, Stamford and Greenwich, or
21 any variations of cities, that would have a tremendous
22 benefit not only in terms of alleviating pollution,
23 alleviating crowding on our existing trains, creating a
24 shorter trip time between New Haven and New York, which

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 would be an economic driver, but it would also better
2 integrate the state.

3 And what we need to look at, in terms of
4 our planning, instead of being Indian Chieftains, where
5 we say, oh, we want to build the Fast Track, or the
6 Busway, want to look at like looking at the state as one
7 unified state, not Gold Coast versus Central Connecticut.
8 I'll leave my comments.

9 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mr. Stowe. Our next
10 speaker is Paul Hammer. Please come to the microphone
11 and give your name and address for the record.

12 **Comment No: 1018; Mr. Hammer**

13 **Summary of Comment:** Advocates incorporation of bikes on
14 trains, dedicated bike cars, and bike parking.

15 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 4.4.10 F.

16 MR. PAUL HAMMER: Paul Hammer, past
17 President of the Connecticut Bicycle Coalition, 123 Lenox
18 Street in New Haven.

19 I think that this project gives
20 Connecticut the opportunity to have one of the best new
21 rail projects in the world in the 21st Century, and, in
22 order to do that, I think it's important for us to look
23 at best practices.

24 Among those best practices are the
25 incorporation of bicycles onto trains, whether that be in

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 California, or in Denmark, and that will increase the
2 incidents of multi-modal transportation, take more people
3 off the roads, allow people to take short commutes when
4 they get to their destinations.

5 It's something that I would like to see
6 the DOT convene a working group to discuss this, to look
7 at the cost, the practicality, to look at the best
8 practices, to involve representatives from bicycle
9 groups, such as the League of American Bicyclists, Bike
10 Walk Connecticut and others, to see if we can find sort
11 of an optimum plan to do this, rather than wait until the
12 last minute, as the trains are about to roll away, and
13 say oops.

14 So, to me, and I say this just from having
15 done some research, I think this involves, you know,
16 considering the possibility of having dedicated bike
17 cars, or dedicated spaces on trains for bicycles, but,
18 also, to have bike parking in stations and bike sharing
19 stations, as well, so I don't think it's limited to one
20 solution.

21 I think Connecticut has, you know, come to
22 the point, where many of its buses do have bicycle access
23 in urban areas, and they are being heavily used, and now
24 I want to see us do the same on the train.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 So I ask you to consider convening a small
2 working group to look at this while you're looking, also,
3 at the bigger picture. Thank you.

4 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Any other
5 first-time speakers? Yes, sir. Just come to the
6 microphone and give your name and address for the record,
7 and I have to put it into the public record. Your name,
8 please?

9 **Comment No: 1019; Mr. Leahy**
10 **Summary of Comment: Opposed to the project due to costs;**
11 **questions need.**

12 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 2.0 A.**

13 MR. JIM LEAHY: My name is Jim Leahy. I
14 live at 12 Regency Drive in North Haven.

15 MR. IKE: Excuse me. How do you spell
16 your last name, sir?

17 MR. LEAHY: L-E-A-H-Y. I filled the form
18 out out there.

19 MR. IKE: This is the speaker sign-up
20 sheet.

21 MR. LEAHY: I'm sorry?

22 MR. IKE: This is the speaker sign-up
23 sheet.

24 MR. LEAHY: Yeah. I'm speaking for this
25 project.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 MR. IKE: Your address, again, sir?

2 MR. LEAHY: 12 Regency Drive, R-E-G-E-N-C-
3 Y, in North Haven.

4 MR. IKE: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. LEAHY: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen,
6 this project is a colossal waste of money. It should be
7 cancelled right now.

8 It's a boondoggle, the State of
9 Connecticut can't afford it, and, least of all, our
10 country, which is 16 trillion dollars in debt, can't
11 afford it.

12 The DOT has a sordid record of mismanaging
13 just about every project they worked on, and this
14 presentation -- I've been involved in a lot of
15 presentations of a 40-year career of being involved with
16 costs and budgeting. This is a laughable presentation.

17 There's absolutely no proof that people
18 would take this very thinly-traveled route right now and
19 use it. I see these trains every day go through
20 Wallingford. They're empty.

21 A better use of the money would be to
22 upgrade Amtrak's equipment, but whatever the government
23 says, 674 million, it's probably triple that amount, and
24 what happens is it leaves the taxpayers -- if the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 government gives you some money, the federal government,
2 what they're not telling you is what the operating costs
3 will be and how much it will be on the backs of the State
4 of Connecticut's taxpayers.

5 This is a boondoggle beyond belief. Let
6 me just give you some examples. Again, calling this
7 high-speed is a joke. If you have a train station every
8 five miles, how can it be high-speed?

9 I have been in a high-speed train in
10 Japan, the Shinkansen. I've been on that. This is
11 laughable. Building train station we don't need. I mean
12 we can't afford it.

13 Amtrak runs a similar route. The trains
14 are empty. So where in the study is there any empirical
15 proof that people will take these trains? There is none.

16 Number two, who is going to be left with
17 the operating cost, which probably will be in the
18 hundreds of millions of dollars over a 10-year period.
19 We can't afford it.

20 We need to start running governments like
21 a business. This is an example of governments totally
22 out of control. It sounds great. I'd like to drive a
23 Mercedes. This is wonderful, but this is not going to
24 work.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 Amtrak, in general, should be abolished,
2 except for the northeast corridor and some routes in
3 California and the Midwest, but to spend money to build
4 25 trains a day, whizzing through Wallingford, I mean
5 this is laughable, once again. This is absolutely crazy.

6 Why do you think Florida rejected these
7 funds? Why do you think the taxpayers of California,
8 who, in a crazy vote of confidence, decided to vote for a
9 high-speed train to Las Vegas in the middle of nowhere?

10 They're going to be left with about 70
11 billion dollars in costs, the taxpayers of California.
12 They're thinking about repealing that.

13 Connecticut doesn't have the sufficient
14 population to make this work. We've lost population over
15 the last 10 years, or our population has been about
16 steady, so when somebody says, oh, be on a train from New
17 Haven to Downtown Hartford, who is going to do that? I
18 mean it's only 30 or 40 miles.

19 I've seen good projects. This is not one
20 of them. I'll give you an example. Phoenix has a
21 fabulous light rail system from Scottsdale down to the
22 center of Phoenix. That's the fourth largest
23 metropolitan area in the United States. There's plenty
24 of population to support that.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 You had your time. When are we starting
2 holding politicians accountable for projects like this?
3 I mean it sounds great, it's wonderful, you know, nice
4 trains and new stations. Again, we can't afford it. We
5 cannot afford it.

6 Somebody has to pay the bill. That's you
7 and I. It doesn't come for free. Federal money doesn't
8 come for free. Taxes in Connecticut are high enough
9 already. We're chasing businesses out. This will do
10 nothing to help business.

11 I'll give you a few examples of
12 boondoggles that the State has wasted our money on. The
13 Connecticut Science Center, which is a great idea, a
14 building cost two or three times more than it should
15 have, and the Connecticut Convention Center, a total
16 waste of money, a total white elephant, a boondoggle.
17 The taxpayers of Connecticut support that every year, and
18 they'll never make money. It should never have been
19 built.

20 So, in my opinion, we have scarce
21 resources in this state. We need to allocate those
22 resources on projects that makes money. A better use of
23 the money would be upgrade Amtrak's equipment. Sure,
24 building a rail line is not a bad idea. That's not a bad

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 idea, but I would spend about one-tenth of the money on
2 this project.

3 And, by the way, when was the last time
4 you ever saw a government project, A, be on time, or, B,
5 meet its goals, as far as cost goes? Never.

6 And I'll take the DOT, for example. DOT,
7 in one of its worst moments, totally botched the
8 acquisition of the trains for Amtrak, for the Metro North
9 project.

10 They're about two or three years late.
11 They bought it from the wrong source. And, finally,
12 after years and years of delay, those trains are coming
13 on stream.

14 DOT can't manage anything, so why would we
15 trust them with a project like this, which we shouldn't
16 waste one more penny on this project. Thank you.

17 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Any other
18 first-time speakers? Come to the microphone, please,
19 sir, and give your name and address for the record. I
20 have to write your name in for the record, please. You
21 have to go to the microphone, sir.

22 **Comment No: 1020; Mr. Munzer**

23 **Summary of Comment: Concerned with the safety of grade-**
24 **crossings.**

25 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.13 B.**

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 MR. DAVID MUNZER: David Munzer, M-U-N-Z-
2 E-R.

3 MR. IKE: Your address, please, sir?

4 MR. MUNZER: Oh, I'm sorry. Two Oliver
5 Drive, North Haven.

6 MR. IKE: Thank you.

7 MR. MUNZER: I second that gentleman's
8 comments. I saw this thing. I was just browsing on the
9 internet today and saw this and said, gee, was I
10 sleeping?

11 I live 2,300 feet from the line, as it
12 comes through North Haven, so this is in my backyard. I
13 hear the train whistles all day long. It's sort of a
14 pleasant sound, until it doesn't become pleasant any
15 longer, and I guess they're every hour or so now, and I
16 guess, according to the schedule, they're going to be
17 more frequent. I'm not a fan.

18 Here's my number one concern. Grade
19 crossings. There's the Toelles Road crossing, which is
20 at-grade, very dangerous. We've had a couple of deaths
21 there in the 16 years that I've been living in this area,
22 and we have the Sackett Point Road grade crossing.

23 These are crossings, where road and track
24 are at the same grade, and the gates come down, and the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 bells and whistles go off, and all kinds of good stuff,
2 and then I heard in tonight's comments that there are 38
3 at-grade crossings in this effort, 38.

4 To go on the back of this previous
5 gentleman, what kind of high-speed railroad are we going
6 to have with 38 grade crossings? They have to slow down
7 each time, blow their whistle, proceed with caution.

8 I heard a speed of 110 miles an hour.
9 Unless you're going for, you know, vast distances, I
10 don't see how you're going to achieve any kind of great
11 speed.

12 And, oh, by the way, I'm a fan of Amtrak.
13 I'm an accountant by trade. I have clients all over the
14 northeast. For the better part of a year, I was
15 commuting to Delaware on Amtrak, used the Acela.
16 Fantastic, great. All suits. You know, people going to
17 Washington was the biggest thing.

18 I don't see where you guys see people
19 using this thing. I mean from New Haven to Springfield?
20 Huh? If I'm going to do that, I'm going to get in my car
21 and go.

22 By the way, a real benefit would be to
23 relieve the traffic to Stamford. When I have a client in
24 Stamford, it takes me the better part of two hours each

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 way to go the 50 miles.

2 When I have a client in Hartford, it's a
3 vacation. I'm there in 30 minutes by car, so I'm not
4 going to take the train, because the car alternative is
5 far better for me. It gives me all the flexibility that
6 I need, and it's a pleasant ride. The roads are great.

7 Six hundred million dollars, wow. Is this
8 financially viable? John, you're the PM on this. When
9 is this going to pay off? What's the estimated breakeven
10 point for this project?

11 MR. IKE: Just give your name for the
12 record, please. Yes, sir?

13 MR. BERNICK: Okay. John Bernick. I'm
14 the Program Manager for CONN DOT. First, I want to
15 address the issue of speed, because there's a lot of
16 questions about the speed on the line.

17 The line has been designated by the
18 Federal Railroad Administration as a regional high-speed
19 corridor, speeds 90 to 110 miles an hour.

20 Speeds on the line right now are around 80
21 miles an hour. What limits the speed on the corridor is
22 not the grade crossings, and it's not the equipment. The
23 equipment can get up to 110, even between Wallingford and
24 North Haven. Even the diesel equipment comes up very

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 quickly, and, so, we can achieve those speeds in 110
2 miles an hour.

3 What limits us is, actually, is the curve
4 geometry. We're building on an existing roadbed.
5 There's an efficiency in that, in that you're not
6 establishing a brand new corridor, like, for instance,
7 like California is doing. It's much more challenging in
8 doing that.

9 Here, we're making use of infrastructure
10 that already exists. We're simply putting the second
11 track back where the second track used to be, and, so,
12 the 110 miles an hour really comes from the geometry of
13 the railroad, and, yes, it is achievable.

14 From the standpoint of cost, you have to
15 look at cost not from a microcosm, but from the bigger
16 picture, so you say are we just talking about --

17 MR. MUNZER: I'm a number's guy. If I
18 were to invest in this company, when would be my
19 breakeven point? When could I expect to see a return?

20 MR. BERNICK: The service will be
21 subsidized, okay, and we don't make any -- we don't make
22 --

23 MR. MUNZER: So it won't be profitable?
24 It will have to be subsidized.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 MR. BERNICK: The payoff comes, because
2 the revenue does not only come from the fare box. The
3 revenue comes from the transit-oriented develop from the
4 tax base that you build in the individual communities as
5 business grows up and down the corridor.

6 And, so, the business model for the line
7 is not simply what gets collected at the fare box, but
8 what is the overall economic impact to the region, and
9 what's the overall benefit to the taxpayer?

10 MR. MUNZER: I'm disappointed to hear
11 that.

12 MR. IKE: Just give your name for the
13 record, sir. Give your name for the record, please?

14 MR. MUNZER: David Munzer, speaking again.
15 My biggest concern is safety, and when I heard this, that
16 this was being entertained, I thought, okay, great.
17 We'll have an opportunity to fix some of the things that
18 are wrong, all of these grade crossings.

19 This is ancient technology that we're
20 dealing with, gates coming down, whistles going off,
21 horns blasting. That's from 1940 or '30.

22 We have an opportunity, if you guys go
23 ahead with this, you have an opportunity to do it right,
24 and I would encourage you to use all the technologies

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 that are available, and to not elevate grade crossings is
2 an inexpensive way out. Human lives will -- I'll just
3 leave it at that.

4 And the last thing, the environmental
5 impact, I was glad to hear that the noise was discussed
6 under environmental impact. I'm glad we don't have any
7 snail darters that are going to get wiped out in this
8 fiasco.

9 I think there's one environmental impact
10 that you haven't considered, and that's the residential
11 sanity of people living anywhere within earshot of these
12 horns going off. With that, I'll conclude. Good luck.

13 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Any other
14 first-time speakers? First-time speakers? Please come
15 to the microphone, and give your name and address for the
16 record.

17 **Comment No: 1021; Mr. Bonan**

18 **Summary of Comment: Advocates roll-on access for bicycles**
19 **on trains.**

20 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.10 F.**

21 MR. DAVE BONAN: Good evening. Dave
22 Bonan, 18 James Street, Danbury. Sorry I was late.

23 MR. IKE: Can you spell your last name,
24 sir?

25 MR. BONAN: Bonan, B-O-N-A-N.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 MR. IKE: Your address, please?

2 MR. BONAN: 18 James Street, Danbury.

3 Sorry I was late. I was biking from Danbury. I know
4 Richard comes from New Canaan, so I'm sure we came the
5 furthest today.

6 Before I start, I wanted to say it's kind
7 of laughable that the person saying before me was
8 complaining about living near a railroad. It's like the
9 same people living near the airport that start
10 complaining about the noise, so I just thought that was
11 hilarious, because you choose to live where you live.

12 I want to talk about unboxed, roll-on
13 access for bicycles on the corridor. Currently, from New
14 Haven to Hartford on the Peter Pan bus, it's 15 to 17
15 dollars into Springfield, about 21 to 29 dollars. Amtrak
16 is between 12 and 20 dollars, depending on what time
17 you're going.

18 I would prefer to go by train. No
19 traffic. Hardly any rail traffic. New Haven has got the
20 really amazing thing in the last 10 years of being a real
21 good bike city now, very multi-modal, lanes being striped
22 all the time, a big cohesive bike community, probably
23 second only to Boston in bike trips per day, per year.

24 I think it's somewhere between three to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 five percent commuting, and you have to take real
2 advantage of this multi-modal transportation option,
3 knowing that all those cyclists could go on to Hartford.
4 I know I would, as well.

5 I can bike from New Haven to Hartford,
6 sure, in two and a half hours, three hours. I'd rather
7 take the train as much as possible, and you have a wealth
8 of people in New Haven and the knowledge corridor from
9 Yale, all the way up to University of Hartford, all the
10 way up to Northampton, as well, all the colleges and
11 universities.

12 Vermont just reinstated roll-on bike
13 access, with a small fee. Just roll-on. You don't have
14 to pay extra. You don't have to box it. On the western
15 corridor, Maine has the roll-on bike access all the way
16 down to, I believe, Boston at this point, which I'm going
17 to take advantage of in a couple of weeks, and that
18 always fills up. It's amazing.

19 What most train operators, who don't favor
20 bicycles, in this day and age, I can't believe that
21 actually happens, and most buses, like Greyhound and
22 things like that interstate, there's problems with
23 bringing your bike on, because, in Connecticut, you can
24 bring on Peter Pan, and you can stick it under the rack,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 and you'll be okay, but when you go from state-to-state
2 and you go out of the corridor, it's harder, and they
3 don't want to hear the complaints of, oh, you just box it
4 up. Well I can't pull a bike out of my -- a box out of
5 my butt. It's not something that cyclists just bring
6 with them everywhere they go, a box, or a torque wrench
7 to take off the pedal wrenches, you know, to take the
8 pedal off. It weighs 10 pounds. It's not common sense.

9 This is actually going to alleviate a lot
10 of congestion from cyclists to go for work and for travel
11 and for recreation, and I'd like to see covered bike
12 parking at all stations. Metro North is making strides
13 in that right now along the Danbury branch and along the
14 New Haven line, and we'd very much like to see that.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Any other
17 first-time speakers? Yes, ma'am. Just come to the
18 microphone, and give your name and address for the
19 record.

20 **Comment No: 1022; Ms. Attota**

21 **Summary of Comments:** Concerned that the New Haven State
22 Street Station will not be constructed during the initial
23 stages of the project.

24 **Response to Comment:** See Response to Comment No 1.3 B.

25 MS. SUSMITHA ATTOTA: Good evening. I
26 represent the New Haven City Plan Department, and my name

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 is Susmitha Attota.

2 MR. IKE: How do you spell your first
3 name, ma'am?

4 MS. ATTOTA: S-U-S-M-I-T-H-A. Last name
5 is A-T-T-O-T-A. And I had a question --

6 MR. IKE: Your address, please, ma'am?

7 MS. ATTOTA: You could take it as 165
8 Church Street, New Haven.

9 MR. IKE: City of New Haven?

10 MS. ATTOTA: Yes.

11 MR. IKE: Okay.

12 MS. ATTOTA: I have a question for Mr.
13 John, as to why New Haven is not included in this current
14 phase of construction and why the project has been pushed
15 for the future funding.

16 MR. IKE: Give your name for the record,
17 please.

18 MR. BERNICK: John Bernick. I'm the
19 Program Manager, Project Manager for CONN DOT. Well,
20 when you say New Haven, you mean New Haven, State Street?

21 MS. ATTOTA: Yes.

22 MR. BERNICK: Okay, because the trains,
23 obviously, go to Union Station. It's a matter of the
24 configuration of the track, as you get to what we call

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 the Mill River interlocking, and it's one of those
2 things, where, because of the configuration of the
3 switches and the traffic that comes into the northeast
4 corridor, it makes it very difficult for the train to
5 move all the way from the tracks coming on this corridor
6 all the way over to the State Street platform, which is
7 on the opposite side.

8 It's something that, from my vantage
9 point, I'm continuing to look at. I'm always working
10 with the operation's side of the house to see, you know,
11 is there a possibility for at least some of the trains to
12 make that move?

13 I don't have an answer for you on that. A
14 lot of the train scheduling is going to get worked out in
15 the coming years.

16 Unfortunately, the Federal Railroad
17 Administration will not fund the work to get that
18 additional platform on State Street that would make this
19 an easier move and a more regular move, therefore, we
20 don't have a funding source for it.

21 It is on the radar. We are doing, right
22 now, we're starting a grant for alternatives analysis to
23 look at and fine-tune the additional, what we call the
24 additional stations, which would be State Street would be

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 one of them.

2 And, so, we are making strides towards
3 doing the homework necessary to speed the way towards a
4 future grant application and future grant obligations, so
5 it's something we're striving for. Unfortunately, we're
6 not funded to that level yet.

7 MS. ATTOTA: Well what is the anticipated
8 timeline, then, for New Haven?

9 MR. BERNICK: Well, for starter service,
10 we're looking at 2016. For adding a platform at State
11 Street, I don't have a timeline for you. It depends on
12 the availability of federal grants.

13 MS. ATTOTA: So does that mean that the
14 service would start, but New Haven would be left out?

15 MR. BERNICK: You would have service
16 start, but the service would -- you would have de-
17 boarding at Union Station, and, so, we would have to look
18 at the transit, the bus linkage there to get people up to
19 the Green, but you would have New Haven, Union Station,
20 as your stop.

21 MS. ATTOTA: Well I also conduct
22 environmental reviews for the City, and I read each and
23 every page of the EA, and I somehow missed the point. I
24 don't know why, but when the phase two said New Haven to,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 you know, Hartford or something else, just as you mean
2 that New Haven is also included in this thing, although I
3 didn't see what was written in the parenthesis, and there
4 was no timeline mentioned, and there was no wording
5 called phase four, it just said regional rail stations
6 for future, so it was all very confusing, and it's nice
7 to know, nice to come to this meeting here and this
8 hearing and to hear it from you.

9 I appreciate that, you know, it's a great
10 project and all, but, as you know, New Haven right now
11 undergoing a lot of change, and there are so many
12 development opportunities coming up in New Haven, and we
13 have so many riders.

14 Even your EA states that New Haven has the
15 second highest average daily ridership at State Street,
16 and potentially 390 new riders, and there are nearly 40
17 percent of people, who use non-motorized transportation
18 to work, so it will be really a missed opportunity, I
19 think, if it's not included in this current program, and
20 if it's pushed back, or, you know, if there's no definite
21 timeline for this.

22 MR. BERNICK: John Bernick, again. And
23 I'll leave you with one final thought. I was involved in
24 the development of the State Street station. I also did

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 all the Shoreline East stations, and it was a big boost
2 in ridership when we added State Street to the system,
3 and, so, the Department recognizes the importance of the
4 State Street stop, and, so, we're working towards that,
5 but we're going to do our very best to get that
6 implemented.

7 MS. ATTOTA: Thank you.

8 MR. IKE: Thank you, ma'am. Any other
9 first-time speakers? Do we have any other first-time
10 speakers? Yes, sir. Please come to the microphone and
11 give your name and address for the record.

12 **Comment No: 1023; Mr. Silver**

13 **Summary of Comment 1023.1: Concerned that the state needs**
14 **to acquire his property for the construction of the West**
15 **Hartford Station and displace a business and his**
16 **employees.**

17 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.3 A**

18 **Summary of Comment 1023.2: Questions whether increasing**
19 **train service will result in an increase in ridership.**

20 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.5 A**

21 MR. DANIEL SILVER: My name is Daniel
22 Silver. I'm from West Hartford, 20 Ironwood Road, and I
23 have a great interest in this particular project.

24 I was informed today that one of the new
25 stations, which is planned, is going to require that the
26 State take more property.

27 The first thing is that I got this from a

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 secondary source, and there were plans, apparently, were
2 drawn up a considerable length of time ago, and nobody
3 came to me to discuss this.

4 I have a viable business that employs
5 people in the City of Hartford, and the first thing I
6 want to do is complain about that.

7 I'm not sure if there was some ulterior
8 motive here, or just keep it hushed up, but it would have
9 a significant impact on me and a lot of other people that
10 work for me if the State decides to take my property.

11 The other thing, which comes to mind, is
12 the project, itself. Some of these points were touched
13 on. One thing is, presently, we have an Amtrak system,
14 which doesn't seem to be fully utilized, at least when I
15 see trains going up and down the rail in my backyard.

16 They seem to be considerably less than
17 half full most of the time. By increasing the amount of
18 trains, as was suggested, is that going to actually
19 increase the amount of ridership? I scratch my head. I
20 don't see the logic in this.

21 Add more stations, add more stops,
22 conceivably, you could add more people, but, again, the
23 population is a good, interesting question, too, the
24 population density.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 One question I have that maybe some of the
2 people here can answer is what, presently, if you're
3 riding from, say, Hartford to New Haven by rail, what is
4 the time, what is the distance, and what is the time it
5 takes to get from point-to-point?

6 MR. IKE: Give your name for the record,
7 please.

8 MR. BERNICK: John Bernick. You know,
9 what I would rather do, rather than give you a number
10 that's off, I would rather provide that information to
11 you. I can e-mail it to you. I can give you a call
12 tomorrow.

13 When you compare it to -- I will say this.
14 When you compare it to a drive, okay, could you beat it
15 in a car? You might be able to beat it in a car, like in
16 the middle of the night.

17 Rush hour, absolutely no way. There's no
18 way you're going to get into Hartford from New Haven at
19 rush hour and beat the train. It's not going to happen.

20 I just want to bring out one other thing.
21 I just want to clarify the issue, and it's been brought
22 up a couple of times, of ridership, and, well, gee, you
23 want to add all these trains, and there's nobody, you
24 know, the trains are only partially full now.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 The market analysis for this line, which
2 really originated by Amtrak, was verified through a
3 number of ridership models that both DOT and Amtrak ran,
4 shows a highly underserved market here, and the reason
5 that you don't have people riding is because you don't
6 have the frequency of the train.

7 So, in other words, there's people that
8 want to take the train, and it's not only -- it's not a
9 Hartford -- it's not a New Haven/Springfield. I mean you
10 don't stop in New Haven and then have nowhere else to go.

11 You come down to New Haven, you have a
12 huge intermodal transportation system there that gets you
13 onto the northeast corridor, onto Metro North. You can
14 travel anywhere up and down the eastern seaboard from New
15 Haven, and even the Amtrak service gives you single-seat
16 access all the way down to Philadelphia and D.C., but
17 it's the frequency of the trains that drive the
18 ridership, and that's historically true if you look at
19 any rail system just about anywhere.

20 It's almost a linear relationship, that
21 when you up the frequency, that the ridership grows at
22 the same rate, and, so, that's the methodology behind the
23 ridership modeling, and, once again, it was developed
24 between we ran separate models, both CONN DOT and Amtrak,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 and they both came to the same conclusion.

2 MR. SILVER: So you're suggesting that
3 there will be an increased ridership, because of more
4 frequent trains?

5 MR. BERNICK: Right, because, right now,
6 for instance, and I've had a number of people approach me
7 that are even taking the service now, just to get to New
8 Haven, and I said, well, you know, number one, isn't
9 that, you know, kind of inconvenient, and they said, yes,
10 because, you know, if I get out of work at, I don't know,
11 5:00, or whenever they get out of work, I miss my train,
12 I've got to wait two hours for the next train, so a lot
13 of people don't take it, don't use it, because it's not
14 convenient, and, so, it's really more an issue of
15 convenience than it is raw speed.

16 Raw speed sounds sexy, it sounds great,
17 but if I can get you to New Haven a minute earlier, or if
18 I can get you out of New Haven, if you work a half hour
19 overtime or an hour overtime and you can still make a
20 train, which is the more benefit of you? It's the
21 frequency that has the more benefit.

22 MR. SILVER: I see. It's not going to run
23 really any faster than the present --

24 MR. BERNICK: No, it will. Right now,

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 it's running about 80 miles an hour as a top speed.
2 We'll bring it up to 90 to 110.

3 I mean there's areas, like, for instance,
4 the center of Wallingford, center of Meriden, that will
5 control the speed, but, in between those areas, we'll be
6 able to get 90 to 110.

7 MR. SILVER: So you think that you may be
8 able to speed up the trip by 20 or 30 percent?

9 MR. BERNICK: It's a -- in time savings,
10 it's, and I'd have to get you the exact number, it's not
11 an earth-shattering savings in time, but realize, once
12 again, that time savings is not what drives the
13 ridership. It's the frequency of the service that drives
14 the ridership.

15 MR. SILVER: Thank you.

16 MR. IKE: Thank you, sir. Any other
17 first-time speakers? First-time speakers? Any other
18 first-time speakers? Do we have any second-time
19 speakers? Mr. Stowe?

20 Remember, we will stay here this evening
21 for a reasonable amount of time, and you're welcome to
22 stay in the hallway for as long as you want to, to talk
23 with you one-on-one.

24 **Comment No: 1024; Mr. Stowe**

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 **Summary of Comment 1024.1: Advocates construction of the**
2 **State Street New Haven Station improvements in the**
3 **initial stages of the project.**

4 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 1.3 B**

5 **Summary of Comment 1024.2: Requests greater frequency of**
6 **train service, especially on weekends.**

7 **Response to Comment: See Response to Comment No 4.4.10 H**

8 MR. STOWE: My name is Richard Stowe.

9 Just for the record, I'm back on.

10 MR. IKE: Give your address, please, Mr.
11 Stowe.

12 MR. STOWE: 12 Mead Street, New Canaan. I
13 want to bring up a couple of points that speakers have
14 brought up since I spoke.

15 One is the issue of New Haven, State
16 Street. I would ask that this project, the Project
17 Manager move New Haven, State Street from phase four up
18 to phase two and do what needs to be done, in terms of
19 redistributing the monies, to make sure that that goes on
20 as soon as possible, and, of course, part of that would
21 be to like connect the Smoothie building, so have the
22 platform that goes across, all the way across.

23 With regard to the issue of speed and
24 frequency the previous speaker brought up, I just want to
25 tell just a personal story.

26 I got on a train on 125th Street, and the

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 train was full, but there was one seat next to this
2 attractive, blonde woman, so I sat next to her. She was
3 asleep.

4 When she woke up, we started talking, and,
5 by the end of the conversation, I got off in Stamford,
6 she had given me her number, and I contacted her, invited
7 her down for dinner in Westport, and then she invited me
8 up to Hartford, or to Glastonbury, actually, for dinner
9 with some friends of hers.

10 And, so, I said, oh, yeah, no problem.
11 I'll take the train. It was like a Friday evening, or
12 Friday or Saturday evening, and, so, I said, well, what
13 time would you like me to get there? She said, oh,
14 around 7:00, 7:30, so I identified the Amtrak train and
15 said, great.

16 Well, when it came to like getting back
17 home, it turns out the last Amtrak train leaves at 6:30
18 out of Hartford, so it's real tough to take the train if
19 the train isn't leaving until the next morning, so the
20 frequency thing is there's, you know, you've got to have
21 some kind of memory schedule, where people, without like
22 getting out a calculator, can go, okay, this is when the
23 train is going to be leaving, you know, leaving the
24 station or arriving.

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 And that's why, on Saturdays, on weekends,
2 like Saturday and Sundays, ridership at New Haven Union
3 Station doubles, at least doubles, is because it is like
4 a funneling, sort of a -- it's a sort of an unmet demand
5 for all, you know, for this New Haven/Springfield
6 corridor, and the lack of service out to Providence and
7 Boston.

8 And when I say lack of service, I mean
9 there's another issue that Mr. Bernick didn't bring up,
10 and that is price. Supply/demand is determined. Price
11 is a determining factor, so the prices of Metro North
12 type of commuter rail -- I'm sorry. That was like not a
13 word we want to use, but regional rail, whatever, if it's
14 priced at sort of a Metro North standard, which is, by
15 the way, the highest in the country for that type of
16 service, you're going to get significantly more ridership
17 than you are if you're pricing it at Amtrak levels.

18 That's why New Haven line, one reason why
19 New Haven line carries twice as many people every day as
20 Amtrak carries nationwide. Amtrak is priced a little bit
21 on the high side, more like an airline price, for
22 considerably slow service.

23 I took the train from New York to Miami,
24 31 stops, you know? Not a lot of people are willing to

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

1 go through that and pay, and I could have flown for less,
2 so, again, like as far as money deficits for this
3 project, if we can work to like reassign the busway money
4 towards this project, we can have a much better project
5 right away, so that's a political question that we have
6 to like have the Governor sign on to to understand the
7 benefit of having one really superlative project, and it
8 will grab extra people.

9 The New Britain area has, you know,
10 100,000, 71,000 people in the city, and maybe 150,000
11 people within, you know, the Bristol to New Britain area,
12 so I think that's about it for my follow-up.

13 MR. IKE: Thank you, Mr. Stowe. Any other
14 second-time speakers? Any other second-time speakers?
15 Any other second-time speakers?

16 If there are no further comments, I will
17 now close tonight's hearing. On behalf of Commissioner
18 James P. Redeker, I'd like to thank you for coming and
19 expressing your views tonight.

20 Please remember that you have until June
21 22, 2012 to submit any written postmarked comments to the
22 Connecticut Department of Transportation. Thank you for
23 coming, and have a good evening.

24 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned.)

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

HEARING RE: INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL PROJECT
JUNE 14, 2012

74

INDEX OF SPEAKERS


	PAGE
John Bernick	7
Mark Alexander	15
John Letourneau	21
James P. RePass	26
Molly McKay	28
Amanda Kennedy	32
Richard Stowe	38, 69
Paul Hammer	43
Jim Leahy	45
David Munzer	50
Dave Bonan	56
Susmitha Attota	59
Daniel Silver	64

POST REPORTING SERVICE
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

5. **Copy of the workshop report “Dependable Rail in 2016: What Will it Mean for the Knowledge Corridor”**

Dependable Rail in 2016

What Will It Mean for the Knowledge Corridor Region?
A Program of America 2050 and Regional Plan Association



Workshop
Report

June 2-3, 2011

The Hartford Club
46 Prospect Street
Hartford, CT



America 2050

America 2050 is a national initiative to develop a framework for America's future growth and development in face of rapid population growth, demographic change and infrastructure needs in the 21st century. A major focus of America 2050 is the emergence of megaregions – large networks of metropolitan areas, where most of the projected population growth by mid-century will take place – and how to organize governance, infrastructure investments and land use planning at this new urban scale.

For more information, contact:
Petra Todorovich, Director
4 Irving Place, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10003
212-253-5795
Petra@rpa.org

www.America2050.org



Regional Plan Association

Regional Plan Association (RPA) is an independent regional planning organization that improves the quality of life and the economic competitiveness of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut region through research, planning, and advocacy. Since 1922, RPA has been shaping transportation systems, protecting open spaces, and promoting better community design for the region's continued growth. We anticipate the challenges the region will face in the years to come, and we mobilize the region's civic, business, and government sectors to take action.

RPA's current work is aimed largely at implementing the ideas put forth in the Third Regional Plan, with efforts focused in five project areas: community design, open space, transportation, workforce and the economy, and housing.

For more information, contact:
Robert Yaro, President
4 Irving Place, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10003
212-253-2727
Yaro@rpa.org

David Kooris, VP and Connecticut Director
2 Landmark Square, Suite 108
Stamford, CT 06901
203-356-0390
David@rpa.org

www.RPA.org

1. Executive Summary: Findings & Recommendations	4
Workshop Findings	4
Case Studies	4
Recommended Strategies	5
2. Workshop Introduction	6
An Opportunity for Growth	6
Event Summary	6
3. The New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project	8
Background	8
The Vision	9
Benefits	10
4. Successful Strategies from Other Corridors	11
Capitol Corridor, California	11
Downeaster Corridor, Maine	13
5. Strategies for Leveraging Public Investments in the Knowledge Corridor Region	15
Institutions	15
Transit & Mobility	16
Marketing & Promotion	16
Economic Development	17
Funding & Financing Tools	18
Transit Villages & Downtown Revitalization	18
Land Use Regulations	20
6. Briefing Materials on the Knowledge Corridor	22
Regional Profile	22
Corridor Profile	23
Knowledge Industries Analysis	27
7. Participant List	30
June 2 nd & 3 rd	30
8. Acknowledgements	31
Planning Committee	31
Funding Support	31
Local Co-Host	31
In-kind Support	31
Final Report Contributors	31

1. Executive Summary: Findings & Recommendations

In June 2011, Regional Plan Association and America 2050 organized a two-day workshop that convened key stakeholders in the Knowledge Corridor region. The goal of the workshop was to identify strategies to best leverage rail investments being made for greater economic growth.

Workshop Findings

Knowledge Corridor Region

Anchored by the Hartford, CT and Springfield, MA metropolitan areas, the "Knowledge Corridor" is a spatial economic framework developed in recent years to describe the Central Connecticut and Western Massachusetts region, emphasizing the concentration of colleges and universities in the region. The region also has a unique mix of knowledge-sector industries, such as insurance and financial services, health care services, aerospace and defense manufacturing, and more.

At the heart of the Knowledge Corridor runs the New Haven-Hartford Springfield Rail Corridor, a major branch line of the Northeast Corridor, stretching from New Haven, CT through Hartford and north to Springfield, MA. This historic rail line connects a string of communities located along the Connecticut River Valley that are also linked by Interstate 91.

Knowledge Industries

Earlier economic studies of the region have emphasized the Knowledge Corridor's concentration of higher education institutions and specialization in several knowledge sector and related industries.

According to our analysis of employment levels, the Knowledge Corridor region has a greater share of its total employment in nine specialized knowledge-sector and related manufacturing industries when compared to the nation as whole. These industries include Firearms, Aerospace and Defense, Medical Device, Plastics, and Precision Manufacturing; Educational, Insurance and Financial, and Health Care Services; and Renewable Energy.

Rail Project

The State of Connecticut is currently pursuing the New Haven-Hartford Springfield (NHHS) Rail Project, a major investment that will result in faster, more frequent, and more reliable rail service. The rail project entails adding a second track, upgrading

Figure A-1. The Connecticut River Bridge



Credit: Flickr - Wingreen Connection: <http://bit.ly/nk6eGQ>

existing stations and rail infrastructure including drainage, signals and communications, and at-grade crossings. Four new stations, as well as new train equipment will also be part of later phases.

When complete, the rail project will increase service frequency from 6 to 25 daily round trips, increase speeds, and reduce travel times. The double tracking, track and signal system improvements will provide moderate reductions in travel times. However, the introduction of express trains will result in substantial travel time reductions for some origins and destinations. For example, express service from Hartford to New York City will reduce the current travel time from 2 hours and 30 minutes to 2 hours.

The rail project is projected to take 1.5 million car trips off the road and eliminate 100 million miles of vehicle travel annually. State funding and federal grants have fully funded the first two phases and partially funded the third phase of this five-phase project.

Case Studies

Successful passenger rail services that have benefited from incremental improvements similar to the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Corridor in other regions around the country can provide useful lessons for the Knowledge Corridor region. Two speakers from other regions attended the workshop to share their case studies.

Capitol Corridor, California

Service improvements to Capitol Corridor service in California highlight the importance of managing partnerships with freight railroads, and understanding and accommodating their business

objectives, and how intermodal transit connections at stations support ridership.

The development of properties surrounding the stations, totaling hundreds of millions of dollars in value, demonstrates the ability of strong municipal planning and strong partnerships with real estate developers to create successful transit villages. Furthermore, design guidelines can ensure sensitivity to neighboring communities.

Figure A-B. Emeryville Station and Recent Development



Credit: Wikipedia Commons, <http://bit.ly/pMz8N>

Downeaster Corridor, Maine

Modest, incremental improvements to service and stations on the Downeaster Corridor in Maine, local ownership, and marketing and branding strategies have boosted ridership, created jobs, and generated other significant economic development benefits.

An important takeaway from the Downeaster case study is how a single-purpose authority, the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority, tasked solely with managing the rail service, has dedicated all of its resources to providing a high-quality service with a unique local flavor and integrated the service with local station communities and the greater region.

Figure A-C. Downeaster Service



Credit: Flickr - d.n. Davidson, <http://bit.ly/qTScPe>

Recommended Strategies

Through presentations, panels, and group discussion, workshop participants formulated several key recommended strategies in the following seven categories (see chapter 5 for more detail).

Institutions

To coordinate regional efforts to improve and manage the rail operations, create a new Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority. To encourage more local participation, create a coordinating council of municipalities in the region. To protect riders and continuously improve the service, create an advocacy coalition.

Transit & Mobility

To ensure that passengers are able to reach the service and their final destinations, promote intermodal connectivity at stations by integrating bus services, private shuttles, and bike and pedestrian infrastructure, and concentrate development of new housing and jobs within walking distance to rail stations to help reduce the need for auto trips.

Marketing & Promotion

To promote rail ridership and generate a local sense of ownership for the new service, create a unique name and brand identity that highlights the region's natural beauty, history, and culture as part of a broader regional marketing and advertising strategy.

Economic Development

To maximize economic growth in the region, integrate and align state economic development initiatives and planning, with local strategies to create a single, corridor-wide economic development plan that attracts and retains businesses and talented employees, particularly in knowledge-sector industries.

Funding & Financing Tools

To help fund critical ongoing capital improvements and local development projects, the state should consider the adoption of innovative financing mechanisms, such as value capture, and provide assistance to communities that want to use them.

Transit Villages & Downtown Revitalization

To promote mixed-use transit villages that revitalize downtowns, the state should initiate a new program that assists communities in developing infill sites in downtown areas and walkable, mixed-use, commuter-oriented housing around rail stations.

Land Use Regulations

To encourage transit-supportive development sensitive to each community, adopt a corridor-wide Transit Village Overlay district that creates a new set of regional design standards, but leaves local zoning codes intact.

2. Workshop Introduction

"Once fully completed, the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project will permit a quadrupling of passenger rail service and create one of the best passenger rail corridors in the nation, serving the needs of Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont for decades to come."

- Connecticut Department of Transportation¹

An Opportunity for Growth

A tremendous opportunity is coming to the Knowledge Corridor region. The State of Connecticut and the federal government are making capital investments of over \$400 million in the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Corridor to create faster, more frequent, and more reliable passenger rail service between the job centers of the region. The Knowledge Corridor region enjoys a tremendous opportunity to leverage these investments into a broader economic development strategy for the region. At the same time, regional leaders must address the challenge of preparing for these investments and coordinating across multiple communities, stakeholder groups and industries to achieve a successful, regional vision.

The NHHS Rail Project promises to transform passenger rail services in the NHHS Corridor. Upon completion of the project, the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) plans to operate trains every 30 minutes during peak hours and every 60 minutes during non-peak hours, increasing speeds up to 110 mph, enhancing existing rail stations, opening four new stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield, and connecting rail passengers to Bradley International Airport with a shuttle bus at Windsor Locks.

As we have learned from case studies around the world, building a successful passenger rail system is more than just laying tracks and running trains. Passenger rail can bring businesses and people closer together and expand access to markets, but only if a mix of complementary strategies are in place. The success of passenger rail depends on a larger set of actions, including siting the station at the center of regional transportation connections, providing convenient pedestrian and public transit access, promoting and marketing the service, measuring and improving on-time performance, improving the public realm and urban design of station areas, and attracting commercial development around stations.²

¹ Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2010. HSI/PR Program Supplemental FY2010 Funding Grant Request Summary. <http://hsd.ny/06b6f/>.

² Todorovich, Schmid, and Lane. 2011. *High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for U.S. Policy Makers*. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Event Summary

On June 2-3, 2011, business and community leaders, city and regional planners, and government officials convened in Hartford to identify the opportunities to leverage public investments in the NHHS Rail Corridor for economic growth and to determine the strategies necessary to achieve a complementary, regional vision.

The workshop sought to answer the following questions:

- How can faster, more frequent, and more reliable rail service connecting the Knowledge Corridor to Southwestern Connecticut and New York City benefit the region?
- What can the Knowledge Corridor learn from successful implementation of passenger rail in similar corridors?
- What strategies can Connecticut and Massachusetts adopt to best leverage federal and state investments in the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project for economic growth?
- How can we extend the benefits of frequent rail service to a larger, more connected region?

The first day of the workshop featured an introduction to the Knowledge Corridor and an update on the plans for the NHHS Rail Project, provided by Tom Maziarz, ConnDOT Bureau Chief of Policy and Planning. Speakers shared strategies from successful corridors in other parts of the country. Patricia Quinn, Executive Director, Northern New England Rail Authority, provided an overview of the Downeaster service in Maine. The Downeaster, serving almost 500,000 passengers annually, contributes an estimated \$15 million in economic activity to the states of Maine and New Hampshire, and helps promote tourism, investments, and community pride in the small towns it serves.

Eugene Skoropowski, Director of Rail and Transit Services at HNTB, provided an overview of the Capitol Corridor in California, which is the nation's third busiest intercity rail route and boasts the highest on-time performance (93 percent) of any Amtrak service in the country. Since launching the service in 1991, they have increased daily trains from 6 to 31, tripled ridership, and reduced their need for operating subsidies. Successful station development strategies have attracted hundreds of millions in private investment dollars to northern California.

Workshop participants discussed how lessons from these case studies and others could be applied to the Knowledge Corridor and engaged in an exercise to develop strategies specifically for this region. On the second day, these strategies were presented to a primarily business audience, which provided additional feedback and suggestions for next steps, as provided in this report.



Top left: Guest speakers Eugene Skoropowski and Patricia Quinn joined the forum on June 2, 2011, to present their experiences in the development of successful corridors in California and Maine. (Photo: Dan Schned, RPA)

Top right: Forum attendees participated in a brainstorming exercise, sharing their challenges and strategies for leveraging rail investments in their communities. (Photo: Daniel Ferry, RPA)

Bottom left: On June 3, 2011, a panel discussed how to leverage rail service for economic development. (Photo: Dan Schned, RPA)

Bottom right: Attendees shared and discussed their strategies with other participants. (Photo: Daniel Ferry, RPA)

3. The New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project

Background

The Corridor

The NHHS Rail Corridor is currently a primarily single-track railway that runs from New Haven Union Station in Connecticut north to Springfield Union Station in Massachusetts, serving both intercity passenger and freight rail. The Corridor roughly parallels the route of Interstate 91. Eight passenger rail stations currently have Amtrak service while New Haven and New Haven State Street stations also have Metro-North and Shoreline East service.

Map 3-A. The NHHS Corridor and Rail Project



Credit: Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2011. *New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project*. <http://www.nhhsrail.com/>

Table 3-A. Project Summary¹

Length	62 miles
Project Limits	New Haven, CT – Springfield, MA
Passenger Operators (2)	Amtrak and MTA Metro-North RR
Freight Operators (4)	Connecticut Southern RR, CSX Transportation, Providence and Worcester RR, and Pan Am
Existing Passenger Rail Stations (9)	Berlin, Hartford, Meriden, New Haven Union Station and State Street, Wallingford, Windsor, Windsor Locks, and Springfield.
Future Passenger Rail Stations (4)	Enfield, Newington, North Haven, and West Hartford
Total Estimated Cost of Phases 1-3	\$647.3 million

Ownership

Amtrak owns and operates the entire NHHS Rail Corridor and controls dispatching for all passenger and freight train movements. This is an uncommon situation for Amtrak, which outside of the Northeast Corridor normally runs trains on rights-of-way owned by freight companies.

Current Service

Amtrak currently operates three services between Springfield and New Haven: the Vermonter, which runs from Washington, DC through to St. Albans, VT; the Northeast Regional, which runs from Springfield to points in Virginia, and the Northeast Regional Shuttle, which connects riders on the NHHS Corridor to transfers on the Northeast Corridor at New Haven. Combined, these three services provide six trains daily in each direction. Four freight rail companies also operate on the NHHS Corridor: Connecticut Southern, CSX, Providence and Worcester, and Pan Am.

New Haven Union Station, the main pivot point between the NHHS Corridor and the Northeast Corridor, is a major station on the Northeast Corridor and the busiest station on the NHHS Corridor. In 2010, it was the tenth busiest station in Amtrak's national network. Along with the three services listed above that run along the NHHS Corridor, the station is also served by Amtrak's Acela Express and Northeast Regional trains that operate along the Northeast Corridor (Table 3-D).²

¹ Ibid

² Amtrak, 2010. Amtrak Fact Sheet, State of Connecticut, Fiscal Year 2010. <http://www.amtrak.com/>

The Springfield Station is also a stop on Amtrak's Lake Shore Limited— Boston line, which runs from Boston to Chicago. From Springfield, Amtrak's Vermonter carries riders north to St. Albans, VT, and south to New York City and Washington, DC.

Table 3-C. Distance, Travel Time, and Frequency of Current Amtrak Service between City Pairs⁵

City Pairs	Distance (miles)	Travel Time (minutes)
Springfield, MA–New Haven, CT	62	~ 1:30
Hartford, CT–New York, NY	108	~ 2:45

Table 3-D. Amtrak Boardings/Alightings in 2010, by Station⁶

Station	Boardings / Alightings
Berlin	23,196
Hartford	170,060
Meriden	35,904
New Haven	723,287
Springfield	130,790
Wallingford	15,190
Windsor	10,219
Windsor Locks	15,812
KNOWLEDGE CORRIDOR	1,124,458

The Vision

Details

The NHHS Rail Project envisions a completely double-tracked rail corridor, major upgrades to existing infrastructure, four new stations, new trains, and new connections to other transit systems. This would forever change the nature of New England's passenger rail system by providing a new, faster, frequent, and reliable service.

Full build-out will include the following elements:

- Addition of 29 miles of double tracking and passing sidings;
- Major upgrades to bridges and drainage systems;
- Improvements to 38 existing at-grade crossings;
- Improvements to existing station platforms;
- Construction of four new regional rail stations in North Haven, Newington, West Hartford, and Enfield;
- Purchase of new rolling stock for regional rail service;
- Repair and replacement of the Hartford Viaduct; and
- Repair of the Connecticut River Bridge in East Windsor.

⁵ Amtrak. 2011. Routes. <http://www.amtrak.com/>

⁶ Amtrak. 2010. Amtrak Fact Sheet, Fiscal Year 2010 (State of Connecticut & State of Massachusetts). <http://www.amtrak.com/>

The project will also enhance rail stations in Connecticut and Massachusetts and implement a new bus shuttle connecting the rail line to Bradley International Airport at Windsor Locks. Commuter service may begin before completion of all components of the full multi-phase project.

Phasing

The projects above will be implemented in five phases. Phases 1–3 are outlined in Table 3-E and described in more detail below. Each of the first three phases corresponds to particular funding sources and rounds of grants awarded through the FRA's HSIPR Program. While Phases 1 and 2 are fully funded, Phase 3 remains partially funded. No funding has been identified for the future Phases 4 and 5 (Table 3-F).

Table 3-E. Phasing Plan (cost in millions of dollars)⁷

Phase	Location	Total Cost	Federal Awards	State Bonds
1	Meriden–Newington	60 (Fully Funded)	40	20
2	New Haven–Hartford	262.9 (Fully Funded)	121	141
3	Hartford–Springfield	324 (Partially Funded)	30	97.3 authorized

Phase 1 – Meriden–Newington:

Scope:

- Adds 10.2 miles of second track between Meriden and Newington.

Funding:

Phase 1 is estimated to cost \$60 million and is fully funded. In 2009, the FRA awarded the project \$40 million in ARRA funds and the state matched the award 50 percent by authorizing \$20 million in state bonds.

Phase 2 – New Haven–Hartford:

Scope:

- Adds second track and infrastructure upgrades south of Hartford (except for the Hartford Viaduct);
- Installs new crossovers and PTC signaling;
- Improves existing grade crossings and station facilities; and
- Adds capacity for up to 16 new peak morning/evening rush hour trains between New Haven and Hartford.

Funding:

Phase 2 is estimated to cost \$263 million and is also fully funded. In 2010, the FRA awarded the project \$121 million and the state matched the award 117 percent by authorizing \$142 million in state bonds.

⁷ Connecticut Department of Transportation. 2011. New Haven–Hartford–Springfield Rail Project. <http://www.nhhsrail.com/>

Phase 3 – Hartford-Springfield:

Scope:

- Adds second track and infrastructure upgrades north of Hartford (except for the Connecticut River Bridge);
- Completes upgrades to infrastructure; and
- Enables 110 mph service and capacity for up to 50 trains a day between New Haven and Springfield.

Funding:

Phase 3 is estimated to cost \$324 million. This phase is only partially funded and seeking additional funds. In April 2011, the state applied for \$227 million of federal funding and authorized \$97 million in state bonds. In May, the FRA awarded the project \$30 million. Even if the state uses all of its authorized bonding authority, \$97 million, there will still be a funding gap of \$197 million.

Table 3-F. Future Phases⁹

Phase	Name	Description
4	Regional Rail Upgrades and Rolling Stock	- Construct four regional stations - Purchase new train equipment
5	Ongoing State of Good Repair Program	- Repair Hartford Viaduct - Repair Connecticut River Bridge

Benefits

Transportation

Once fully completed, the NHHS Rail Project will permit a quadrupling of intercity and regional passenger rail service (from 6 to 25 daily round-trip trains with 30-min peak and 60-min off-peak headways) and an increase in train speeds to 110 mph. The project will also connect to the New Britain-Hartford Busway and create a new bus shuttle connecting the rail line to Bradley International Airport at Windsor Locks.

The project will reduce travel time from Hartford to New York Penn Station to 2 hours and 23 minutes (currently 2 hours and 45 minutes) and cut travel time from New Haven to Springfield to 73 minutes (currently 1 hour and 30 minutes). The project will also dramatically increase train frequency, from 6 to 25 daily round trips (Table 3-G).

The project will also form the foundation for an expanded regional rail network in New England. This project is necessary in order to achieve any increase in frequency on Amtrak's Vermonter service. The project will also improve capacity for Northeast Regional trains traveling from New York to Boston via Springfield on the so-called "inland route," as an alternative to the busy coastal route.

⁹ Connecticut Department of Transportation, 2011, New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Project. <http://www.ctdhsrail.com/>

Table 3-G. Frequency of Future Amtrak and Regional Service⁹

City Pairs	Round Trip Trains/Day (Current)	Round Trip Trains/Day (Phase 2)	Round Trip Trains/Day (Phase 3)
Springfield – New Haven	4	4	14
Hartford – New Haven	–	8	–
Springfield – DC	1	1	1
St. Albans – DC	1	1	1
White River Junction – New Haven	0	0	5
Boston – Springfield – DC	0	0	3
Boston – Springfield – New Haven	0	0	1
TOTAL	6	14	25

Commuters travelling from the Knowledge Corridor to and from jobs in Stamford or New York City currently have only one one-seat option in the mornings, which leaves Springfield at 6:00 AM or they can take Shuttle at 7:10 or 10:20 AM and transfer at New Haven. The corridor's expanded rail service will offer riders new connections to existing services, including Amtrak, Metro North, and Shore Line East. The new service will also provide a seamless experience across multiple operators. Commuters will be able to pay the same fare structure regardless of the kind of train they board, including commuter and regional trains.

Environmental

According to ConnDOT, this new and improved rail service would attract 1.26 million new passengers by 2030. These new rail passengers would divert cars from the region's highways, saving fuel and reducing vehicle emissions (Table 3-G).

Table 3-H. Environmental Benefits¹⁰

Car trips diverted to rail	1.5 million
Reduction in number of vehicles	3.2 million
Reduction in vehicle miles driven	100+ million
Gallons of fuel saved	3.5+ million

Economic

Construction of the project will create a total of 8,090 new jobs, including 4,710 short- and long-term jobs in the construction industry and thousands of jobs in manufacturing and service-sector industries. ConnDOT also envisions stations as catalysts for transit-oriented development in station communities, providing an additional source of new jobs and government revenue.

¹⁰ Ibid
¹¹ Ibid

4. Successful Strategies from Other Corridors

Capitol Corridor, California

Figure 4-A Northern California's Capitol Corridor



Credit: Flickr - todd510

San Jose, CA – Auburn, CA (170 miles)

The Capitol Corridor is an intercity passenger rail corridor operated by Amtrak that provides fast, reliable, and affordable service to 16 stations in the Northern California Megaregion. The service began in 1991 with six daily trains between San Jose and Sacramento and by 2010 was operating 32 weekday trains between Sacramento and Oakland, and 14 daily trains to San Jose (Map 4-A, Table 4-A).

In 1998, Caltrans Division of Rail transferred responsibility of the route to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, who has managed the Capitol Corridor ever since. In the first two years, the Authority was able to expand train service by 50 percent and achieve substantial gains in ridership, revenues, and operating efficiency. In the full 12 years since taking over the Capitol Corridor service, frequency has quadrupled, ridership and revenue have more than tripled, and the revenue-to-cost ratio has improved by 56 percent (Table 4-A).

In 2010, the Corridor maintained its exceptional 93 percent on-time performance for the second year in a row, holding on to its standing as the most dependable Amtrak-operated service in the country. It also remained the nation's 3rd busiest rail corridor in 2010, behind the Northeast Corridor and the Pacific Surfliner, attracting nearly 1.6 million riders.

Map 4-A. Capitol Corridor Route Map



Credit: Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, 2011. <http://bit.ly/marPo>

Table 4-A. 12-Year Performance Enhancements¹¹

	1998	2010	12-Year Improvement
Frequency	8 daily trains	32 daily trains	+300%
Ridership	463,000	1.58 million	+242%
Revenue	\$6.25 million	\$23.5 million	+290%
Revenue to Cost Ratio	30%	46%	+56%

Successful Strategies

One of the most challenging aspects of the Capitol Corridor is that it operates on rights-of-way that belong to the freight railroad Union Pacific (UP). The Authority has built and maintains a strong working relationship with UP in order to achieve reliability of service while accommodating freight movements. Building a successful working relationship with the freight railroad required the Authority to strike business deals that respect and promote UP's business interests.

The Authority also uses a set of "Good Neighbor" guidelines to ensure that the corridor's design complements freight activity and is sensitive to communities along the corridor. For example, the

¹¹ Ibid.

Authority uses island platforms that accommodate bi-directional tracks (for simultaneous passenger and freight operations). Following state specifications, sound barriers line the right-of-way and are covered with vines to discourage graffiti. In addition, a 30-foot linear park along the outer edge creates an attractive buffer between the right-of-way and the adjacent communities.

The Authority has also successfully cultivated riders from the four universities located on the corridor: San Jose State, Sacramento State, University of California Berkeley, and University of California Davis.

Promoting Transit Villages

The 16 station communities along the Capitol Corridor have harnessed the service's success to promote downtown revitalization as well as greenfield developments in rural areas.

Some communities along the Capitol Corridor have been proactive in creating and promoting a vision, and attracting developers with tools like zoning incentives, while other communities have worked with developers who have proposed their own visions. Examples from two of these cities are described below.

Sacramento Railyards Project

One of the largest urban infill sites in the nation is underway in Sacramento on a 240-acre brownfield that is roughly equivalent in size to Sacramento's existing downtown central business district.¹²

The site is being redeveloped into a dynamic urban environment with a comprehensive transit system. The project also involves the construction of a new intermodal transit hub with connections between the Capitol Corridor, San Joaquin Corridor intercity rail services, intercity bus services, local light rail and bus services, and other local public transit systems.

Figure 4-B. Proposed Transit Village in Sacramento



Credit: The Railyards. 2011. Project Facts. <http://bit.ly/qKRQ7D>

¹² The Railyards. 2011. Project Facts. <http://bit.ly/qKRQ7D>

An economic impact analysis of the Railyards project was conducted by the City of Sacramento, which calculated that the project will generate an annual \$2.7 billion in positive economic impact and 19,200 permanent jobs.

Emeryville/Richfield Project

The Emeryville train station serves as the main transfer point for Amtrak travelers to get to San Francisco. After Oakland's original Beaux Arts 16th Street Station was damaged in the Loma Prieta Earthquake of 1989, private developers in the area built a new train station, which opened in 1994. In 2010, nearly 530,000 passengers traveled through the station.

Since opening in 1994, large retail, residential, and commercial development has flourished around the station in a concentrated, transit-oriented form, and has attracted major employers, such as Pixar Animation Studios.

The city's successful development can be largely credited to the long-term partnerships that have been fostered between private developers and the municipal government, which has provided strong leadership and a clear vision of the city's growth.

Figure 4-C. Emeryville Station and Recent Development.



Credit: Wikipedia Commons. <http://bit.ly/pMzSN>

Lessons Learned

- Managing successful passenger operations on freight railroads requires mutual understanding and accommodation of each party's business objectives.
- Intermodal connections at stations support ridership.
- Strong municipal visions and partnerships with developers encourage successful transit villages.
- Design guidelines can ensure sensitivity to neighboring communities and other railroad operators.

Downeaster Corridor, Maine

Figure 4-D. Downeaster Train



Credit: *New England Futures*, 2011. <http://bit.ly/pAwUp>

Boston, MA – Portland, ME (116 miles)

The Downeaster service operates on a 116-mile corridor between Boston, MA and Portland, ME and has become a national model for the successful introduction of new intercity passenger rail service. The service connects the metropolitan area of Boston to important cities and resources to the north. In 1995, the Maine State Legislature created the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA) as a public transportation authority to introduce rail service between Portland and Boston. NNEPRA manages the budget, contracts, promotion, and customer services associated with the Downeaster passenger rail service, while Amtrak operates the service.

Map 4-B. Downeaster Service



Credit: *Amtrak Route Map*, www.amtrakdowneaster.com

The Downeaster began operations in December of 2001, restoring passenger service between Boston and Portland after a hiatus of 37 years. The tracks utilized by the Downeaster have multiple owners: the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, Pan Am Railways, and Boston Maine Railway. Investments worth \$54 million were made to upgrade the freight lines for passenger service capable of reaching speeds of 79 mph.

Successful Strategies

Since the service began, continuous investments have enabled a reduction in trip times and more frequent trains. The inaugural run between Portland and Boston took 2 hours 45 minutes, which has since been reduced 20 minutes to 2 hours 25 minutes. Ridership has also grown 67 percent from 291,794 in 2002 to 487,463 in 2010. In 2008 ridership grew 28 percent from the previous year with the addition of a fifth round trip per day.

In addition to these improvements, NNEPRA also credits on-time performance, amenities, and friendly service as contributing to the Downeaster's popularity. NNEPRA has worked closely with PanAm Railways to improve on-time performance and with Amtrak to ensure high service standards among personnel. In fact, the Downeaster is consistently ranked the highest in overall service and customer satisfaction of any Amtrak line.

The Downeaster has benefited from heavy promotion and a strong brand identity. NNEPRA dedicates a significant portion of its annual budget (approximately \$480,000) to marketing and promotion. The Downeaster is also the only Amtrak service with its own, contracted food service, which provides unique options like clam chowder, lobster rolls, and Whoopie pies, which link the service with the Maine experience.

NNEPRA also provides strong support to help each station community improve the station facilities and take advantage of the service. Since each community is responsible for managing its own station, community residents and leaders have a vested interest in the service's success. NNEPRA provides assistance and facilitates collaboration by convening bi-monthly meetings with leaders from all station communities. Thanks to local efforts, many stations have become gathering spaces, improving the quality of life for the local community.

Figure 4-E. NNEPRA Logo



Credit: *Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority*, 2011. *Education Piece*. <http://bit.ly/qgJlty>

Economic Impact of the Downeaster Service

A 2005 study completed for the Maine Department of Transportation calculated that in the first three years of operation the Downeaster contributed to \$15 million of annual economic activities in Maine and New Hampshire by attracting tourism, triggering real estate investment around station areas, reducing transportation costs for residents, who are then free to spend that money discretionally, and generating state and local revenues via property taxes, visitor spending, and employment creation. The study estimated that by 2015 the rail service will contribute over \$100 million to the economy and will create over 1,500 jobs.

In 2008, the Center for Neighborhood Technology published a study highlighting the projects created or planned in response to the Downeaster service between 2005 and 2008, including:

- In Old Orchard Beach, two hotels and a \$20 million residential-retail complex built two blocks from station;
- In Saco, an old mill was renovated into a \$110 million retail-office-residential development; and
- In Brunswick, developers were planning a \$30 million hotel-retail-office-residential development.

Figure 4-F. New Development in Old Orchard Beach, ME



Credit: HomeAway.com. 2011. Luxurious Ocean Front Condo in Old Orchard Beach, Maine. <http://bit.ly/nG5wMT>

Then, in 2011, developers in Portland announced plans to transform a 30-acre site adjacent to the rail station into a \$100 million hotel-office-convention center-arena development. These projects highlight the success and continuing trend of new rail-oriented investment around the station areas of the Downeaster. The report went on to predict that with \$255 million in investments planned through 2030, the Downeaster would yield a 160 percent return on investment and produce:

- \$7.2 billion in construction;
 - 42,000 housing units, 6.8 million sq. ft. of commercial space, and 17,800 jobs;
- \$244 million a year in transport cost savings;
- \$2.4 billion a year in purchasing power; and
- \$75 million a year in state and local taxes.

Expansion of Service

In the future, the Downeaster will benefit from two expansion projects. First, the states along the Corridor have received federal and state funding to improve track infrastructure with the goal of reducing travel time between Boston and Portland to two hours and increasing capacity to support seven daily round trips.

Second, the Downeaster Extension Project is currently underway to extend service to Brunswick, ME. This extension project will create an important connection that will increase passenger rail access from Boston to the mid-coast region, via a Maine-owned Rockland Branch, and reduce congestion along I-295 and Route 1. As of May 2011, construction of the extension is on schedule and service to Brunswick is expected to begin in the fall of 2012.

Figure 4-G. Construction of the Downeaster Extension



Patrick Quinn, NNEPRA. 2011. PowerPoint presentation, 6/2/2011

Lessons Learned

- Local community ownership of each rail station has facilitated a strong constituency for improving the service and cooperation along the entire corridor.
- NNEPRA, as a single purpose rail authority, can bring all its resources to bear on providing best service possible. NNEPRA is essentially Amtrak's client, and holds Amtrak accountable to a high level of service.
- Strong Maine-oriented branding and marketing has attracted ridership, promoted tourism, and created a positive passenger experience with unique amenities, like lobster rolls and clam chowder.
- Coordination with freight railroads improves on-time performance.

5. Strategies for Leveraging Public Investments in the Knowledge Corridor Region

The following strategies were developed by attendees at the Knowledge Corridor workshop on June 2nd. Participants were engaged in a participatory exercise led by RPA staff to help distill the most effective ideas for leveraging public investments in the Knowledge Corridor region. RPA staff then organized all of the strategies into categories or groups of strategic initiatives.

The key strategies from this exercise are summarized into the following seven categories: Institutions, Transit & Mobility, Marketing & Promotion, Economic Development, Funding & Financing Tools, Transit Villages & Downtown Revitalization, and Land Use Regulations.

Institutions

Challenge

The NHHS Rail Project does not yet have a strong champion or a well-established public identity. Currently, managed from within ConnDOT, the project is progressing with the aid of state and federal funds and is still in development. The lead agency will need to develop a detailed service plan, brand identity, and marketing strategy. It is unclear whether it will be ConnDOT that continues to manage the enhanced rail service once improved or a new spin-off rail authority dedicated to managing the corridor and the relationship with the rail operator.

Leadership is required not just for promoting, managing, and operating the rail service, but for the regional and local planning considerations of stations and station areas. These considerations are likely to require the participation of state and municipal officials and urban planning expertise beyond that of the transportation planners and engineers at ConnDOT.

Finally, continued support for the expansion and improvement of passenger rail service in the Knowledge Corridor will surely benefit from an engaged constituency of rail passengers, interest groups, and local communities.

Suggested Strategies

- Create a single-purpose authority for planning and operating the new passenger rail service, such as the "Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority."
- Create a council of municipalities that can coordinate with each other, the rail authority, and state agencies on station and station area planning issues.

- Form a coalition to advocate for continued investment and improvements to the NHHS Rail Corridor.

Implementation

The success of a passenger rail service can be greatly influenced by engaged, active leadership in the form of a single purpose rail authority that manages the service and the rail operator. In Maine and California, strong leadership at the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA) and the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority established clear lines of responsibility to riders for the quality of the service, as well as created a brand identity and marketing strategy for the rail service. These rail authorities acted as a client of Amtrak, the rail operator, by holding Amtrak accountable to on-time performance and other service goals. This allowed these state-sponsored corridors to become known not just as any typical Amtrak service, but specially branded state services with unique identities, the Downeaster and Capitol Corridor. As a result of the active leadership of these rail authorities, these two services also developed reputations for their reliability, friendly customer service, good community relations, and quality, locally-oriented food and beverage services on board the trains. The State of Connecticut should strongly consider creating a rail authority modeled after these two examples in Maine and Northern California.

Another lesson gleaned from the case of the Downeaster service in Maine is the role of local communities along the rail corridor in owning and managing their own rail stations along the corridor. NNEPRA convened bimonthly meetings with the station communities to coordinate with each to improve their stations and ensure continuity in access to the rail service. The Knowledge Corridor rail authority, if established could create a similar council of municipalities to collaborate together and with the state on station and station area planning issues, ensuring that economic development activities complement one another.

Finally, area business groups, advocacy organizations, and rail passengers, should consider forming a coalition to promote better service and continued capital improvements to the corridor. An active constituency of rail service supporters would advocate for greater funding and help elected officials prioritize improvement projects and direct state and federal funds. This coalition would also help establish service goals and hold the rail authority accountable to these goals and other standards.

Transit & Mobility

Challenge

A rail passenger's trip typically does not begin or end at the train station. Most rail trips are an intermediate step on a longer journey to or from home or work. A comprehensive, regional approach to transit and mobility must take into account how travelers get to and from each station, and examine how the train can meet the needs of those living within walking distance of stations as well as those living in suburbs and areas further afield.

Suggested Strategies

- Promote intermodal connectivity of stations by integrating bus and shuttle services, cross-accepting fares and transfers with other transit systems, and installing bike and pedestrian facilities.
- Support accessibility by concentrating housing and jobs within walking distance to rail stations.
- Prevent parking from impeding future development in the areas surrounding the stations or detracting from station area walkability.
- Provide clean, safe, and inviting stations.

Implementation

The NHHS Corridor should be considered the main artery of a regional network of transit services. Other supportive transit and mobility services, such as public buses and shuttles or private vans and car-sharing should be developed to provide access to housing and job sites dispersed throughout the region. The local feeder services should be coordinated with the rail service to facilitate convenient transfers between modes.

In California's Capitol Corridor, rail passengers receive free vouchers to use connecting transit services. The Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority should partner with MTA Metro-North, CT Transit (the ConnDOT-owned local bus service), Pioneer Valley Transit Authority, and other local bus transit districts to develop a similar voucher for making transfers between local buses and regional trains, providing a powerful incentive to use both systems. At the center of the corridor, ConnDOT should continue to develop the New Britain-Hartford Busway, which will connect to the NHHS Corridor rail service in both Newington and Hartford, and pursue other bus rapid transit (BRT) corridors and express bus routes to the north, east, and south of Hartford.

The most successful and efficient rail stations are located within walking distance of housing and jobs. Commuters are particularly discouraged from using rail if workplaces are not easily accessible to station locations. To create accessible stations, communities should maximize activity within station areas by concentrating new commercial development within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the station and residential development within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile. Quality bicycle and

pedestrian facilities should be installed at the rail stations to further increase their multi-modal accessibility.

If the private automobile is the only means of station access, it limits the number of people who can access the rail service, and requires tremendous amounts of valuable land surrounding the stations for parking. While some parking is necessary, it should be designed in such a way that it does not impede the potential for future development that would support the rail service. Every parking space avoided is land that can otherwise be utilized for more productive land uses.

In Maine, local communities manage their own rail station, which gives them the incentive to maintain and upgrade the facilities, and take advantage of the rail service by coordinating transit connections and demanding high-quality rail service from Amtrak. The Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority should encourage local control of NHHS rail stations to ensure that they become clean, safe, and inviting gathering spaces in the communities.

Marketing & Promotion

Challenge

Many people have never had a chance to ride passenger rail in the Knowledge Corridor region and will have difficulties visualizing the future service. Others may have ridden rail and had a negative experience. Improved, more frequent and reliable rail service could attract new customers, including business travelers; however, new rail passengers will not materialize on word of mouth alone. A marketing and promotion strategy is critical to getting people out of their cars and beginning to consider passenger rail as an option for a variety of trip types, from business travel to cultural and tourism excursions.

Suggested Strategies

- Create a unique name and brand identity for the new passenger rail service that highlights the region's natural beauty, quality-of-life, and shared history and culture.
- Develop a regional marketing and advertising strategy to attract new and lasting customers.
- Establish a tiered fare policy and promotional campaigns that incentivize student groups, seniors, and recreational travelers to use the rail and help fill trains in off-peak hours.

Implementation

Successful branding, marketing, and promotion strategies for a new passenger rail service should begin before the service has opened and evolve as the service develops. Before the launch of the Knowledge Corridor service in 2016, the Knowledge Corridor Rail Authority should develop a distinctive name and brand identity for the rail service that reflects the Knowledge Corridor region's unique natural beauty, overall quality-of-life, and shared history and culture. The name and brand should capitalize on the

region's existing Knowledge Corridor brand. In Maine, NNEPRA successfully branded the Downeaster service as "Maine's train" by highlighting the state's culture identity and providing dining choices that are drawn from local cuisine, like lobster rolls and clam chowder.

The rail authority should also work to develop a powerful marketing and advertising strategy to attract customers. An essential foundation of this strategy should be to clearly articulate the benefits of the new rail service for the region and its inhabitants, and what kind of experience customers can expect, such as reliable on-time performance and outstanding customer service. An effective advertising strategy should also seek to encourage communities' sense of ownership over the stations and the service itself.

The rail authority should offer a range of fare policies to attract low-income passengers, seniors, students, and others, to help fill seats during off-peak hours and attract those who cannot afford full price, peak fare. Promotional campaigns can also be used to target discrete user groups, such as students and school faculty, drawing from the large number of educational institutions in the region. Recreational travelers can be targeted by coupling rail fares with entry fees to the region's various natural and cultural amenities.

Economic Development

Challenge

The Knowledge Corridor region has already developed a specialty in several, niche, knowledge-sector industries, such as precision and medical device manufacturing, educational and health care services, and renewable energy. By creating enhanced connections to major markets, such as New York, Philadelphia, Washington, DC, and Boston, improvements to the NHHS Rail Corridor will offer the opportunity to attract jobs at firms in these industries that are looking to relocate or expand in the Knowledge Corridor region, and retain jobs at firms that are considering a move elsewhere.

However, if each local community with an enhanced or new rail station pursues its own vision of economic prosperity, which may seek to achieve similar or contradictory objectives, then none will be effectively realized. Industry clusters and labor markets are not limited to political boundaries and a regional strategy to enhance the Knowledge Corridor must respond to this reality. The region must pursue a coordinated, regional strategy to maximize the economic benefits of the rail investments.

Suggested Strategies

- Perform market research to better understand the needs of employers, and attract and retain businesses.

- Encourage municipalities to pursue economic development strategies that reflect local economic conditions and achieve positive, local outcomes, while also advancing a shared, regional vision.
- Create mechanisms to integrate and align state economic development planning with regional growth strategies and local development programs at the corridor scale.

Implementation

In order to best leverage rail investments for economic growth, public sector actors at all levels along the Knowledge Corridor should coordinate strategies to attract and retain jobs, particularly those that will make use of enhanced rail service in the Knowledge Corridor. The strategies should be informed by market research, in order to better understand the needs of existing employers and support regional business attraction and retention initiatives. The goal should be to develop a bi-state, corridor-wide, regional vision for economic growth, in which improved rail service plays a starring role.

An official bi-state partnership between Connecticut and Massachusetts should be established that works in coordination with local communities to implement complementary activities, land uses, and investments to attract jobs along the corridor. This corridor-wide economic development plan should result in a range of options for each station area, policies for business retention and attraction, and site locations for each target activity/land use, offering municipalities flexibility while working towards the shared, regional vision. The states and municipalities in partnership can then develop the suite of investments and incentives to best implement each station area's economic development strategy.

While some strategies will be targeted investments to leverage private investment or incentives to attract particular industries, others will be mechanisms geared to municipalities to mitigate short-term revenue losses that may result from a station area's unique, local land use mix. For example, some land uses, such as parking, educational institutions, business incubators, job training centers, and community facilities provide great long-term value for cities, but do not generate much short-term tax revenues. Land uses that generate more short-term revenues, such as housing and commercial development compete for physical space in station areas.

Municipalities' reliance on local property taxes ensures that the default decision-making will result in cities choosing those uses that provide the greatest local, short-term benefits, potentially crowding out other uses to the detriment of the long-term success of the region. A new, bi-state economic partnership that works with local municipalities could create tools such as tax-increment financing to promote cooperation among cities and states on attracting uses that result in stronger regional outcomes.

Funding & Financing Tools

Challenge

Despite significant state and federal funding commitments to the NHHS rail project, additional funding and financing mechanisms are still needed for the remaining capital, operations of commuter and local transit services, and development of transit villages. However, in the absence of a federal transportation reauthorization bill and a political climate of growing concern over government spending, continued federal support for transportation is uncertain.

Traditional private financing tools may not be sufficient, as many lenders are unfamiliar and uncomfortable with financing unconventional projects like mixed-use development and transit villages. Current housing and commercial markets in the station areas will make development challenging over the short term without gap financing support.

Innovative financing mechanisms to build transit systems and transit villages are being employed elsewhere in the country, such as using value capture financing and parking fees. However, these tools may be less viable in the Knowledge Corridor region due to state laws or because they face public perception hurdles. For example, because abundant surface parking exists in the region, drivers may be unwilling and unlikely to pay more for parking.

Suggested Strategies

- Provide assistance to communities that want to make use of creative financing mechanisms, such as value capture, to fund their local economic development strategies.
- Organize seminars aimed at educating banks on the benefits of transit villages to make them more comfortable providing loans for innovative development projects.

Implementation

Currently, the level of future federal funding is uncertain due to the expiration of the transportation authorizing legislation and the lack of a viable transportation reauthorization bill on the horizon. In its absence, states and local governments across the country are experimenting with innovative financing mechanisms to invest in transportation alternatives and housing options that unlock previously untapped resources.

Some governments have established new, dedicated revenue streams for major transportation projects through property or sales taxes, which can be used to leverage federal support from existing financing tools, such as the Federal Highway Administration's Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act and the Build America Bond program created under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which has expired, but could be renewed. The Denver metropolitan region has enacted a regional supplemental sales tax to fund transit capital projects and the New York State Legislature enacted a regional payroll/mobility tax to

fund Metropolitan Transportation Authority operations. Legislative action in the State of Connecticut would be required to authorize comparable innovative financing strategies.

Other less conventional financing tools, such as value capture, should be explored in the region. A renovated or new rail station along the Corridor with significantly enhanced service to Fairfield County and New York City will add measurable and pronounced value to surrounding properties. Value capture financing involves the public sector capturing a portion of that added value through property taxes, special assessments, or revenue sharing, thereby creating a new revenue source. Some communities have used the new revenues to repay a portion of the initial capital expenditure by the state or transit agency. Others have used them to fund ongoing operations of the transit service, or improvements to the local station area public realm.

The Knowledge Corridor region could use additional revenues from value capture financing to improve local roads, sidewalks, and greenways in the station areas, or support transit services that link station areas to surrounding neighborhoods and communities. Or, revenues could be used (and have been used in other communities) to create resources shared by other localities in the region, such as parking garages, which facilitate the construction of mixed use buildings in the station area by removing that financial burden from private development. They could even be used to provide gap financing from a revolving fund or as grants to private developers as a catalyst to station area regeneration.

Additionally, the local development and financing community should be exposed to case studies from other communities that faced similar hurdles of creating mixed use, transit villages and overcame them using conventional and innovative financing tools. Regional partnerships and state agencies should organize a series of seminars aimed at educating banks on the components and benefits of transit villages to make them more comfortable financing innovative mixed-used and transit villages.

Transit Villages & Downtown Revitalization

Challenge

Improvements to the NHHS Corridor offer the opportunity to leverage public investment in transportation to encourage transit villages in station areas and leverage development for the economic revitalization of cities' central business districts. While transit villages have an established track record for encouraging the revitalization of downtowns, this relationship has its limitations.

Transit villages alone cannot lead to downtown revitalization. Stimulating development in downtown areas is often a difficult and complex enterprise with multiple dimensions, many of which are supported by transit villages, but not all to the same degree. A suite

of land use, urban design, and development strategies, along with the reform of land use regulations (see the next section), must be adopted to successfully revitalize a stagnant downtown area.

Suggested Strategies

- Use state policies to promote transit villages around stations in Connecticut and Massachusetts.
- Capitalize on the potential of stations to create a place-based experience and celebrate the downtown experience that differentiates transit villages from commercial strip malls.
- Promote commuter-oriented housing, flexible spaces, and infill development in station areas.

Implementation

Experience with transit villages in the Knowledge Corridor region and across the country has shown that housing located in these types of developments attracts few children and results in net-positive fiscal impacts for their communities. Communities throughout the Knowledge Corridor region should continue to pursue mixed use housing and commercial development around their train stations.

At the state level, the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development, in cooperation with ConnDOT, and the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development should work together to promote transit villages in the Knowledge Corridor region. Over the past ten years, the State of Massachusetts has enacted several innovative policies that proactively incentivize transit villages in station areas, which have been consolidated into the Mass Works Infrastructure Program and the Commercial Area Transit Node Housing Program.

Communities should work to create a sense of place at the train stations by exploiting their unique characteristics. Train stations are capable of being the centerpiece of a unique branding strategy because they are a singular and relatively scarce resource. The general activities associated with train stations – the constant comings and goings of travelers and the pulse of movement as the trains pull in and out – make them an exceptional asset for creating identity. Furthermore, most of the communities in the Knowledge Corridor region grew up around their stations and improving them provides the opportunity to celebrate their history and heritage.

Cities should work to create a dynamic mix of uses around the stations that reflect the local context of the station and its role in the larger downtown area. Striking the appropriate balance of land uses in transit villages can be difficult to accomplish. Housing is a vital component of the right land use mix. While most housing is not usually considered a revenue positive use, a strong residential presence is essential to support healthy downtown areas and village centers. In addition to direct spending on goods and services, downtown residents provide levels of activity and passive security that help make them destinations for a larger geography and for extended hours. Mixed-use transit villages can be particularly

effective at attracting residents because transit services have their greatest impact on the journey to work. Improved transit access and regional connectivity can also be used to grow businesses and industries that are already present, but can benefit by being part of an agglomeration of economic activities in a larger geography.

Chambers of commerce, merchants associations and business improvement districts should focus on celebrating those aspects of the downtown experience that differentiate them from the typical suburban shopping malls or large-lot, low-density developments, which will always be more convenient for single-purpose, auto-oriented shopping and work trips. For example, transit villages are walkable, have a fine-grained mix of land uses, and provide visitors a diversity of experiences, all of which contrast sharply with the banality of a suburban, commercial strip mall.

Redevelopment plans should not be built around a single business, industry, or land use. Long term station area plans must anticipate future conditions, by planning for more flexible building types and adopting land use regulations that allow for multiple uses in the same structure. Cities should take care not to develop structures in their downtown areas for only one business or industry without consideration of future uses in the event that the business or industry eventually leaves the community.

Redevelopment plans should initially focus on abandoned and underutilized sites, as they artificially depress the development values of adjacent properties, stymieing downtown revitalization. Access to train stations often provides the marginal, increased value necessary to reclaim sites that are otherwise encumbered by environmental or ownership challenges. And, because station area development can be framed as a public investment, it is often possible to attract other public monies that are available for remediation and infrastructure.

To achieve the potential benefits of transit villages in the Knowledge Corridor region, municipalities must be prepared to put into place a complete set of other complementary initiatives. Improved transit access inherent to transit villages is not in itself sufficient to entice developers and revitalize downtowns.

Complementary initiatives include corridor-wide economic redevelopment strategies, urban design interventions beyond the station areas, increased connectivity from the stations to the larger landscapes, and smart growth policies that promote development in built, transit-accessible areas and inhibit growth in farmland and natural landscapes, as well as land use and zoning regulations that allow desired mixed-use development to take place, as discussed below.

Land Use Regulations

Challenge

Land use planning and zoning in station areas should encourage mixed use and mixed-income development that is at transit-supportive densities appropriate for each community, but also that fits into a corridor-wide plan that fosters positive development outcomes for the entire Knowledge Corridor region.

Some communities do not have experience working with the complex zoning and regulatory tools that help encourage transit villages. As a result, they are vulnerable to the common pitfalls and must be careful to avoid the unintentional consequences of zoning decisions, such as precluding certain types of development that will support transit and make these areas more livable. Communities must be able to cooperate to develop growth plans that complement, rather than compete with, each other.

Suggested Strategies

- Better utilize tools in the basic zoning toolbox to guide development around station areas.
- Utilize tools from the advanced zoning toolbox, such as design- and form-based zoning, to control the shape of station area development without prescribing specific uses.
- Create a model zoning code as an educational tool that different towns can adapt to their own needs.
- Adopt a corridor-wide Transit Village Overlay district that leaves the underlying municipal zoning codes in place and imposes a new set of transit village standards.

Implementation

Zoning for transit villages is distinguished from standard zoning by its promotion of compact, mixed-use development patterns and by the need to control design not just at the scale of individual sites, but at the scale of the larger station area district.

A lot can be accomplished through the basic zoning toolbox:

- Mixed-use sites and buildings can be explicitly allowed.
- Buildings can be sited in ways that help define streets and public spaces through height and setback regulations.
- Minimum levels of development can help ensure that valuable land within the station area is not consumed by low-intensity, auto-oriented uses.
- Off-street parking requirements can be reduced to reflect increased access to transit and the opportunities to share parking in mixed-use environments.
- Affordable housing can be built through set-aside requirements for developments above a certain scale.

The advanced zoning toolbox contains additional tools that can also be useful for helping implement transit villages. Form-based zoning establishes the envelope in which development must take

place, describing the form of buildings in relationship to the public spaces they support, such as the immediate station area. This is often used in conjunction with performance-based zoning that does not prescribe particular uses, but instead evaluates the performance of the uses. For example, does the use contribute to the overall character of the transit district? Or, does the use negatively impact the adjacent uses?

Planners and regional advocacy groups should propose a model zoning code with tools from the basic and advanced toolboxes, as an educational tool. Each community could then calibrate the template to the particular circumstances of each station.

However, wholesale changes to the existing zoning in every municipality in the corridor will be difficult. For this reason, communities of the Knowledge Corridor region may see a great opportunity to take on the challenge of zoning for transit villages collectively. A preferred tool may be an overlay district that leaves the underlying zoning in place, but imposes a new set of transit village standards on top of them that creates the desired changes incrementally over time.

There are many precedents for Transit Village Overlay districts around the country to draw upon for experience and best practices. In 2004, the State of Massachusetts passed the Smart Growth Zoning Act, which encourages municipalities to establish new overlay zoning districts that promote smart growth, particularly housing, by providing financial incentives to communities that adopt dense residential or mixed-use zoning districts in station areas or existing urban centers. Communities in the Knowledge Corridor should pool their resources to launch a shared, regional initiative, such as the Massachusetts state initiative, which would educate local stakeholders and land use officials, and work towards the implementation of a transit village overlay district in the Knowledge Corridor region.

It is also essential to understand the limits of zoning. Zoning is not place-making and therefore is not the best tool for dealing with situations where development must be coordinated over time among multiple property owners, or situations where the design of a larger area requires careful coordination between private development and public investments, such as streetscape or public space design. And as the land use regulatory tools become more complex, so too does the administrative burden they apply on the communities. At the end of the day, creating great places around these stations will be an incremental process, and will require ongoing administrative messaging and advocacy.

**Perspective: Matt Nemerson, President and CEO,
Connecticut Technology Council**

As a leader in the knowledge industries that the Knowledge Corridor region wishes to attract, Mr. Nemerson spoke to workshop participants about the characteristics of a region and community that growing tech companies look for when making decisions about where to locate. Mr. Nemerson's organization surveyed over 50 growing firms on the choices they face and the factors that influenced their decisions, particularly regarding expansion or relocation, finding that the region faces several challenges in convincing such industries to choose the Knowledge Corridor and needs a strategic vision to address them.

Successful businesses within a given industry prefer to locate near their competitors. This proximity creates a larger labor market for firms with specialized employment needs, allows each company to keep current with their peers, and facilitates the exchange of best practices that keep firms competitive. Locating near competitors also adds credibility with customers because the firm is seen as occupying a first-class ecosystem, much as a software company may seem more legitimate if it is in Silicon Valley. The benefits a firm accrues from locating near competitors can drive a virtuous cycle of development known as an agglomeration economy.

Connecticut is seen to have a critical mass problem, in which firms contemplating a move face uncertainty over whether the region will be able to attract enough other firms and workers to drive agglomeration economies. The question for the future of the region is whether Connecticut can bring about either the influx or the organic growth of knowledge industries to overcome this problem and foster a dynamic, innovative economy.

Transportation is a critical part of solving the critical mass problem. Industry leaders have a vision of rail systems uniting suburbs and urban areas, allowing a firm's employees to choose from a variety of lifestyle options and still commute conveniently. Suburban or rural firms favored light rail and street car options that would allow them to recruit from the cities. However, urban employers were skeptical of how the public investment in intercity rail would benefit the major cities. Addressing this credibility gap is a part of a bigger challenge the region must rise to in order to compete for knowledge industry jobs.

Nemerson concludes that the region needs a strategic vision. Rather than focus on projects, regional leaders should pursue critical mass by setting a population goal, identifying areas to accommodate new growth, and enacting strategies to induce it. Knowledge industry businesses have many options on where to locate. Knowledge Corridor leaders must create, articulate, and promote a long term strategy for the region's success that will resonate with business leaders. The region must create a global, competitive brand that will recast its image from being on the periphery of the Northeast Corridor region to being in its center.



6. Briefing Materials on the Knowledge Corridor

This section updates the economic analysis of the Knowledge Corridor that was provided to participants in advance of the workshop as part of the briefing materials.

Regional Profile

The Northeast Megaregion

The New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Corridor is a major north-south branch line of the Northeast Corridor that runs 62 miles from New Haven, Connecticut north to Springfield, Massachusetts. The area developed as a network of communities linked by the Connecticut River and the 19th century rail network. Today, the Corridor is primarily linked by Interstate 91, which runs parallel to the Amtrak passenger rail right-of-way.

The corridor is in between Boston and New York, two of the great metropolitan areas of the "Northeast Megaregion" (Map 6-A).

Map 6-A: Northeast Megaregion¹³



The Northeast Megaregion is composed of the 142 contiguous counties that stretch from the northernmost suburbs of Boston to the southernmost commuter shed of Washington, DC. The Megaregion is framed by five great cities along the eastern seaboard and the metropolitan regions that have grown up around them,

¹³ Regional Plan Association, 2007, *Northeast Megaregion 2050: A Common Future*, <http://www.rpa.org/publications.html>

including (north to south) Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, DC. Together, these five metro areas constitute the largest continuously urbanized area in the nation. The urban centers at the core of these close-knit metropolitan regions play a vital role in shaping the identity of the Northeast. They are the Megaregion's economic engines, bringing together concentrations of capital, institutional expertise, entrepreneurial talent, and skilled, ambitious people from all over the country and the world. The Megaregion is currently home to 52 million people and is projected to add an additional 18 million people by the year 2050, which is the equivalent of adding a second New York state to this already heavily and densely populated part of the country.

These five cities are also major intellectual and cultural centers, attracting and focusing creative energies that enrich local life while resonating around the globe. Most fundamentally, the five great cities of the Northeast Megaregion are icons, the epitomes of urban life for the rest of the nation and powerful symbols of America to the world.¹⁴

This dense concentration of economic and cultural activity generates a wide variety of benefits for the Megaregion, but also creates capacity constraints on its unbalanced transportation system. For example, six of the nation's top ten most delay-prone airports are in the Northeast and the top four are JFK, Newark, LaGuardia, and Philadelphia. Amtrak's Northeast Corridor, a defining feature of the Northeast Megaregion running 450 miles from Washington, DC to Boston, is the nation's most congested rail corridor and one of the most heavily used corridors in the world. Every year, roughly 13 million Amtrak and 250 commuter rail passengers use the Corridor, along with approximately 50 freight trains per day.

As a major branch line of the Northeast Corridor serving Central Connecticut and Western Massachusetts, and an important link to Greater New England, the NHHS Rail Corridor is a crucial piece of the Megaregion's transportation network. New Haven is already a key station on Amtrak's Northeast Corridor, and the NHHS Rail Project will quadruple existing train service. The Corridor will play an even more significant role in the future as population and employment in the region's cities continue to develop, inter- and intra-city traffic grow, and other existing transportation modes become increasingly congested.

In the long-term, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) contemplates that the NHHS Corridor could serve as an inland route connecting New York City and Boston with true, dedicated high-speed rail service. Also, upgraded conventional rail service

¹⁴ *Ibid*

connecting New Hampshire, Vermont, and perhaps Montreal to New York City has been conceptualized for several years.¹⁵

Corridor Profile

A Shared History

The economies of Hartford and Springfield have long been linked by geography and transportation networks. Original settlement of the area began in the 17th century, when the settlers of Western Massachusetts' Pioneer Valley migrated south towards Hartford and Wethersfield, expanding the region often referred to as the Connecticut River Valley. For more than a century, people and goods navigated the Connecticut River by boat. Goods from northern New England were traded in Hartford, spurring the development of Hartford's insurance industries, which began by insuring these shipments.

In the 19th century, new railroads were constructed that linked New Haven more strongly to Hartford. The Corridor remained a center of manufacturing and industrial innovation throughout the first half of the 20th century. Construction of Interstate 91 and Bradley International Airport has reinforced these historic connections along the Corridor, even as the region continues to adjust to the economic challenges of the last several decades.

The Knowledge Corridor

The Knowledge Corridor is a spatial and economic framework that has been developed in recent years to describe the Central Connecticut and Western Massachusetts region, emphasizing the Corridor's concentration of colleges and universities, and unique mix of knowledge industries, such as insurance and financial services, health care and aerospace and defense manufacturing.

A 1999 report prepared by Michael Gallis & Associates for the Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century, studied the Connecticut region and developed a new spatial framework for thinking about how the state fits into the national and greater megalopolitan economy. It recognized the important role of the Knowledge Corridor, defining it as "a bi-state metro extending from New Haven, which functions as its southern gateway, to Amherst and Northampton, which together form the northern terminus."¹⁶ (Map 6-B)

The Knowledge Corridor concept was further developed by the Hartford Springfield Economic Partnership (The Partnership), a bi-state collaborative effort between Hartford and Springfield to promote regional economic growth, business development, talent retention, advocacy, and research. The Partnership was initiated by Northeast Utilities, the parent company of Connecticut Light &

Power, Yankee Gas and Western Massachusetts Electric, and launched in 2000.¹⁷

Branding Hartford and Springfield under a single regional identity emphasizes the proximity, size, and connectedness of the two cities in a way similar to the Dallas-Fort Worth relationship in Texas or the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul in Minnesota. This regional identity is also consistent with the two cities' historical connections within the Connecticut River Valley.

Map 6-B. New England's Knowledge Corridor¹⁸



¹⁵ Vermont Agency of Transportation, 2003, *Boston to Montreal High-Speed Rail Planning and Feasibility Study: Phase 1*, <http://www.vdot.state.vt.us/planning/BostonMontreal.htm>

¹⁶ Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century, 1999, *Connecticut: Strategic Economic Framework*.

¹⁷ The Hartford-Springfield Economic Partnership, 2011, *About Us Overview*, http://www.hartfordspringfield.com/about_us/overview

¹⁸ Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century, 1999, *Connecticut: Strategic Economic Framework*.

Although New Haven is often left out of Knowledge Corridor promotional materials, the Michael Gallis report clearly recognized its importance as a pivot point in the state, contributing to Central Connecticut's economy, as well as the economies in the New York-Southwestern Connecticut region. Two of the three major ports in the region are located in New Haven, the Port of New Haven and Tweed New Haven Regional Airport.¹⁹

Adopting the 1999 Gallis report's definition of the Knowledge Corridor (which also includes all of the cities with passenger rail stations on the NHHS Corridor south of Hartford that are in the New Haven metro area) would allow the Knowledge Corridor region to market the full assets of the NHHS Rail Corridor.

Demographic & Economic Indicators

Cities with train stations along the Knowledge Corridor have nearly three quarters of a million residents as of 2010. The largest city is Springfield followed by Hartford and New Haven, which have virtually identical populations of nearly 125,000 (Table 6-A).

Table 6-A: Population of the Knowledge Corridor²⁰

Station/City	City Population
Springfield, MA	155,580
Enfield, CT	45,259
Windsor Locks, CT	12,517
Windsor, CT	29,014
Hartford, CT	124,060
West Hartford, CT	60,852
Newington, CT	29,818
Berlin, CT	20,467
Meriden, CT	59,186
Wallingford, CT	44,881
North Haven, CT	23,916
New Haven, CT (2 stations)	123,330
KNOWLEDGE CORRIDOR (Three Metro Areas)	728,880
Boston, MA	645,169
New York City, NY	8,391,881

The three metropolitan areas of New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield had a total of approximately 2.8 million residents in the 2010 Census, which together makes this area the second most populous region in New England, following Greater Boston with approximately 4.6 million people (Table 6-B).

The Knowledge Corridor also has a large and diverse work force. With nearly 1.3 million employees, it is the second largest labor pool in New England, following Greater Boston. Unfortunately,

¹⁹ *Ibid*

²⁰ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 2010. *2010 Decennial Census, American FactFinder*. <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

the unemployment rate in the region remains high, slightly above the national average (Table 6-B). This is evidence of the region's ongoing shift from a manufacturing based economy towards a service- and knowledge-sector economy.

Table 6-B. Civilian Labor Force and Unemployment, by MSA (March 2011)²¹

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Population	Civilian Employees*	Unemployment Rate
Springfield, MA	692,942	350,300	9.4
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	1,212,381	601,100	9.3
New Haven- Milford, CT	862,477	314,100	9.6
KNOWLEDGE CORRIDOR	2,767,800	1,265,500	9.4
UNITED STATES	308,745,538	153,022,000	9.2
Boston, MA	4,552,402	2,454,200	7.1
New York City, NY	18,897,109	9,418,100	8.4

* Not seasonally adjusted.

In 2009, the region's Gross Domestic Product was roughly \$140 billion, approximately one percent of the nation's total output and roughly half the GDP of Greater Boston and one-tenth the GDP of New York City.


The large population and employment pool are both highly educated and well paid compared to the national average. Per capita income in the Knowledge Corridor is roughly 114 percent of the national average, and since 1999 all three of the metro areas have improved their U.S. ranking of metro areas with the wealthiest population.

Employment Distribution


As shown in the following maps (Map 6-C and Map 6-D), the distribution of employment in all industries and knowledge-sector industries is very similar. Throughout the region, employment is clustered around train stations. This pattern is particularly apparent in the three major cities of New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield, which are shown in the inset maps, where all of the surrounding census tracts contain the highest concentrations of employment in all industries and knowledge-sector industries.

²¹ Population - *Ibid*. Civilian Employees and Unemployment Rate - U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011. *Civilian Labor force and unemployment by state and metropolitan area*. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/metro.t01.htm>

Map 6-C. Distribution of Employment in All Industries



Map 6-D. Distribution of Employment in Knowledge Industries



Knowledge Industries Analysis

The Hartford-Springfield Economic Partnership (the Partnership) has identified several key employment industries that are either currently specialized or are growing in the Knowledge Corridor region. These industries include: finance and insurance, precision manufacturing, health care, information technology, educational services, and medical device manufacturing.²¹

In order to further investigate which industries make up the core of the Knowledge Corridor region's economy and which represent unique growth opportunities for the region's future, America 2050 conducted a location quotient analysis and a comparison of the national and regional growth rates of the 13 knowledge industries identified by the Partnership, listed in Table 6-C.

Location Quotient (Economic Base) Analysis

A strong base of export industries is critical for the continued growth of the Knowledge Corridor's regional economy. A location quotient (economic base) analysis can help identify in which industries a region specializes (i.e. the region's export industries). America 2050 completed economic base calculations that compare employment in the three metropolitan areas and an aggregated Knowledge Corridor region to national employment figures.

Table 6C shows the results of the location quotient analysis using employment data gathered from the U.S. Economic Census. Location quotients were calculated for all of the 13 knowledge industries to determine whether or not the three metropolitan areas' and the region's economy as a whole have a greater share of employment in each knowledge industry when compared to the nation, indicated by a value greater than "1." If an industry in a given area has a greater share than the nation, then there are more jobs in that industry than the local economy needs to have in order to serve local needs. This suggests firms are using these additional jobs to export their goods and services to other areas of the region or nation. Economists define this as, "basic sector employment."

The Knowledge Corridor

The Knowledge Corridor region—defined here as the combined New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield metropolitan areas—has a greater share of its total employment in nine out of the 13 specialized manufacturing and knowledge-sector industries that were analyzed. These include (beginning with the highest degree of specialization): Firearms Manufacturing, Renewable Energy, Precision Manufacturing, Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing, Educational Services, Medical Devices Manufacturing, Insurance & Financial Services, Health Care, and Plastics Manufacturing. The share of Firearms Manufacturing in the region is significantly higher than that of the nation, driven mainly by businesses in the Springfield metropolitan area, along with basic sector employment in the other two metropolitan areas. Precision Manufacturing and

Health Care are the only other two industries that have basic sector employment in all three metropolitan areas in the Knowledge Corridor region.

However, the results of this analysis showed that four of the industries that the Partnership identified as knowledge industries do not exhibit basic sector employment, including Advanced Security, Life Sciences / Biotechnology, Tourism, and Information Technology. We will look more closely at those four industries below to determine whether or not those industries are growing, but first we discuss the results for each of the three metropolitan statistical areas that together make up the Knowledge Corridor region.

New Haven-Milford, CT (MSA)

The New Haven metropolitan area has more of its total employment in the sectors of Educational Services, Medical Devices Manufacturing, Precision Manufacturing, Firearms Manufacturing, Health Care, and Life Sciences / Biotechnology than the nation as a whole, with a particular emphasis on the Educational Services industry. Much of the specialization in New Haven's Education, Medical Devices Manufacturing, Health Care, Life Sciences / Biotechnology industries is driven by high rates of employment in the metropolitan area's fine academic and research institutions, and hospitals.

Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT (MSA)

Employment in Renewable Energy, Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing, Firearms Manufacturing, and Precision Manufacturing is much more prevalent in the Hartford metropolitan area than it is nationwide. Additionally, Hartford has a greater share of its total employment in Insurance & Financial Services, Health Care, and Educational Services than is the case for the nation. United Technologies, which has a large base of employment near the Bradley International Airport in the region, is the main driver of the region's specialization in the Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing industry. The Hartford metropolitan area's abundance of insurance company headquarters drives the basic sector employment in the Insurance & Financial Services industry.

Springfield, MA (MSA)

In the Springfield metropolitan area, employment in Firearms Manufacturing is far more prevalent than it is for the nation. To a far lesser degree, Springfield has a greater share of its total employment in Precision Manufacturing, Educational Services, Plastics Manufacturing, Health Care, and Medical Devices Manufacturing than is the case for the nation.


²¹ The Hartford-Springfield Economic Partnership, 2011. *Welcome to New England's Knowledge Corridor*. <http://www.hartfordspringfield.com/sites/default/files/HSE201008rchure.pdf>

Table 6-C. Location Quotient Analysis of Knowledge Industries in Local Metro Areas

Industries	New Haven	Hartford	Springfield	Knowledge Corridor Region (NHHS)
Firearms Manufacturing	1.98	5.28	27.57	9.04
Renewable Energy	0.63	8.31	0.88	4.46
Precision Manufacturing	2.42	4.32	2.71	3.41
Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing	0.75	6.12	0.59	3.36
Educational Services	3.28	1.11	2.66	2.08
Medical Devices Manufacturing	3.64	0.66	1.37	1.69
Insurance & Financial Services	0.70	2.25	0.93	1.51
Health Care	1.43	1.18	1.56	1.34
Plastics Manufacturing	0.77	0.55	2.48	1.03
Information Technology	0.95	0.96	0.47	0.85
Tourism	0.76	0.77	0.95	0.80
Advanced Security	0.94	0.78	0.58	0.78
Life Sciences / Biotechnology	1.30	0.12	0.63	0.58

Source: America 2050 analysis of U.S. Census Bureau, 2008, *Metro Business Patterns*; <http://www.census.gov/econ/dbq/index.html>

Figure 6-A. Changes in the Specialization of Knowledge Industries in the Region



Source: America 2050 graphic and analysis of U.S. Census Bureau, 2008, *Metro Business Patterns*; and U.S. Census Bureau, 2000, *Metro Business Patterns*. <http://www.census.gov/econ/dbq/index.html>.

Figure 6-A graphically depicts the Knowledge Corridor's current specialization, growth or decline in specialization, and absolute number of jobs in the 13 knowledge-sector employment industries. The y-axis shows the industries' 2008 location quotient (current industry specialization), the x-axis shows the percentage change in the industries' location quotient from 2000 to 2008 (growth or decline in industry specialization), and the size of each bubble depicts the relative size of that industry in 2008 (total number of jobs). So, bubbles in the upper-right quadrant represent industries that are currently specialized and becoming more specialized. For example, health care is a large industry, employing over 200,000 people in the Knowledge Corridor at a higher rate than that of the nation, and the region is becoming more specialized in the health care industry. Figure 6-A shows that of all of the knowledge-sector industries that are not currently specialized in the region, only the Tourism and Advanced Security industries represent growth opportunities because their location quotients are increasing.

Comparison of National and Regional Growth Rates

In addition to looking at the change in location quotients from 2000 to 2008, the national and regional growth rates of these 13 knowledge-sector industries were examined over this same time period, in order to determine how the composition of the region's knowledge-sector industries are shifting (Table 6-D).

Table 6-D. National and Regional Growth Rates for Knowledge Industries between 2000 and 2008²³

Industries	National Growth Rate	Regional Growth Rate
Life Sciences / Biotechnology	86%	50%
Firearms Manufacturing	25%	61%
Educational Services	24%	18%
Health Care	22%	22%
Tourism	20%	17%
Advanced Security	16%	31%
Precision Manufacturing	14%	13%
Insurance & Financial Services	9%	-8%
Medical Devices Manufacturing	6%	16%
Information Technology	-8%	-20%
Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing	-9%	-43%
Plastics Manufacturing	-20%	-14%
Renewable Energy	-24%	-17%

Table 6-D shows the growth rates (from 2000 to 2008) of the 13 knowledge industries at the scale of the nation and the Knowledge Corridor. Of the four knowledge-sector industries that do not have basic sector employment, the region is outperforming the nation in only one of those industries in terms of relative growth. When compared to national growth rates, Advanced Security in the region is growing nearly twice as fast as the nation. This confirms the location quotient change analysis above, which

showed Advanced Security to be an opportunity for growth. Although the region's Life Sciences / Biotechnology industry is only growing about half as fast as the nation, it is still growing at a very high rate. These signs of ongoing growth suggest that the region should look to capitalize on these two industries in the future by continuing to attract firms working in those fields.

Conversely, the Information Technology industry is not currently specialized in the region and is shrinking twice as fast as the nation. While the Aerospace & Defense Manufacturing industry is highly specialized in the region as of now, it is shrinking at a rate over four times as fast as the nation. As a result, these two industries may provide a smaller opportunity for future growth.

Among other basic sector employment industries, where the region currently has specialization, we observe that the Insurance & Financial Services industry is growing nationwide, however the Knowledge Corridor region is actually losing jobs in that industry. If this pattern continues the region's modest specialization in that industry may not exist much longer, disrupting the balance of the region's current economic framework.

The Educational Services, Health Care, Tourism, Precision Manufacturing, Medical Devices Manufacturing, and Plastics Manufacturing industries are changing at virtually the same rate as the nation. The Knowledge Corridor region's Renewable Energy industry is shrinking, but at a much slower rate than the nation.

Suggested Strategies

Overall, the location quotient, change in specialization, and growth rate analyses indicate that Health Care is a major employer in the region, it is currently specialized, and over time getting more specialized. Educational Services is a highly specialized and stable industry in the Knowledge Corridor region, employing well over 60,000 people. Precision and Medical Devices Manufacturing firms employ fewer people in the region, but they are specialized industries and becoming even more so over time. The Firearms Manufacturing industry only employs about 2,700 people, but it is highly specialized, becoming more so, and growing twice as fast as the nation. The region should look to continue building on these five industries in particular. The Plastics Manufacturing industry is small, but slowly becoming more specialized in the region, so it could represent another growth industry in the future.

Aerospace and Defense Manufacturing are currently very specialized, but rapidly losing specialization. Finally, the Insurance & Financial Services industry employs nearly 100,000 people, but is losing specialization in the region while it is growing overall around the nation. These industries have long been pillars of the regional economy, and Connecticut and Massachusetts should seek to stem the decline in the region's specialization.

²³ U.S. Census Bureau, 2000/2008. *Metro Business Journals*.

7. Participant List

June 2nd & 3rd

Gary Anderson, Town of Manchester
Eric Barz, Town of Windsor
Clayton Beckett
Stewart Beckett, Beckett & Associates Veterinary Services
Wayne Benjamin, City of Hartford
Kip Bergstrom, Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development
John Bernick, Connecticut Department of Transportation
Peggy Brennan, City of Meriden
Tim Brennan, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Jim Burke, Town of Windsor
Karen Burnaska, Transit for Connecticut
Armando Carbonell, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
Jennifer Carrier, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Steve Cassano, Connecticut State Senate
Elizabeth Conrad
Jim Cronin, CSX
Robert Cummings
Mario Di Loreto, Readeo, LLC
Sam Eisenbeiser, Fitzgerald & Halliday
Joe Ferrucci
David Fink, Partnership for Strong Communities
Douglas G. Fisher, Northeast Utilities
Sandy Fry, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Mark Gander, AECOM
Anne Gatling Haynes, Economic Development Corporation of New Haven
Steve Gazillo, URS Corporation
Julie Geyer, Beckett & Associates Veterinary Services
Dennis Goderre, Goderre & Associates
Toni Gold
Thomas Harned, Milone & MacBroom
Stephen Harris
Maureen Hayes, Hayes Development Services
Anne Gatling Haynes, Economic Development Corporation of New Haven
Patrick Hewes, Saccardi & Schiff
Deborah Howes, AECOM
Ernie Hutton, Hutton & Associates
Ahmed Ismail, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Tom Jost, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Joanna Julian, Regional Plan Association
Philip Katz, Stantec
Amanda Kennedy, Regional Plan Association
David Kooris, Regional Plan Association
Robert Lane, Regional Plan Association
Coleman Levy, Levy & Dronney
Henry Link, Enviro Energy

Maya Loewenberg, Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development
Jim Lohr, New England Regional Council of Carpenters
Bruce Lydem, New England Carpenters Union
Ryan Lynch, Tri-State Transportation Campaign
Jonas Maciunas, City of Hartford
Tom Marano, Northeast Utilities
Tom Maziarz, Connecticut Department of Transportation
David McCary, McCary Stevens Associates
Patrick McMahon, Town of Suffield
Ed Meehan, Town of Newington
Sean Moore, Meriden Chamber of Commerce
Dan Moeley, Office of Policy and Management, State of Connecticut
Paul Mounds, The Office of Senator Richard Blumenthal
Kelly Murphy, City of New Haven
Matt Nemerson, Connecticut Technology Council
Rebecca Nolan, MetroHartford Alliance
David B. Panagore, City of Hartford
Mark Pellegrini, Town of Manchester
Mike Piscitelli, City of New Haven
Stuart Popper, URS Corporation
Patricia Quinn, Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority
Dana Roscoe, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Jonathan Rosenthal, Bristol Development Authority
Cherie Santos-Wuest, Celadon Ventures
Robert Santy, Connecticut Economic Resource Center
Dan Schmed, Regional Plan Association
Garrett Sheehan, The United Illuminating Company
John Shemo, MetroHartford Alliance
Pete Simmons, Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development
John Simone, Connecticut Main Street
Anika Singh Lemar, Wiggin and Dana
Engene Skoropowski, HNTB Corporation
Peter Souza, Town of Windsor
Carl Stephani, Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency
Petra Todorovich, Regional Plan Association
John Treichel, Diversified Technology Consultants
Ronald Van Winkle, Town of West Hartford
Lynne Wallace, Dietz & Company Architects
Michael Wang, Arrowstreet
Lyle Wray, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Robert Yaro, Regional Plan Association
Fiona Zhu, Regional Plan Association

8. Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the following people and institutions that made this effort possible.

Planning Committee

Oz Griebel, Metro-Hartford Alliance
Amanda Kennedy, Regional Plan Association
David Kooris, Regional Plan Association
Robert Lane, Regional Plan Association
Matthew Nemerson, Connecticut Technology Council
John Plante, ULI Connecticut
Dan Schned, America 2050, Regional Plan Association
Anika Singh Letnar, ULI Connecticut
Petra Todorovich, America 2050, Regional Plan Association
Lyle Wray, Capitol Region Council of Governments
Tom Wright, Regional Plan Association
Robert Yaro, America 2050, Regional Plan Association

Funding Support



Local Co-Host

Capitol Region Council of Governments

In-kind Support

Connecticut Technology Council
Metro-Hartford Alliance
ULI Connecticut
Metro-Hartford Alliance

Final Report Contributors

Writing, Editing, and Analysis

Dan Schned
Amanda Kennedy
Petra Todorovich
David Kooris
Robert Lane
Paul Shabsis
Justin Bland
Daniel Ferry
Jeremy Steinemann

Mapping and Data Analysis

Fiona Zhu
Jeff Ferzoco
Dan Schned

Graphic Design

Jeff Ferzoco
Ben Oldenburg



America 2050 • Dependable Rail in 2016 • June 2-3, 2011