

**Greater Hartford Mobility Study
MPO COG COMMENTS
Updated 4/17/2024**

Item #	MPO COG	Project/Program/General	Comment	CTDOT response
1	CRCOG	Main Street Complete Streets, East Hartford	The "Main Street Complete Streets, East Hartford" project (Early Action) appears in the Implementation Plan but is not in Appendix J. It would be helpful to have more details about this project. "Complete Pedestrian Facilities along Main Street, East Hartford" does appear in both the Implementation Plan and Appendix J, but it is unclear if this is a separate project or was combined with the Complete Streets item.	"Main Street Complete Streets, East Hartford" was developed in response to a request from the Town after the publication of Appendix J. The Department's PDU is administering this project and coordinating with the Town. "Complete Ped.... Main Street, East Hartford" refers to the segment of Main Street west of Route 5, which becomes Ellington Road. This section on Main Street does not have sidewalks despite reasonable transit ridership. It is about .5 to 1 mile north of the limits for Main Street - Complete Streets.
2	CRCOG	Station Parking Redevelopment to Further Support TOD	Appendix J notes that this Early Action item was "combined with the Bus alternative." It's unclear which project this is referencing. Please clarify	This refers to Support for TOD (Rail and Bus) listed in the Bus Alternatives.
3	CRCOG	Reconfigure Off-Street Parking	The Implementation Plan notes that CRCOG is the Sponsor for "Reconfigure Off-Street Parking" in Hartford. This appears to be an error and should be corrected to the City of Hartford to align with Appendix J.	Noted.
4	CRCOG	Regional Traffic Calming Framework	This Early Action item is listed in the Implementation Plan but does not appear in Appendix J. It would be helpful to have more details about this project or clarification if it appears as a subset of a different project in Appendix J.	This recommendation was inadvertently omitted from Appendix J.
5	CRCOG	Route 5/15 (Berlin Turnpike) Bike and Pedestrian Facilities	We were surprised that this project from Appendix J was not included in the Implementation Plan. Please confirm if this was an error or supply rationale for its exclusion. CRCOG is pursuing a RAISE Planning Grant for this project with the support of CTDOT.	This recommendation was inadvertently omitted from the Implementation Plan.
6	CRCOG	General	It would be very helpful to have a clearer understanding of the relationship between the projects described in Appendix J and the projects included in the Implementation Plan. Please provide a list of all projects from Appendix J and their outcome (included for implementation, excluded, combined with another project, etc.). It will be important for our municipalities to understand not only what projects are included for them but also which are not being moved forward (and why).	This will be provided.
7	CRCOG	General	The names, the projects included, the interdependencies between projects, and the study areas of the four core components (City Link West, City Link East, River Gateway, Founders Gateway) change between Appendix J and the PEL Report. Clarity and consistency in what is included in the four core components would be helpful.	This will be provided.
8	CRCOG	General	The capital costs of each of the four core projects should be shown, with a breakdown of what portion of costs go to the individual projects.	Programs overlap and costs are most accurately represented in overall figure
9	CRCOG	General	Appendix J should contain a clear listing of numerical performance measures (costs and benefits) of each project such as: Level of Service, VHT, VMT, and ROW acreage. Recommend a table format, similar to the attached document, even if performance measures are qualitative.	The model wasn't run for each project in Appendix J. The GHMS team will work to summarize programmatic KPIs from Appendix K in a more comprehensive manner to provide a more quantitative assessment of the recommendations.
10	CRCOG	Hartford Rail Viaduct Realignment and/or Reconstruction	The potential benefits to regional rail service that could be seen by adding double tracking through Hartford seem to be under-emphasized in the study documents. It would be beneficial to emphasize and expand upon the benefits that this project could have for regional rail. Additionally, it should be labelled clearly as a part of City Link West in Appendix J.	This is consistent with feedback received at the East Hartford public meeting. We can strategically revise the report and Appendix J to strengthen discussion of these.
11	CRCOG	I-84/I-91 Interchange Relocation	In Appendix J the "I-84/I-91 Interchange Relocation Project" is identified on page cxiii with the note that "This alternative has been further divided into City Link, City Link East, and I-84/Route 2 Interchange Improvements, with independent detailed documentation." However there does not seem to be additional detail on the interchange under any of these categories. It would be helpful to have more details about this project and on what configurations are being considered for this interchange.	This will be provided via Appendix J.

**Greater Hartford Mobility Study
MPO COG COMMENTS
Updated 4/17/2024**

Item #	MPO COG	Project/Program/General	Comment	CTDOT response
12	CRCOG	City Link West	CTfastrak realignment is mentioned and included in mockup illustrations alongside the lowering of I-84 and the realignment of the Hartford Rail Viaduct. However, the alignment is inconsistent between the mockup images on pages 36-37 and 62-63 in the PEL Report and there is no detail on what options were explored for this potential realignment in Appendix J: Alternatives Screening. Alternatives for CTfastrak realignment should be detailed in the documents, particularly in Appendix J.	Clarification on the disposition of CTfastrak will be added in Appendix J, with additional reference in the report and Appendix L.
13	CRCOG	City Link East	Mockup images in the PEL Report for Walnut Street (pg 42-43), and Albany Avenue (pg 44-45) do not include bicycle facilities, and the Bulkeley Bridge (pg 46-47) appears to show an on-street, unprotected bicycle facility. If this represents the actual recommendation, provide details on why as it seems to be contrary to CRCOG's Complete Streets Plan and the study goal to "provide multi-modal choices for safe and reliable transportation" (PEL Report, pg 26).	The renderings will be revised to meet the recommendations of the CRCOG CS plan.
14	CRCOG	Cap I-91, Hartford	Draft images in the PEL Report and Appendix J show the I-91 cap as approximately 1 mile long, starting just south of the Whitehead Highway and extending north to the Riverside Park Overpass. We ask that in the upcoming NEPA phase to not limit the extent of the capping to these boundaries and to explore potential for a longer cap on I-91.	Noted.