

Hub of Hartford Steering Committee Meeting
April 22, 2010, 8:30 AM
525 Main Street, 4th Floor

Name	Organization
Bob Painter	Committee Chair/Frog Hollow NRZ
Jackie McKinney	Asylum Hill NRZ
Kevin Burnham	City of Hartford
David Head	ConnDOT
Kate Rattan	ConnDOT
Joe Barber	Frog Hollow NRZ/Co-Chair of Hartford 2000
Michael Zaleski	Hartford BID
Hans Keck	Hartford Courant
Toni Gold	West End Civic Association
Guests	
Jonas Maciunas	City of Hartford
Jon Mullen	City of Hartford
Chris Stone	CTDEP
Dan Lewis	The Hartford Insurance
Carl Bard	MDC
Public Attendees	
Micah Kerr	Resident
Bill Mocarsky	Resident
Project Team	
Tom Maziarz	ConnDOT
Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG
Lia Huang	CRCOG
David Spillane	Goody Clancy
Amy Kohn	Goody Clancy
David Stahnke	Wilbur Smith Associates

- 1. Welcome** Bob Painter opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and leading introductions.
- 2. Public Forum** No public comments were received.
- 3. Adoption of Minutes** The motion to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2010 meeting as written was passed unanimously.
- 4. Phase II Wrap-up**

David Spillane summarized the comments and findings from the second public workshop. The suggestion of a lateral rail alignment shift was made in one of the breakout sessions. This concept has many benefits if it is possible however this realignment is very complex and the project team is still reviewing its potential. The following summarizes the Committee discussion:

- Toni Gold noted that a lateral rail shift opens up many possibilities for the placement of Union Station, the Viaduct, access ramps, and the track itself. David Spillane agreed that the promise is clear, but viability and impacts still need to be reviewed.
- Tom Maziarz agreed that a lateral rail line shift would have benefits and stated that ConnDOT will review this potential as well. Bob Painter noted that ConnDOT involvement in this review is important.

- Chris Stone liked the idea of a rail line shift to the north but wondered what would happen to the land between the new rail placement and I-84. David Spillane replied that this is one of the many items that will need to be considered.
- Jonas Maciunas noted that the City of Hartford is considering strengthening the connection to Asylum Hill via Church Street.
- Toni Gold added that lateral rail shift was more difficult 15-20 years ago because the rail track was lined with mill factories; this is no longer an issue.
- Micah Kerr suggested designing an ideal build out first then determining costs afterward. David Spillane reminded the Committee that the goal of the study is not to select one preferred alternative; rather it is to determine a range of options with enough potential to carry forward into the next study. Bob Painter added that decisions based on cost and complexity are outside of the project scope; the task is to take a broad look at the alternatives available.

5. Phase III Kick-off

David Spillane recommended key issues to be addressed in the last phase of the study. Since the study has limited resources and time it was agreed that critical aspects of each alternative need to be refined. Bob Painter also suggested an update to the alternatives matrix with an indication of which study goals are met with each.

Mr. Spillane presented very preliminary sketches of potential ramp configurations to represent sample layouts that may be compatible with some of the Viaduct alternatives under consideration. The following summarizes the discussion:

- Toni Gold mentioned that the Westside Access Study only looked at the Sisson ramps and did not consider other nearby I-84 access ramps. A holistic approach may be better suited for this study.
- Chris Stone commented that aerial photos are very helpful in visualizing the City and understanding how everything fits together. Bob Painter added that the aerial maps also show how close destinations are to one another as long as the access is in place.

6. Next Steps

The project team will refine the alternatives as discussed. There will be another HUB meeting prior to the final public workshop / community summit. The last public meeting will provide an opportunity to present the refined alternatives and gather thoughts and comments. The product of this study will serve as a springboard for the next phase managed by ConnDOT.

7. Other Business

Hans Keck requested a review of traffic impacts for each of the alternatives. Dr. Painter added that this may help with the access ramp analysis. Tom Maziarz stated that the traffic analysis should not drive the process; ramp configurations should first be designed then run through the CRCOG model. Carl Bard suggested that existing ConnDOT ramp volumes be reviewed. David Spillane explained that these volumes have been reviewed in order to develop realistic ramp configurations.

Jackie McKinney asked how the HUB Committee will stay involved after this study has concluded. Toni Gold mentioned that in the past ConnDOT has worked with citizen advisory groups in similar studies. Bob Painter suggested regrouping at the end of this study to assess how the HUB Committee would best fit in with the next study. Chris Stone agreed that the momentum must be sustained to keep these ideas moving forward.

8. Adjourn The meeting adjourned at 9:20 AM.