



REPORT OF MEETING

Date and Time: Tuesday, September 22, 2015, 8:30 AM

Location: The Lyceum, 227 Lawrence Street, Hartford

Subject: Public Advisory Committee Meeting #8

1. Attendees

NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL ADDRESS
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Anne Hayes	Travelers	aihayes@travelers.com
Jackie McKinney	ArtSpace Residents Association	Jdmckinney07@gmail.com
Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG	jcarrier@crcog.org
Lynn Ferrari	Coalition to Strengthen Sheldon-Charter Oak Neighborhood	Lynn.ferrar@gmail.com
Michael Marshall	Aetna	Marshallml@aetna.com
Jennifer Cassidy	Asylum Hill Neighborhood Association	j.cassidy@snet.net
Tim Bockus	Town of East Hartford	tbockus@easthartfordct.gov
Toni Gold	West End Civic Association	toniagold@gmail.com
Thomas Deller	City of Hartford	tdelle@hartford.gov
Jeff Cormier	City of Hartford	cormj001@hartford.gov
Aaron Gill	Frog Hollow NRZ	ajgill@edtengineers.com
Hank Hoffman	The Hartford	Hank.hoffman@thehartford.com
Jackie Mandyck	iQuilt	jackie@thequiltplan.org
Ted Aldieri	FHWA	ted.aldieri@dot.gov
Robert Painter	HUB of Hartford	Painterbob4250@yahoo.com
Liz Rotavera	St. Francis Hospital	lrotaver@stfrancicare.org
Adrian Texidor	SINA	atexidor@sina.org
Mark McGovern	Town of West Hartford	Mark.McGovern@westhartfordct.gov
OTHER ATTENDEES		
Jillian Massey	CRCOG	jmassey@crcog.org
Michelle Herrell	FHWA	michelle.herrell@dot.gov
Andy Daly	The Hartford	andrew.daly@thehartford.com

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		
Rich Armstrong	CTDOT	richard.armstrong@ct.gov
John Dudzinski	CTDOT	john.dudzinski@ct.gov
Stephen DelPapa	CTDOT	stephen.delpapa@ct.gov
Thomas Doyle	CTDOT	thomas.doyle@ct.gov
Brian Natwick	CTDOT	brian.natwick@ct.gov
Randal Davis	CTDOT	Randal.davis@ct.gov
John Bernick	CTDOT	john.bernick@ct.gov
CONSULTANT TEAM		
David Stahnke	TranSystems Corporation	dkstahnke@transystems.com
Tim Ryan	TranSystems Corporation	tpryan@transystems.com
Dennis Goderre	TranSystems Corporation	dggoderre@transystems.com
Casey Hardin	TranSystems Corporation	crhardin@transystems.com
Nick Mandler	TranSystems Corporation	ncmandler@transystems.com
Pat Padlo	TranSystems Corporation	ptpadlo@transystems.com
Mike Morehouse	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	mmorehouse@fhiplan.com
Debbie Hoffman	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	dhoffman@fhiplan.com
Marcy Miller	Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.	mmiller@fhiplan.com
Christine Tiernan	AECOM	christine.tiernan@aecom.com
Deborah Howes	AECOM	Deborah.howes@aecom.com
Mitch Glass	Goody Clancy	Mitch.glass@goodyclancy.com
Karl Heilmann	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Heilmann@pbworld.com
Julie Georges	A. DiCesare Associates	georges@adicesarepc.com

2. Welcome & Meeting Purpose

Rich Armstrong welcomed everyone to the 8th PAC meeting for the I-84 Hartford Project. He provided an overview of the meeting agenda. He stated that the purpose of the meeting is to provide a recap of the recent work, including the preliminary traffic and alternatives screening analysis. In addition, he stated that the project team will provide an update on the past and upcoming public outreach events.

3. Presentation

Updates since June 2015 PAC Meeting

Mike Morehouse discussed the public outreach that has occurred since the June 2015 PAC meeting. He described the July and August 2015 Open Planning Studios, various pop up events attended throughout the City, and meetings with different stakeholder groups. He discussed the interactive alternatives webpage that recently went live on the I-84 website and thanked that PAC for providing feedback on the draft page. M. Morehouse closed his discussion by describing the project schedule, noting that the team is currently working on the mobility aspect of the overall purpose and need.

Dave Stahnke next provided a brief update on the Hartford Railroad Alternatives Study, stating that the draft study was submitted to CTDOT on 9/8/2015. He said that the results are generally positive. He continued on to say that the report cites that relocating the rail to the north of the highway is a viable option. Once the study has gone through its review, the I-84 Hartford project team will post it to the website. In addition, a new draft purpose and need will soon be available for the PAC to review.

D. Stahnke introduced the preliminary traffic analysis. He described how the team analyzes mainline operations first then ramp and local road intersection operations second. He discussed the bicyclist and pedestrian considerations and stated that the Needs and Deficiencies Study has been posted to the project website. He reviewed the alternatives, spending some time on the traffic analysis results in each of the four vertical alignment categories.

D. Stahnke briefly discussed *CTfastrak*, noting that the team will make sure to consider the corridor into designs that move forward and that this bus service will remain operational during construction. It is expected that Union Station will remain a bus hub in all alternatives.

Current Work Efforts

D. Stahnke next discussed the alternatives screening. He described the process of using the purpose and need to narrow the 150+ possible alternatives to a more manageable number. He reviewed the three major components of the purpose and need (bridge deficiencies, traffic and safety operations, and mobility). He noted that the No-build alternative does not adequately address the bridge functional deficiencies. For example, the bridges would continue to exist with substandard shoulders.

D. Stahnke discussed the ten options that the project team proposed to be eliminated at this point in the study as a result of critical flaws. The team proposed that eight options be eliminated because of traffic performance and two options be eliminated because of property impacts (4a and 4b). He proposed that 11 options be set aside for now, one because of traffic performance, two because they are contingent on closing the highway, seven because of poor/moderate traffic performance and one tunnel option (4c) because of substandard traffic performance and cost.

D. Stahnke explained that the project team recommends that 3 western and 4 eastern options, plus the No-build alternative, continue to be analyzed as part of the alternatives analysis. This means the 150+ possible east-west combinations would be reduced to twelve. The seven east and west options include:

1. 3A:E5(S)
2. 3B:E2(S)
3. 3B:E3(S)
4. 3B:E4(S)
5. 3A/3B: W3-1
6. 3A/3B: W3-2
7. 3A/3B: W3-3

Next Steps

D. Stahnke discussed the next steps for the alternatives screening process. He stated that the project team will be adding additional options to the 3-dimensional modelling; refining the alternatives on the analysis webpage; and further assessing the alternatives. He stated that the team is going to be further assessing the previously noted bicycle and pedestrian considerations in the coming months.

M. Morehouse closed the presentation by discussing the upcoming public meetings in October 2015 and Open Planning Studios in November / December 2015.

3. Next Steps

On the interactive alternatives website, Toni Gold questioned where potential developable land exists that can be added back to the city's tax roll. M. Morehouse noted the grayed out toggle bar for this aspect on the website. He stated that the team plans to add this feature to show urban design opportunities. Once it is available, the team will announce that to the PAC.

Aaron Gill stated that it seems that the project team is now only truly going to analyze the at-grade option. D. Stahnke agreed that the lowered alternatives are performing the best at this time. A. Gill stated that the team is placing importance only on traffic considerations. D. Stahnke stated that team will most definitely be looking at other criteria, but this current screen only factors in whether the options satisfy the purpose and need criteria (bridge structures, traffic and safety operations, and mobility). R. Armstrong added that the team does care about other factors, including neighborhood connections, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and potentially developable land, and the options will be assessed for these other factors in the goals and objectives analysis. There is a long way to go to further narrow the alternatives. A. Gill stated that he views the tunnel alternative as the best in terms of improving neighborhood redevelopment.

T. Gold stated that an at-grade option is really a lowered option. It can be built partially underground in some areas, such as Asylum Hill.

Deborah Howes stated that the projected traffic around the tunnel could contribute to air quality impacts. Christine Tiernan added that the quantitative air quality analysis has not been conducted yet, but improving congestion will likely improve air quality and noise.

Bob Painter asked about the tunnel impacts to Capitol Avenue. D. Stahnke stated that the 4b alignment would have significant property impacts to many of the buildings along Capitol Avenue.

One PAC member questioned whether the alternatives factored in optimized traffic signals. D. Stahne answered that all but the existing conditions analysis factored in optimized traffic signals. T. Ryan added that the projected traffic for the tunnel alternative is worse than the existing conditions.

R. Armstrong and D. Stahnke discussed that all the roads will go over the highway in the lowered alternative. R. Armstrong added that, in the tunnel alternatives, all the north-south crossings will still have to go up and over the rail and CT*fastrak*.

There was a question about how the Park River Conduit would be impacted by the tunnel alternative. R. Armstrong answered that the team has recently met with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers about the feasibility of moving the conduit if needed. The outcome of the meeting was that it is feasible to move the conduit.

Liz Rotavera asked the team to put the alternatives to be further assessed on the website. M. Morehouse said this will be included in the filters on the interactive alternatives webpage.

Hank Hoffman questioned whether additional noise analysis has been completed, especially for the lowered highway. C. Tiernan answered that this has not been completed yet. The team is currently working on the baseline model.

H. Hoffman asked if the comments related to closing the highway were overwhelmingly negative. M. Morehouse answered that they have been fairly balanced. R. Armstrong added that the team does not yet know if closing the highway is feasible.

L. Rotavera questioned whether the team is still looking at turning high occupancy vehicle lanes into toll lanes. R. Armstrong answered that this is currently not on the table. Post meeting correction: Conversion of the I-84 and I-91 HOV lanes into managed toll lanes has been preliminarily examined by CTDOT. The purpose of the conversion would be to reduce congestion. This concept is still being considered.