



***I-91  
Transportation  
Investment Area  
Corridor Plan***

Adopted: September 26, 2002

*I-91 Transportation Investment Area (TIA)  
Final Corridor Plan  
September 26, 2002*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Executive Summary - Policy and Project Priorities .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Public Involvement .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Movement of People .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Corridor Objectives.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Corridor Challenges.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Movement of Goods and Freight .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Corridor Objectives.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Corridor Challenges.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Economy, Land Use, Environment, and Quality of Life .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Corridor Objectives.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Corridor Challenges.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Chapter 6: Integration of the Corridor Economy with State, Regional, National, and     Global Economies.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Corridor Objectives.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Corridor Challenges.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Chapter 7: Policies and Sources to Provide Funding for a Quality Multi-Modal     Transportation System.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Corridor Objectives.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Corridor Challenges.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Chapter 8: Corridor Perspective on.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix A: I-91 TIA Board Membership .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix B: Public Comment .....</b>	<b>26</b>

## **Executive Summary – Policy and Project Priorities**

This final corridor plan is a product of the combined knowledge, experience, and understanding of the fifteen-member I-91 Transportation Investment Area (I-91 TIA) Board. It is based on information provided to the Board by members of the public, as well as other information collected by the TIA Board members themselves.

The I-91/Connecticut River Valley corridor is important to the future of the state because it includes the I-91 corridor, an important transportation and logistics corridor with an interstate freeway, rail line, seaport and airports. The transportation and logistics resources found in this corridor can be utilized to create a foundation for numerous economic activities, which will have long-term benefits to the state and the region.

The I-91 corridor has the potential “to develop as a significant transportation and logistics corridor, linking port, road, rail and air facilities into a network that can provide world class support to manufacturing, research, information and finance-based industries” (see p. 19, *The Connecticut Strategic Economic Framework*,” aka “Gallis” Report).

The I-91 TIA Board strongly urges aggressive implementation of the initiatives presented in this Plan. The TIA Board particularly supports the development of a methodology for doing cost/benefit analyses of alternative modes of transportation.

The I-91 TIA went through a careful process to establish its top five project priorities. As with our TIA’s initial corridor plan, the process of establishing project priorities made it clear that there are overarching policies without which real progress cannot be made. Policy initiatives such as significantly increasing revenue for transportation investments and integrating transportation, land use and economic development planning are pre-requisites for success in implementing specific projects. In addition, some projects, while important to the I-91 TIA corridor, are also important to the entire state. Therefore, we have recommended both statewide projects and broad policy initiatives, just after the list of the I-91 TIA’s five region-specific project priorities.

### **Top Five Project Priorities, in order of priority**

#### **1. New Haven to Springfield Commuter Rail**

Implement New Haven to Springfield commuter rail with a link to Bradley International Airport. The first step in this, a study on the infrastructure costs and operating characteristics of expanded commuter rail in this corridor, has just begun. This project is seen as an important way to connect the Hartford and Springfield areas to New Haven and New York. In particular, it will provide better access to northeast corridor Acela service in New Haven and to Bradley Airport for people in this corridor.

The current study will provide details needed to implement this project including costs, capital requirements and operating characteristics. The study should analyze the cost-benefit of electrification of the New Haven to Springfield line. The State should aggressively pursue the acquisition of the right-of-way in this corridor now.

## **2. Feeder Barge Service - Port of New Haven**

Establish container barge service for the port of New Haven including the purchase of two cranes as recommended by the *Coastal Barge Feeder Service Study – SCRCOG* (Final Report dated March 2001). Support barge to truck and train intermodal transfer facilities at the New Haven port. This can help strengthen our TIA's ties to the rest of the northeast and remove over 300 trucks a day from our highways. This project will have the added benefit of becoming a catalyst for job creation and economic development in the Greater New Haven area.

The public investment in what will eventually be a public/private partnership will consist of \$4.1 million for equipment costs and \$5 million as a working capital loan. Private investment will approximately match that amount. The equipment purchase with public money will be leased to a private company or companies for \$1 per year. The loan will be repaid with interest commencing in Year 10. Implementation is possible immediately upon funding.

## **3. Hartford – New Britain Bus Rapid Transit**

Construct the bus rapid transitway connecting Hartford and New Britain. This facility will be a bus only roadway that provides a rapid transit service, with convenient stations, frequent service, state of the art passenger information, and trip times that are competitive with the private automobile. The State must insure that its operating characteristics and amenities are the same as other forms of rapid transit. This project will provide a less expensive way to deal with congestion in the Hartford region. As importantly, it will serve as a prototype for a new form of rapid transit elsewhere in Connecticut and across the nation.

The New Britain-Hartford BRT will require the construction of 9.4 miles of exclusive bus roadway connecting New Britain, Newington, West Hartford and Hartford; 12 stations varying in size and description; and a multi-use trail through much of the corridor. Approximately 28 new buses will be procured. The current total estimated cost to construct the busway is \$160 million. Expected operating costs for the first year of operation are \$6.3 million. (Source: *Final EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation New Britain – Hartford Busway*, December 2001. Additional details are available in that document; updated construction needs, operating characteristics and related costs will become available as the design is developed.) Construction is expected to be underway in April 2004, with operation of the service expected to begin in January 2006.

#### **4. Metro North Passenger Rail Equipment and Parking**

Upgrade trains, maintenance facilities, parking facilities, and feeder bus services for passenger rail service in the state, particularly along the MetroNorth line, which provides an important link from the I-91 corridor to New York. Upgrades should not be at the expense of other existing services, such as the Shoreline East commuter service. Specifically, we should fund needed commuter rail equipment on the New Haven line and provide additional parking for commuters at an Orange or West Haven rail station. The cost for providing new commuter parking is estimated to be between \$12 and 20 million.

#### **5. Bradley International Airport and Tweed New Haven Airport**

Adopt a statewide airport strategy that recognizes Bradley's role as the primary commercial airport and the need to invest in Tweed as the secondary airport, serving southern Connecticut.

Endorse and implement the Tweed New Haven Airport Master Plan. The four-phase modernization program (including a 600-foot runway extension and navigation-aid improvements) will cost an estimated \$60 million over five years.

Provide the forum for state policy makers to resolve conflicts between environmental, economic development and transportation policies to clear the way for the modest expansion envisioned by the Plan. Support state legislative changes necessary to accommodate implementation of the Plan.

### **Statewide Project Priorities, in order of priority**

The following projects are important to the I-91 TIA, but will also benefit residents throughout the state.

#### **1. Deduct-A-Ride Program**

Expand employer participation in the Deduct-A-Ride program throughout the state and provide other monetary or tax incentives for transit commuters in the corridor. The state has concentrated most of its marketing efforts for Deduct-A-Ride on employers in Fairfield County. It is important that employers and employees in the I-91 corridor be encouraged to use transit and that other transit incentives be provided here and elsewhere in the state. Vanpooling and carpooling should be encouraged in a similar manner, as an additional effort to reduce the number of vehicles on our highways

#### **2. Jobs Access Program**

Continue support for the Jobs Access Program, which has allowed thousands of Connecticut residents, particularly low-income people, to get to work. This program is a proven transportation investment that benefits workers and employers. Reverse commute services, route extensions, and customized paratransit services need a stable, dedicated

funding source. The annual cost to the State for this program in FFY2003 is estimated at \$3.50 million, matched by \$5.38 million in Federal Transit Administration funds.

### **3. Local Bus Services**

Improve transit services by implementing the recommendations of the statewide bus study. While we have made progress in coordinating transit service within and between urban areas in the corridor, more needs to be done. Additional funding will be needed to implement many of the recommendations of the bus study. The estimated additional annual operating cost of the efficiency measures and operating enhancements proposed in the study is \$5.8 million: \$8.6 million in operating costs less \$2.8 million in additional revenue. (Source: *Connecticut DOT Statewide Bus System Study, Executive Summary*, July 2000; additional details are available in that document and in the individual system reports.) Consideration should also be given to creating a statewide transit authority.

### **Top Policy Recommendations**

If we are to make real progress in achieving connectivity, stimulating economic vitality and improving our quality of life, the following policy initiatives should be implemented:

#### **❖ New Revenue Sources**

We must identify one or more significant new revenue sources for transportation investments. These sources must be stable and dedicated solely to capital and operating costs for transportation. Special attention should be given to the use of electronic tolls, not toll booths, on Connecticut highways. This is a promising way to generate significant revenues without inconveniencing highway users.

#### **❖ Better Decision-making and Planning**

We must develop procedures to more closely link transportation, land use and economic decision-making and planning in the state. The goal should be fostering livable communities and environmentally-sound economic development.

#### **❖ Integrated Transportation Facilities**

We must pursue opportunities to integrate transportation facilities, whether transit, freight, highways or rail. Intermodal strategies should be given priority.

#### **❖ Regional Cooperation**

We must work more closely with neighboring states and all states in the northeast to find solutions to many of our most important needs including improved rail freight service, improved commuter rail, and feeder barge service.

# **I-91 Transportation Investment Area Corridor Plan**

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

“The I-91/Connecticut River Valley Corridor is important to the future of the state. The state has never had a ‘Silicon Valley,’ or a ‘Route 128,’ as a focus for its technology sector. The I-91 corridor could become a location of that type. Commercialization of research is one of the most promising initiatives that can impact the state’s economy. The future of Connecticut will be strongly influenced by the utilization of educational, medical, and research resources found in the I-91/Connecticut River Valley. However, the I-91 corridor appears isolated and difficult to access from global and continental markets. A fundamental issue is how to get these resources to world markets and how to get world markets to these resources” (p. 16, Gallis).

Enactment of Public Act 01-5, which established the Transportation Strategy Board and this Transportation Investment Area Board, signals a new direction in transportation policy development for the State of Connecticut. Implementation of this new law allows a fundamental shift in the state’s approach to Transportation – tying the expenditure of state transportation resources to land use and economic development policy. The TIA Board strongly supports this new direction and urges aggressive implementation of the initiative represented by enactment of Public Act 01-5. Our vision for the I-91 corridor stresses the connectivity between transportation, economic development and land use policy and multi-modal solutions to such transportation-related issues as congestion, over-reliance on trucks for freight movement, environmental degradation, and urban decay. We urge the use of commuter rail, bus, and rapid transit and the development of an airport strategy that serves all the state’s population centers.

If significant highway-based infrastructure improvements are pursued, they will take at least ten to twenty years to implement. Quite early during that time frame many of our existing highways will have approached or actually reached complete shutdown due to gridlock; significant interim relief for Connecticut will be non-highway solutions that can be implemented in a much shorter time frame.

## Chapter 2: Public Involvement

This Final Plan was developed following considerable deliberation by the fifteen members of the I-91 Corridor Transportation Investment Area Board. The board itself was constituted so as to provide a broad representation of the different constituencies and transportation interests within the I-91 corridor. Five members were selected to represent the five planning regions in the corridor. Five members were elected at meetings of the general public within those five regions. And five members were specifically selected to insure that businesses, transit advocacy groups, the rail industry, the trucking industry, environmental interest groups, labor unions, and trade associations would be represented. A list of the I-91 TIA board members and the constituencies they represent is provided in Appendix A

Each board member brought to the table significant expertise in one or more aspects of concern regarding the transportation challenges in the I-91 corridor. In sharing this expertise, all members grew in their understanding of those challenges and together they developed first the objectives, then strategies, and finally projects to meet the transportation challenges of the corridor.

They were assisted in this effort by listening to comments from members of the general public, by receiving information from professionals working in various transportation-related fields, and by reviewing the five adopted Regional Transportation Plans. This Final Transportation Plan was revised and refined in response to information gleaned through this process.

All I-91 TIA board meetings were open to the public. Meeting notices and agendas were sent to the town clerks of all municipalities covered by the I-91 TIA before each meeting with a request that the meeting notice be posted in the town hall. In addition, individuals who requested this service were sent personal notification of each meeting by fax or email. Meeting times and places were posted on the Transportation Strategy Board and the Capitol Region Council of Governments websites. Minutes of the meetings were also posted on the web, as were various drafts of the Plan itself.

In addition, members of the I-91 TIA board reported back to their individual constituencies and solicited input. Requests for comment were also posted on several internet news groups, including misc.transport.rail.Americas, misc.transport.road, misc.transport.urban-transit, and ne.transportation. Responses that were received were distributed to board members. The Branford Electric Railway Association (operator of the Shoreline Trolley Museum) and other organizations published notes in their member newsletters asking for public input, and comments were received and shared with I-91 TIA members. Several area chambers of commerce were also informed of and commented upon the deliberations of the I-91 TIA board.

As the Plan was nearing completion as a written document, two public information meetings were held to obtain more focused comment. Again, notices were sent to the town clerks in the TIA and posted on the TSB and CRCOG websites. In addition, legal notices were published in

the Hartford Courant, the Journal Inquirer, and the Bristol Press, and news releases were mailed or faxed to area media throughout the corridor.

The first public information meeting was held at Union Station in Hartford on August 22, 2002. Four written comments were also received. One comment at the meeting cited the importance of integrating existing and future bus systems; all of the remaining comments received requested the inclusion of projects and programs that would meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in the area.

The second public information meeting was held in New Haven's Union Station on September 19, 2002. In addition, four written comments were received. Again, the focus of most of the comments at the meeting was on improving the bicycle/pedestrian environment of the area. Other comments cited the need for increasing and improving service on the Metro-North rail line, extending commuter bus and rail service to include weekends, adding parking at the New Haven train station, increasing and improving local bus service. One citizen expressed opposition to expansion of the Tweed New Haven Airport.

A summary of the comments received at the two public information meetings and summaries of each written comment are included at the end of this document as Appendix B.

Finally, the Plan has been discussed with members of the five Regional Planning Agency policy boards during their regular meetings. These meetings are open to the public, agendas are distributed to town clerks for posting, notices and agendas are mailed to extensive mailings lists representing interested parties throughout the regions, and opportunities for public comment are made available at each of these meetings.

In response to the comments received, the members recognized that they had omitted reference to the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians and subsequently revised the Plan to include support for meeting those needs. Other comments essentially supported the Plan as it was written, except for the comment in opposition to the expansion of Tweed Airport. After careful consideration, the I-91 TIA board members reaffirmed their support for this project.

## **Chapter 3: Movement of People**

### **3.1 Corridor Objectives**

- 3.1.1 Develop a statewide airport strategy.
- 3.1.2 Provide feasible, competitive alternatives to automobile and truck use.
- 3.1.3 Promote greater safety and courtesy among the driving public.

### **3.2 Corridor Challenges**

- 3.2.1 Inability of the existing primary road networks to adequately handle an increasing volume of traffic.
- 3.2.2 Traffic congestion on I-91, especially at intersections with I-95 in New Haven, and I-84 in Hartford.
- 3.2.3 Inadequate and poorly integrated transit systems throughout the TIA.
- 3.2.4 Lack of a statewide airport strategy to facilitate potentially significant growth in passenger traffic and economic activity.
- 3.2.5 Lack of supporting transit systems to distribute airport passengers to their destinations.
- 3.2.6 Inadequate infrastructure for north/south commuter rail passenger service.

### **3.3 Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations**

#### **3.3.1 *New Haven to Springfield Commuter Rail***

Implement New Haven to Springfield commuter rail with a link to Bradley International Airport. The first step in this, a study on the infrastructure costs and operating characteristics of expanded commuter rail in this corridor, has just begun. This project is seen as an important way to connect the Hartford and Springfield areas to New Haven and New York. In particular, it will provide better access to northeast corridor Acela service in New Haven and to Bradley Airport for people in this corridor.

The current study will provide details needed to implement this project including costs, capital requirements and operating characteristics. The study should analyze the cost-benefit of electrification of the New Haven to Springfield line. The State should aggressively pursue the acquisition of the right-of-way in this corridor now.

### 3.3.2 *Hartford – New Britain Bus Rapid Transit*

Construct the bus rapid transitway connecting Hartford and New Britain. This facility will be a bus only roadway that provides a rapid transit service, with convenient stations, frequent service, state of the art passenger information, and trip times that are competitive with the private automobile. The State must insure that its operating characteristics and amenities are the same as other forms of rapid transit. This project will provide a less expensive way to deal with congestion in the Hartford region. As importantly, it will serve as a prototype for a new form of rapid transit elsewhere in Connecticut and across the nation.

The New Britain-Hartford BRT will require the construction of 9.4 miles of exclusive bus roadway connecting New Britain, Newington, West Hartford and Hartford; 12 stations varying in size and description; and a multi-use trail through much of the corridor. Approximately 28 new buses will be procured. The current total estimated cost to construct the busway is \$160 million. Expected operating costs for the first year of operation are \$6.3 million. (Source: *Final EIS and Section 4(f) Evaluation New Britain – Hartford Busway*, December 2001. Additional details are available in that document; updated construction needs, operating characteristics and related costs will become available as the design is developed.) Construction is expected to be underway in April 2004, with operation of the service expected to begin in January 2006.

### 3.3.3 *Passenger Rail Service*

Upgrade trains, maintenance facilities, parking facilities, and feeder bus services for passenger rail service in the state, particularly along the MetroNorth line, which provides an important link from the I-91 corridor to New York. Upgrades should not be at the expense of other existing services, such as the Shoreline East commuter service. Specifically, we should fund needed commuter rail equipment on the New Haven line and provide additional parking for commuters at an Orange or West Haven rail station. The cost for providing new commuter parking is estimated to be between \$12 and 20 million.

- 3.3.3.1 Rail passenger cars should be well-maintained and provided in adequate numbers to meet all demands with excess capacity.
- 3.3.3.2 The State should be served by a single rail transit passenger service.
- 3.3.3.3 The Hartford Division should be purchased from AMTRAK.
- 3.3.3.4 The management of all rail-based facilities in the state (including AMTRAK, Metro-North, Shoreline East and the freight lines) should be integrated to optimize passenger and freight interaction between

systems, and to eliminate existing restrictive agreements and inefficiencies, and increase the utilization of inter-modal opportunities.

### 3.3.4 *Statewide Airport Strategy*

3.3.4.1 In recognizing that Bradley International Airport is of vital economic interest to Connecticut and the entire region, the State should adopt a strategy to support the future needs of this transportation facility, which currently generates over \$2.5 billion annually in economic activity and has the potential to contribute significantly more. The State should further support the expansion of Tweed airport, Connecticut's secondary airport, as a vital transportation facility in a key area for future economic growth. These efforts should be coordinated through a statewide airport strategy that recognizes the importance of both assets and their importance to the efficient movement of people and goods as well as their contribution to economic activity.

3.3.4.1.1 An airport strategy should be developed with the goal of determining how the State will manage growth related directly to these facilities. Particular attention should be paid to how the two airports could become complementary in a two-tier statewide airport strategy.

3.3.4.1.2 These two airports should be intermodally linked for efficient freight and passenger transport. The importance of efficiently managing air passenger and freight traffic cannot be overemphasized and should be managed under a coordinated system that is customer driven and marketed for economic development purposes.

3.3.4.1.3 In its statewide airport strategy, Connecticut should more actively promote new commercial and freight service to these facilities, recognizing that it will oftentimes take resources to initiate service that is not immediately sensed in the market by operators. Initiation of international service out of Bradley to Europe should be a priority to serve the needs of the marketplace, to contribute significantly to the regional economy and to enhance the general attractiveness of this airport.

3.3.4.2 Endorse and implement the Tweed New Haven Airport Master Plan. The four-phase modernization program (including a 600-foot runway extension and navigation-aid improvements) will cost an estimated \$60 million over five years.

3.3.4.3 Provide the forum for state policy makers to resolve conflicts between environmental, economic development and transportation policies to clear the way for the modest expansion envisioned by the Tweed New Haven Airport Master Plan. Support state legislative changes necessary to accommodate implementation of the Plan.

### 3.3.5 *Local Bus Services*

Improve transit services by implementing the recommendations of the Statewide Bus Study. While we have made progress in coordinating transit service within and between urban areas in the corridor, more needs to be done. Additional funding will be needed to implement many of the recommendations of the bus study. The estimated additional annual operating cost of the efficiency measures and operating enhancements proposed in the study is \$5.8 million: \$8.6 million in operating costs less \$2.8 million in additional revenue. (Source: *Connecticut DOT Statewide Bus System Study, Executive Summary*, July 2000; additional details are available in that document and in the individual system reports.) Consideration should also be given to creating a statewide transit authority.

### 3.3.6 *Alternatives to the Single Occupancy Vehicle*

Support incentives to increase automobile occupancy levels. Employer-sponsored programs such as flextime, telecommuting, car/vanpooling, and compensation for transit use should be encouraged.

3.3.6.1 Employer participation in the Deduct-A-Ride program in the I-91 corridor should be expanded and other monetary or tax incentives should be provided for transit commuters in the corridor. The state has concentrated most of its marketing efforts for Deduct-A-Ride on employers in Fairfield County. It is important that employers and employees in the I-91 corridor be encouraged to use transit and that other transit incentives be provided here and elsewhere in the state.

3.3.6.2 As an additional effort to reduce the number of vehicles on our highways, encourage vanpooling and carpooling with monetary incentives, similar to those cited in 3.3.6.1.

3.3.6.3 Provide monetary incentives for cyclists and transit commuters in the form of state income tax credits and/or employer subsidies.

### 3.3.7 *Jobs Access Program*

Continue support for the Jobs Access Program, which has allowed thousands of Connecticut residents, particularly low-income people, to get to work. This program is a proven transportation investment that benefits workers and employers. Reverse commute services, route extensions, and customized paratransit services need a stable dedicated funding source. The annual cost to the

State for this program in FFY2003 is estimated at \$3.50 million, matched by \$5.38 million in Federal Transit Administration funds.

3.3.8 *Highway Incident Management*

Manage highway traffic incidents through a comprehensive highway Incident Management System (IMS) that minimizes traffic delays regardless of the type of incident.

3.3.9 *Seamless Transit Services*

Integrate rail and bus transit, and bus and rail rapid transit services throughout the I-91 TIA corridor and the State.

3.3.10 *Interstate 91*

Maintain Interstate 91 as a limited access highway with additional lanes in urbanized areas where required for safety and congestion mitigation.

3.3.11 *Port Facilities*

Operate the corridor's port facilities in a coordinated manner and improve them so to make them adequate to meet all anticipated demands with excess capacity.

3.3.12 *Interstate Cooperative Connectivity*

Engage other New England states, the State of New York, federal agencies, and the eastern Canadian provinces in the process of addressing critical corridor issues, such as commuter rail, feeder barge and rail freight services (e.g. an additional Hudson River rail crossing, the West Springfield rail yard and the Cedar Hill rail yard).

## Chapter 4: Movement of Goods and Freight

### 4.1 Corridor Objectives

- 4.1.1 Adopt policies and provide facilities that allow freight and passengers to be moved by the most efficient and environmentally sound means.
- 4.1.2 Avoid making decisions to improve freight movement by rail in the corridor that would preclude or impede the use of the same rail corridor for passenger movement.

### 4.2 Corridor Challenges

- 4.2.1 Underutilization of the port facility in New Haven, which could spur economic activity and provide part of the solution to freight movement problems.
- 4.2.2 Lack of east/west rail corridors for through and local freight movement.

### 4.3 Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations

#### 4.3.1 *Feeder Barge Service – Port of New Haven*

Establish container barge service for the port of New Haven including the purchase of two cranes as recommended by the by the *Coastal Barge Feeder Service Study – SCRCOG* (Final Report dated March 2001). Support barge to truck and train intermodal transfer facilities at the New Haven port. This can help strengthen our TIA's ties to the rest of the northeast and remove some truck traffic from our highways. Implementation is possible immediately upon funding.

#### Feeder Barge Service's Role

The global shipping industry is changing. More Asian cargo is coming to the east coast of North America by water, and it is coming to a few central ports. Without an economical alternative, containers destined to (and from) Connecticut and other New England destinations will travel via truck along the I-95 corridor.

A cost effective, reliable container barge feeder service between the New York – New Jersey docks and Connecticut could remove **over 300 trucks a day**, thereby generating additional roadway capacity while enhancing air quality and reducing the requirement for annual highway maintenance. In addition to providing a viable transportation alternative, a successful container barge feeder service can be the catalyst for job creation and economic development. Job creation and the resulting economic development in New Haven would consist of a concentration of container-related businesses that provide value-added services to both import and export supply-chain processes.

### Benefits

1. Provide Connecticut businesses with a reliable, long-term, cost competitive shipping option as import demand continues to grow – while the highways leading to and from New York become increasingly more congested, making container movement via the highway progressively more difficult and expensive — thereby promoting a more competitive Connecticut business environment.
2. Help reduce, or at least arrest, growth in large vehicle movement on I-95 and I-84 – between New Haven, CT and Northern NJ – by capturing a major share of Connecticut’s moderately sized container market and by enabling a significant penetration into the vastly larger Worcester-Framingham, MA market
3. Entice follow-on business opportunities such as container yard / depot operations [e.g. container and chassis maintenance], container route optimization, overweight container handling [e.g. stripping (imports) and stuffing (exports)] and value-added warehousing.

### Recommended Priority

The place to start is New Haven because:

1. New Haven is the closest Connecticut port, in geographical terms, to the Connecticut and Northeast Shippers while also situated at the crossroads of I-95 and I-91. This geographical location maximizes the landside congestion and air quality benefits.
2. New Haven’s nautical distance from the Port of New York and New Jersey (PONY&NJ) enables a 24-hour round trip operation, thereby maximizing cost efficiencies for a chartered tug operation.
3. Existing New Haven based marine terminal operator and trucking company can launch service quickly, with no time-consuming permit or construction issues.
4. The City of New Haven, the surrounding communities and the South Central Regional Council of Governments stand behind a New Haven service 100%.
5. New Haven’s proposed Lift On / Lift Off (LOLO) container operation is the same system as utilized in the PONY&NJ, therefore no additional equipment (e.g. such as container chassis’ for a RO/RO operation) or labor agreements, are necessary. In addition, a LO/LO operation facilitates nearly three times the volume of containers per one-way movement (i.e. the movement of at least 200 containers per one-way voyage, as compared to approximately 65 via a Roll-on / Roll-off operation).
6. A cooperative agreement between labor (Coastline Terminals), marine terminal operator (Logistec) and trucker (Westchester Motor Lines) will enable the New Haven service to effectively load and discharge containers directly from barge to and from the upland processing area.

### What is the Approach?

1. Establish a public / private partnership between the State of Connecticut (administered by the South Central Regional Council of Governments) and existing New Haven based private businesses (Westchester Motor Lines and Logistec).
2. To attract shipping customers away from the existing all-truck service, the barge connection has to not only match the all-truck price, but beat it by a minimum of 5%.
3. Based on a conservative business plan, the barge service would start at approximately 12,500 containers a year, “ramping up” to 50,000 by Year 9. The hump – Years 1-5.
4. Success will require a shared public-private investment in start-up capital costs. Less than half of this amount would come from the State of Connecticut.

### The Proposed Public Investment

The public investment would be structured in a manner which fully recognizes the public nature of the dollars and the need for parallel investment and risk:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Proposed Public Investment</u>
Pre-Operations	\$1.0 million (equipment)
Pre-Operations	\$5.0 million (working capital loan)
Year 1	\$2.4 million (equipment)
Year 5	\$0.7 million (equipment)
Total	\$9.1 million

The equipment purchased with public funds would be owned by the South Central Regional Council of Governments, or other appropriate government agency, and leased to the private company for \$1 per year.

The working capital loans would be repaid with interest commencing in year 10.

#### 4.3.2 *Improved Port Facilities*

Improve the New Haven port facilities to allow freight to pass seamlessly from the rail, highway and port facilities throughout the corridor and through Springfield with minimal legal, political, and physical constraints.

#### 4.3.3 *Integrated Transportation Facilities*

Pursue opportunities to integrate transportation facilities, whether transit, freight, highways or rail. Intermodal strategies should be given priority, especially with regard to movement of goods.

#### 4.3.4 *Late Night Truck Deliveries*

Find incentives for late night truck deliveries.

#### 4.3.5 *Preservation of Physical Assets*

Publicly acquire and preserve existing physical assets to enable future port, rail and bus, passenger and freight infrastructure to be developed, as the State has done historically with abandoned rail lines. Examples of such physical assets include properties in the New Haven rail yards and abandoned port structures in New Haven and New London.

#### 4.3.6 *Rail Freight Management*

Integrate the management of all rail-based facilities in the state (including AMTRAK, Metro-North, Shoreline East and the freight lines) so as to optimize passenger and freight interaction among systems, to eliminate existing restrictive agreements and inefficiencies, and to increase the utilization of inter-modal opportunities.

#### 4.3.7 *Interstate Cooperative Connectivity*

Engage other New England states, the state of New York, federal agencies, and the eastern Canadian provinces in the process of addressing critical corridor issues, such as commuter rail, feeder barge, and rail freight services (e.g. an additional Hudson River rail crossing, the West Springfield rail yard, and the Cedar Hill rail yard).

## **Chapter 5: Economy, Land Use, Environment, and Quality of Life**

### **5.1 Corridor Objectives**

- 5.1.1 Implement policies that will integrate transportation planning strategies with land use, economic development, and environmental goals and objectives.
- 5.1.2 Restore, maintain, and enhance the vitality, diversity and economic and cultural health of the corridor's urban areas.
- 5.1.3 Encourage future development to allow the most efficient and environmentally sound use of resources.
- 5.1.4 Encourage the most efficient and environmentally sound use of transportation resources to enhance the economic development and quality of life of the Corridor.

### **5.2 Corridor Challenges**

- 5.2.1 Potential for continued deterioration of the area's natural and cultural environments as increased transportation system needs are met.
- 5.2.2 Inadequate state and area policy guidance to reduce the continued spread of suburban sprawl and urban decline.
- 5.2.3 Insufficient resources for significant new investment in transportation infrastructure (capital and operating).
- 5.2.4 Over-reliance on property tax in Connecticut encourages wasteful competition and poor land use decisions that work against economic, efficient and environmentally responsible transportation systems planning.

### **5.3 Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations**

#### **5.3.1 *Better Decision-making***

Develop procedures to more closely link transportation, land use and economic decision-making and planning in the state. The goal should be to foster livable communities and sustainable economic development.

- 5.3.1.1 Encourage, through transportation investments, the preservation of community character, the revitalization of urban centers, and increased utilization of transit services.
- 5.3.1.2 Promote the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities and infrastructure with an emphasis on service integration, safety and connectivity.

5.3.1.3 Utilize technology to improve the management of existing transportation facilities.

5.3.1.4 Integrate transportation and land use planning in setting transportation strategies and priorities for the State, including development of State policies to increase the population densities of the corridor's core cities.

### 5.3.2 *Alternatives to the Single Occupancy Vehicle*

Support incentives to increase automobile occupancy levels. Employer-sponsored programs such as flextime, telecommuting, car/vanpooling, and compensation for transit use should be encouraged.

5.3.2.1 Expand employer participation in the Deduct a Ride program throughout the state and provide other monetary or tax incentives for transit commuters in the corridor. The state has concentrated most of its marketing efforts for Deduct a Ride on employers in Fairfield County. It is important that employers and employees in the I-91 corridor be encouraged to use transit, and that other transit incentives be provided here and elsewhere in the state.

5.3.2.2 As an additional effort to reduce the number of vehicles on our highways, encourage vanpooling and carpooling with monetary incentives, similar to those cited in 5.3.2.1.

5.3.2.3 Provide monetary incentives for cyclists and transit commuters in the form of state income tax credits and/or employer subsidies.

### 5.3.3 *Pedestrian and Bicycle Initiatives*

5.3.3.1 Adopt the USDOT Policy on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure.

5.3.3.2 Complete long distance multi-use paths, such as the East Coast Greenway and the Farmington Canal Greenway.

5.3.3.3 Support continued and expanded bicyclist access to mass transit systems.

## **Chapter 6: Integration of the Corridor Economy with State, Regional, National, and Global Economies**

### **6.1 Corridor Objectives**

- 6.1.1 Improve the corridor's connections to the state, regional, national and global economies through the development of a seamless multi-modal transportation network that efficiently moves both people and goods.
- 6.1.2 Identify new and emerging routes of commerce, including movement of human capital, and develop appropriate transportation linkages.

### **6.2 Corridor Challenges**

- 6.2.1 Non-highway freight transportation infrastructure is either fragmented and underdeveloped or underutilized.
- 6.2.2 Existing transit infrastructure and services provide linear commuter connections from cities to suburbs, but do not provide suburb-to-suburb connections.
- 6.2.3 Jurisdictional and political boundaries which make it difficult to ensure coordinated planning, financing and implementation of transportation system improvements.
- 6.2.4 Uncertainty as to whether post-9/11 commutation patterns are temporary or permanent.
- 6.2.5 Lack of effective interface between Connecticut and the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council.
- 6.2.6 Past development practices including a historical lack of investment in non-highway infrastructure, particularly for moving freight, and a lack of interstate coordination and cooperation have contributed to the congestion problems facing the corridor today.
- 6.2.7 Over-reliance on property tax in Connecticut encourages wasteful competition and poor land use decisions that work against economic, efficient and environmentally responsible transportation systems planning.

## **6.3 Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations**

### *6.3.1 Coordinated and Compatible Development*

Encourage Connecticut state agencies to reinforce collaboration both within the state and with appropriate agencies in neighboring states to ensure coordinated and compatible development of transportation and other infrastructure.

### *6.3.2 Resolution of Competing Policies*

Establish mechanisms for resolving conflicts among competing policy considerations at the local, state and federal level, e.g., sharing of rail infrastructure, waterborne transportation, energy transmission facilities, shellfish and other aquaculture, species and natural habitat, development choices.

### *6.3.3 Overhead and Side Clearances on Rail Lines*

Evaluate policies regarding overhead and side clearances on rail lines to identify changes necessary to increase opportunities for use of the state's rail infrastructure.

### *6.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations Study Extension*

Seek to have the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations Study extended through New York and Connecticut

### *6.3.5 Infrastructure Investment*

Invest in transportation infrastructure that strengthens linkages to the NAFTA Corridor and to the rest of the northeastern United States (e.g. Bradley International Airport, New Haven Sea Port, New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Intercity Rail, Hudson River rail crossing (passenger and freight)).

### *6.3.5 Interstate Cooperative Connectivity*

Engage other New England states, the state of New York, federal agencies, and the eastern Canadian provinces in the process of addressing critical Corridor issues, such as commuter rail, feeder barge, and rail freight services (e.g. an additional Hudson River rail crossing, the West Springfield rail yard, and the Cedar Hill rail yard).

## **Chapter 7: Policies and Sources to Provide Funding for a Quality Multi-Modal Transportation System**

### **7.1 Corridor Objectives**

Goal 5 in the State Transportation Strategy Board's initial plan calls for identifying an adequate and reliable flow of funding for a quality transportation system. Achieving this goal is fundamental to the overall success of the State Transportation Strategy Board in its efforts to carry out its charges as outlined in Public Act 01-5, the law that created the TSB.

The I-91 TIA identifies four objectives in the area of funding and finance for transportation:

- 7.1.1 Provide the necessary resources to maintain the current transportation system in good repair.
- 7.1.2 Provide a dedicated funding source that enables significant expansion of transit services (especially for operating costs).
- 7.1.3 Identify innovative financing tools and cost-effective strategies to enhance system capacity and improve operations.
- 7.1.4 Maximize funding from the federal government for transportation and secure funding from other sources (federal, state, and regional).

### **7.2 Corridor Challenges**

As stated in the Transportation Strategy Board's initial plan, the I-91 TIA and regions throughout the state face these challenges:

- 7.2.1 Insufficient resources for significant new investment in transportation infrastructure.
- 7.2.2 Instability in budgets and revenue sources due to competing demands on state and federal funds.
- 7.2.3 The reliance of the DOT operating budget (including for transit) on automobile user fees—almost entirely from one revenue source, the gasoline tax.

However, the I-91 TIA would add these additional challenges to that list:

- 7.2.4 Lack of an independent and reliable funding source for public transportation.

- 7.2.5 The lack of authority at the regional and local level to voluntarily generate additional revenues to invest in transportation (from sources other than the property tax).

### **7.3 Corridor Initiatives/Recommendations**

#### *7.3.1 Study Potential Revenue Sources*

In order for state leaders to make informed decisions on potential new revenues for transportation investment, a careful analysis of the options and the costs and benefits of each must be provided. A report that reviews how funds/revenues are generated for transportation investment in other comparable states would help in this.

The report should include the location/state, the revenue source, the amount of the levy or fee, the revenue yield from this source, the method of collection, revenue growth/stability, administrative and/or legal considerations, and political considerations.

A study showing overall effort or burden for taxes and fees, etc. in Connecticut compared to other comparable states might show that given our rank as first in the nation in per capita income there is an opportunity to raise more revenues from specific sources in Connecticut without putting us at a competitive disadvantage with other states.

While there are other worthy uses for new public funds in our state, this report could help TSB and state leaders have a better understanding of the most prudent options for new and increased revenue sources, especially during this difficult budgetary period for the state. KPMG and Parsons Brinckerhoff prepared reports similar to these for the Capitol Region Council of Governments Regional Transit Strategy.

#### *7.3.2 Maximize Federal Funds*

Work to maximize federal funds for Connecticut especially through the reauthorization of TEA 21; however, given sectional shifts in power in Congress out of New England and the northeast, we must assume that this is not the ultimate answer to Connecticut's funding needs.

#### *7.3.3 Identify Benefits*

In promoting new funding sources, it is important to tie the proposal to tangible benefits and projects, which are very visible and clearly beneficial to the people of Connecticut.

#### 7.3.4 *Enlist Champions*

Public champions such as the Governor, business and community leaders, mayors, and state legislators must be enlisted to communicate the benefit of any new revenue proposal.

#### 7.3.5 *Foster Acceptance of New Funding*

Prospects for acceptance of new taxes or fees may improve when:

7.3.5.1 The tax and proposed use present a coherent and compelling transportation policy and investment.

7.3.5.2 An existing revenue source can be utilized (i.e. no new taxes).

7.3.5.3 The tax is not perceived as an undue public burden.

7.3.5.4 The tax is not perceived as creating an imbalance among towns or groups of people.

#### 7.3.6 *Explore Electronic Toll Collection*

Explore the use of existing electronic toll collection systems that do not require the use of tollbooths. In addition, utilize these systems to charge for, manage, selectively subsidize and collect statistics about all aspects of transportation including HOV lanes, capacity pricing, buses, trains, parking, ridesharing, van pools, etc. Monthly “passes” under this system should be able to cover almost any possible mix of resources from home to work with appropriate incentives or disincentives applied as required.

#### 7.3.7 *Allow Local Funding Generation*

Careful consideration should be given to providing permissive authority for municipalities and/or regions to generate funding from sources other than the property tax for transportation investments.

## **CONCLUSION**

If Connecticut is to sustain its economic standing in the global economy and its high quality of life, now is the time to invest strategically and aggressively in our transportation infrastructure. The resources required to improve mobility (especially, alternatives to single occupant vehicles) and to strengthen connectivity to the rest of New England, the northeast, and the world are substantial. Some estimates put this investment in the range of \$5 to \$10 billion over the next 20 years. This will not be accomplished without identifying one or more significant new revenue sources that remain reliable for the foreseeable future. Success in this will lead to success in the rest of the TSB’s transportation objectives.

## Chapter 8: Corridor Perspective on “Section 16” Projects

The TIA supports completion of existing ConnDOT projects already in design, r-o-w acquisition, or construction. The TIA also supports completion of the following additional projects which are listed in Section 16(a) of House Bill No. 7506/Public Act 01-5, and which will impact this Area:

- 8.1 A study of the infrastructure cost and operating characteristics of rail commuter services from New Haven to Springfield, including Bradley International Airport.
- 8.2 Implementation of a demonstration project for a freight Feeder Barge Service in Long Island Sound between the port facilities of New York and New Jersey and Bridgeport Harbor in Bridgeport and New Haven Harbor in New Haven.
- 8.3 Continuation of the efforts of the Capitol Region Council of Governments and the Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency to support the Hartford to New Britain Bus Way.
- 8.4 A design study for an Orange/West Haven rail station with parking for one thousand commuters. *Note: The I-91 TIA supports a design study of a rail station for Orange/West Haven. We believe a design study should be consistent with the goals of community development, reducing auto dependency, increasing intra-state ridership and reducing congestion. The study should also examine ways to improve access to all Metro North stations by foot, bike and feeder bus service with the goal of reducing parking demand.*
- 8.5 The Jobs Access program, which provides reverse commute bus service, route extensions and customized paratransit services for residents in the cities of Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven and Waterbury.
- 8.6 Expansion of express bus service in the Hartford area.
- 8.7 Marketing of an employer-sponsored pretax commuter benefit program to be known as the "Deduct-A-Ride" program.
- 8.8 A site selection study for the expansion of the New Haven Line rail maintenance facilities' capacity, and purchase of land for a new rail service maintenance facility.
- 8.9 Expansion of existing commuter parking lots statewide.

## **Appendix A: I-91 TIA Board Membership**

*CoChair: Judy Gott, (203) 234-7555*

*Cornelius P. O’Leary, (860) 832-3008*

### *Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG)*

RPO Representative: Stephen T. Cassano, Mayor of Manchester  
Alternate: Richard J. Porth, Executive Director, CRCOG  
Public Representative: Norman Garrick, All Aboard!

### *Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency (CCRPA)*

RPO Representative: Carl Stephani, Executive Director, CCRPA  
Alternate: Theodore C. Scheidel, First Selectman of Burlington  
Public Representative: Morgan Seelye, Retired Town Engineer

### *Connecticut River Estuary Regional Planning Agency (CRERPA)*

RPO Representative: Linda Krause, Executive Director, CRERPA  
Alternate: N/A  
Public Representative: T. Gerald Dyar, Financial Consultant

### *Midstate Regional Planning Agency (MRPA)*

RPO Representative: W. Lee Osborne, Architect (Secretary, MRPA)  
Alternate: N/A  
Public Representative: Michael Doyle, Association of Commuter Rail Employees

### *South Central Region Council of Governments (SCRCOG)*

RPO Representative: Judy Gott, Executive Director, SCRCOG  
Alternate: William Dickinson, Mayor of Wallingford  
Public Representative: Denis Pope, Association of Commuter Rail Employees

### *At-Large Members:*

John J. Leone, President, Bristol Chamber of Comm.  
Cornelius P. O’Leary, Associate Vice President, Central Connecticut State University  
Robert Santy, President, Regional Growth Partnership  
John Shemo, Vice President, Connecticut Capitol Region Growth Council  
David Titus, Mattabeseck Audubon Society

*Towns represented by the I-91 TIA Corridor:* Andover, Avon, Berlin, Bethany, Bloomfield, Bolton, Branford, Bristol, Burlington, Canton, Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Granby, East Haddam, East Hampton, East Hartford, East Haven, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Essex, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Guilford, Haddam, Hamden, Hartford, Hebron, Killingworth, Lyme, Madison, Manchester, Marlborough, Meriden, Middlefield, Middletown, Milford, New Britain, New Haven, Newington, North Branford, North Haven, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Orange, Plainville, Plymouth, Portland, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Somers, South Windsor, Southington, Suffield, Tolland, Vernon, Wallingford, West Hartford, West Haven, Westbrook, Wethersfield, Windsor, Windsor Locks, and Woodbridge.

## Appendix B: Public Comment

**TIA BOARD PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
AUGUST 22, 2002, 6:00 P.M.  
MEETING REPORT**

**Attendance:**

**RPO Representatives:**

Judy Gott  
W. Lee Osborne  
Richard Porth

**At Large Representatives:**

Cornelius O'Leary  
John Shemo  
David Titus

**Public Representatives:**

T. Gerald Dyar  
Norman Garrick  
Denis K. Pope

---

**Others:**

Karen Olson, CRCOG  
Mark Phillips, ConnDOT  
Grayson Wright, ConnDOT  
Dr. Robert Painter, Hartford City Council  
Gene Kennedy, Parsons  
Bob Hammersley, TSB

David Hiller, CT Bicycle Coalition  
Jim Platts, East Hartford CBC  
Kevin Lange  
Kari Watkins, Wilbur Smith Associates  
Thomas Smart, CT Bicycle Coalition

The public information meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m. Con O'Leary, as chair of the meeting, offered a brief introduction to the work of the I-91 TIA. This was followed by self-introductions made by the I-91 TIA committee members present. Comments were then received from the public as follows.

1. David Hiller, CT Bicycle Coalition: Mr. Hiller complimented the committee on the work done to date, but pointed out the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists were essentially ignored in the draft plan. He suggested that the committee add to the plan the following recommendations:
  - a. that the USDOT policy on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into the Transportation Infrastructure be adopted;
  - b. that the East Coast Greenway and the Farmington Canal Greenway, both long-distance multi-use paths, be completed; and
  - c. that Transportation Demand Management projects and programs be given a high priority in addressing automobile congestion problems.

Mr. Dyar asked if Mr. Hiller's group recommended bicycle paths as a priority over on-road bicycle routes; Mr. Hiller stated that bicycle routes were supported as long as they were well designed and followed the geometric design guidance provided by the USDOT. He offered as an example CRCOG's policy of adding points for highway project proposals that addressed the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Mr. O'Leary pointed out the development on Route 75 near Bradley Airport as a missed opportunity to provide accommodations for pedestrians: a busy roadway with lots of commercial activity and no sidewalks.

Ms. Gott noted that Hamden had recently awarded the bid for another section of the Farmington Canal Greenway. She also stated that the City of New Haven was very supportive of completing the bicycle path through the City. In response to a question by Mr. Dyar, Mr. Hiller stated that the CBC supports bicycle access to railcars.

Mr. Hiller also stated that he supported the proposed New Haven-Hartford-Springfield commuter rail service.

Mr. Hiller will submit written commentary for consideration by the committee.

2. Mr. Porth reported that he had received written commentary from two bicycle enthusiasts: Janet Valine and Carol Ann Tyler. Both of these letters are attached to this report.
3. Thomas Smart, CT Bicycle Coalition: Mr. Smart stated that he supported Mr. Hiller's comments. As a full-time bicycle commuter, he stated that safety improvements in the design of intersections are very important. Mr. Dyar commented that automobiles and trucks making right turns in front bicyclists was a serious safety problem and that accident statistics do not accurately reflect this problem since State police reports show this as the bicyclist running into the vehicle.
4. Dr. Robert Painter, Hartford City Council: Dr. Painter commented on the importance of integrating existing bus systems with each other as well as with new systems such as the proposed Hartford Downtown Circulator.
5. Jim Platts, East Hartford resident: Mr. Platts suggested that the needs of bicyclists should be given a higher priority in the draft plan. He cited Quebec City as an example of a community that made good provision for bicyclists traveling into and through the City.
6. Thomas Smart: Mr. Smart commented that the shoulders along a roadway seemed to disappear when a roadway was widened. He stated that suburban connector routes in particular needed wider shoulders to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

**TIA BOARD PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002, 6:00 P.M.  
MEETING REPORT**

**Attendance:**

**RPO Representatives:**

Judy Gott

**Public Representatives:**

T. Gerald Dyar

**At Large Representatives:**

Cornelius O'Leary

David Titus

Robert Santy

---

**Others:**

Karen Olson, CRCOG

Mark Phillips, ConnDOT

Robert Haramut, MRPA

Gary Christopher, WQUN News

Dave Bonan, Danbury / Hat City Free Press

Victorya McEvoy

Michael Criscuolo, Branford

Bill Meier, Meriden

Bill O'Grady, New Haven

Elaine Lewinnek, New Haven

Jason Schwaber, New Haven

David Hiller, CT Bicycle Coalition

The public information meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. Judy Gott, as chair of the meeting, offered a brief introduction to the work of the I-91 TIA. This was followed by self-introductions made by the I-91 TIA committee members present, and by others around the room. Ms. Gott also reviewed the top priorities of the I-91 TIA as included in the draft Transportation Plan. Comments were then received from the public as follows:

1. There are no places to leave a bicycle at the train station. The few bike racks are full. How does this plan address the needs of people using non-motorized transportation?
2. The needs of bicyclists should be addressed as part of the top five priorities for the TIA. The airport expansion proposal will not help with the congestion problem.
3. Increased service on Metro-North is important. Priority number 5 should be eliminated and bicycle access added as a replacement. Biking needs to be made safer. There are no bike lanes.
4. There is a lot to like in this plan. Improving port facilities and investment in the airport are important. Commuter buses and rail service should run on weekends. \$5 lifetime pass on MetroNorth for bicycles during off peak hours is a good thing. Bike racks are being placed on buses in Stamford. When will this service be available elsewhere? When will the Farmington Canal Greenway be completed?
5. Parking at the New Haven train station needs to be addressed. Residents are forced to take the train from New Haven if they expect to return after the MetroNorth trains stop running. The area around the train station is unsafe at night.
6. Let the State build the parking garage.
7. Bike racks at the train station could help with the parking problem.
8. The train station needs a bus system map. The individual route maps are too difficult to figure out without a companion system map.
9. There is a great need to strengthen the multi-modal transfer opportunities.

10. Buses will go right by a passenger if they are not standing in the right place. Stops need to be better identified.
11. Three different buses run on parallel routes. If you put all three on one roadway, you could triple headways for no additional cost.
12. Smaller buses should be operated in off peak hours to save money. By offering these smaller buses at greater frequency, ridership will increase.
13. Bicycling is unsafe. There are no bike lanes, no bike paths, no place to safely leave a bicycle. Every public building should have bike racks near the front door. Private business should be encouraged to offer bike racks as well. There should be tax breaks for employers who have many employees taking mass transit, biking and walking to work. The bike trails should be finished. I will volunteer to help raise money to pay to finish the trails. The trolley is great.
14. There is an extensive lack of uniformity of speeds on the highways. Speed limits should be enforced.
15. Recreation bike trails are packed on weekends. If the trails went into the cities, to places of employment, you would soon see them well used by commuters.
16. The Q bridge will be filled as soon as it is opened. High speed ferries are needed. Bicycles should be allowed on ShoreLine East. There needs to be pedestrian/bicycle access on the Tomlinson Bridge.
17. Buses don't run late enough.
18. The cost of transportation is too high for the average wage earner. The cost of installing bike racks is peanuts compared to the cost of other transportation investments. Biking has changed my life, my personal economy and my health.
19. On-road bike routes need to be identified.
20. The CT Bicycle Coalition does not support highway widening projects, even when bike paths are included in the project.
21. HOV lanes should not be separated from the regular travel way as they are in the Hartford area. This discourages use by persons who believe they might get trapped behind a slow driver. HOV lanes should be designated for peak hour use only.
22. We are opposed to expansion of Tweed New Haven Airport because many other airports in the State have shorter runways, but host many more general aviation aircraft including jets. If it were economically viable, the aircraft would already be at Tweed. If airlines could make money at Tweed, they never would have left. Airlines are cutting back now, not expanding service. The land should be used for a higher valued use. The land is worth \$700,000 per ½ acre.
23. What is the frequency of trips proposed for the New haven-Hartford-Springfield railroad service?
24. It is impossible to get around this State on public transportation.
25. When the train spur to TF Green Airport is activated, a lot of people will go to TF Green rather than Tweed or Bradley.
26. The trains are not comfortable. The seats are too narrow and crowded together.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

## **Summary of Written Comments:**

1. Janet Valine, Danbury: support for needs of bicyclists. Request for information about public information meetings in Danbury area.
2. Kevin Lange, Enfield: support for rail from Enfield to Springfield, Hartford, Foxwoods casino, and New York City.
3. Jean Jakoboski, North Windham: support for walking and biking paths.
4. Carol Ann Tyler, address unknown: support for walking and cycling paths, with an emphasis on safety.
5. David Lee, CT Transit: support for the I-91 TIA priorities, especially the New Britain-Hartford BRT, the Deduct-A-Ride program, the Jobs Access program, and the Statewide Bus System recommendations.
6. Jeffrey Beadle and Gloria Mills, CT Association for Community Transportation: support for the New Britain-Hartford BRT, the Statewide Bus System recommendations, the Deduct-A-Ride program and the Jobs Access program
7. William O'Grady, New Haven: support for container port in New Haven, trans-Hudson rail-freight bridge, New Haven-Springfield rail service, expansion of airport service, as well as meeting the needs of bicyclists.
8. Elaine Lewinnek, New Haven: support for barge and commuter rail plans, more bike racks to existing parking, bikeracks on buses, emphasis multimodal and nonmotorized transport, and completion of the Farmington Canal Bikepath and East Coast Greenways.