

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2004 7:18 PM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by [REDACTED] on Tuesday, August 17, 2004 at 19:18:14

fname: Erich

[REDACTED]
company: n/a

[REDACTED]
city: Seymour

states: CT

textfield: 06483

comments: I agree a 3rd lane is needed from Exit 54 to Rhode Island. A new lane has to be added at some point in the future, might as well do it now. It will provide some extra "elbow" room. To me, a 3rd lane is also safer, because the slower vehicles and the exiting & entering traffic can use that extra lane.

With the current traffic and with there only being 2 lanes, the road is currently insufficient. Whether you look at the future or not, the road has to be widened to 3 lanes anyway to meet the demands of today's traffic.

Imagine if I-95 in Stamford was only 2 lanes, the congestion would be doubled. The 3rd lane will help in this clogged section of road!

Build the third lane! Thank you for recommending that.

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2004 10:20 PM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Tuesday, August 17, 2004 at 22:20:12

fname: Justin

states: CT

comments: Please finish the highway project from Branford to Greenwich before creating another disaster on I-95.

How can you start another highway project when you have the Merrit Pkwy,95, and 84 already under construction?

With the current construction\traffic issues in this state adding more will only "drive" everyone out of this state.

The New York\southern traffic to the Cape is the only reason we have traffic problems from Guilford to RI. Personally I don't want to widen the highway for them. They can sit in the traffic.

Sincerely,
One of the commuters fed up with decades of construction.

Submit Form: [Submit](#)

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 06, 2004 12:36 AM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Monday, September 6, 2004 at 00:35:53

fname: Marjorie

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: East Lyme

states: CT

textfield: 06333

comments: In the proposed changes, thus far, there are no recommendations to correct the problem of getting on I-95 eastbound at Flanders(East Lyme) and crossing traffic to get on the let hand exit ramp for 395 north. I have filed complaints with the Montville Troop E barracks after I have had near death experiences trying to to get to the 395 north ramp. People do not go 50 MPH, even though that is the posted speed, and they do not let you in the left lane. This is a very serious matter. Please correct this dangerous area of the highway. It is absolutely insane to have an on ramp to I-95 so close to an left-side exit ramp.

Marjorie [REDACTED]

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 11:19 AM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by [REDACTED] on Tuesday, September 7, 2004 at 11:18:59

fname: Stephen

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: Essex

states: CT

textfield: 06426

comments: I've skimmed the new feasibility study. While the long-term goal of adding a 3rd lane is laudable, the report's short-term goals seem sparse and ineffective in helping clear up congestion. I have a few suggestions:

1. Am I the only person who's noticed that there is a newly built 12-foot wide left shoulder all the way from Branford to Old Saybrook? For a "quick and dirty" (and cheap) short-term fix, couldn't some simple re-striping convert that shoulder into a third lane? That would not only speed thru traffic, but also help the local shoreline residents get through their daily local trips.
2. There's often a back-up northbound where 95 narrows from 3 lanes to 2 just before the major tourist destination of Mystic. Why not extend the third lane right away from Allyn St. the short distance to the Mystic exit, where a lot of the traffic gets off anyway?

With regard to the long-term changes, is there some law requiring a 14- or 12- foot wide left shoulder? If not, a lot of money could be saved by building a much narrower one. Most Interstates I ride do not have such an extravagant left shoulder. Thank you.

Steve [REDACTED]

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 08, 2004 9:27 AM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Wednesday, September 8, 2004 at 09:26:48

fname: Harry
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

city: Guilford

states: CT

textfield: 06437

comments: Dear Study Team,

Widening I-95 from Branford to the Rhode Island border is at best a short-term "solution" to a problem that demands long-range thinking and planning. If our experience over the past half-century has taught us anything, it is that building superhighways simply encourages Americans' reliance on the automobile, to say nothing of the truck traffic that has increased so dramatically over the eighteen years I've lived in Connecticut. By now, nobody--least of all those in charge of creating a transportation master plan for the future--should need to be convinced that this policy is unsustainable, both environmentally and socially.

Connecticut's air quality is already among the worst in the nation. Both my wife and our seven-year-old daughter suffer from respiratory conditions that are greatly aggravated by the air pollution caused in large part by the heavy traffic on I-95. To my amazement, I find no reference to air-quality issues in the environmental impact section of the feasibility study. Have I overlooked something? Moreover, the roar of highway traffic is now continually audible at our house just off the Guilford Green, more than a mile south of exit 58. This was not true when we moved here ten years ago. Noise pollution is a major concern for all of us who live along the I-95 corridor. Again, the DOT has shown little or no willingness to address this issue.

I see that the DOT is once again (as in the planning for the new Q Bridge) floating the idea of imposing tolls as a means of reducing traffic on I-95. This at least would go some way toward impressing on drivers the real costs of using cars and trucks. But to submit the idea to a public referendum makes no sense whatsoever. Does the DOT seriously expect that motorists will vote to tax themselves in this way? Given the choice, most people will naturally say, "If it's all the same to you, I'd rather not pay to use the highway." This isn't the way responsible public policy is made.

What we need now, most urgently, is leadership on the part of the DOT and our elected officials. They must spell out a long-

10/7/2004

range transportation policy that goes far beyond expanding existing highways to facilitate car and truck traffic. Nor is it sufficient merely to provide limited train and bus service along the shoreline. Passive inducements to use mass transportation will never succeed, by themselves, in weaning Americans off their addiction to the automobile. They must be reinforced by efforts to positively discourage car travel, through tolls, gasoline taxes, and other instruments of public policy that are widely used in more forward-looking regions of the country.

That politicians should find it difficult to follow such a bold course of action is regrettable, but understandable. It's up to the DOT, other governmental agencies, and the public to provide our elected officials with the information they need to make responsible long-term decisions--and then to insist that they live up to their responsibilities.

Sincerely yours,

Harry [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Guilford, CT 06437

Submit Form:

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2004 7:15 AM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Thursday, September 9, 2004 at 07:14:55

fname: James

[REDACTED]

company: Ret. MD

[REDACTED]

city: Stonington

states: CT

textfield: 06378

comments: Has there been any consideration to double-decking I95? [REDACTED]

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2004 2:33 PM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Thursday, September 9, 2004 at 14:32:48

fname: David

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: Ledyard

states: CT

textfield: 06339

comments: I have prepared a brief presentation which outlines some proposals to affect immediate short-term solutions to local congestion. I am hoping that I might be able to obtain floor time at the upcoming meeting to share my ideas with the committee and the general public. Is it possible as a private citizen to pre-arrange for floor time to make a brief presentation? Would it be possible to use an overhead or laptop/projector to make a presentation?

I would appreciate it if you could get back to me either by email [REDACTED] or one of the phone numbers listed below.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Thank you in advance,
David [REDACTED]

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2004 8:36 PM
To: info@i95southeastct.org
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
[REDACTED] on Saturday, September 11, 2004 at 20:35:44

fname: Lawrence

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: New London

states: CT

textfield: 06320

comments: As a frequent driver of the Branford-Rhode Island corridor, the area where I have observed the greatest cause of flow interruption is at the intersection of Interstates 95 North and 395 at the border of East Lyme and Waterford. Due to the right lane entrypoint of the Exit 75 on ramp and the left lane entrance to I-395 in extremely close proximity to one another, traffic flow is severely disturbed by drivers crossing the two lanes of traffic in order to access I 395 from Rt 1/Exit 75. My recommendation would be the closure of the Exit 75 onramp to I-95 North with the possible creation of an I-95 onramp at Oil Mill Rd for I-95 Northbound access. I-395 could then be accessed by the Exit 74 on ramp, allowing a greater distance for merging to the left entrance of I-395 North.

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

[REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2004 3:50 PM

To: info@i95southeastct.org

Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

To: info@i95southeastct.org
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
(rrbacci@aol.com) on Wednesday, September 15, 2004 at 15:50:26

fname: Rich
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

city: Old Lyme

states: CT

textfield: 06371

comments: Are there any plans to look into developing a parallel route to I 95?

Such a route could be accomplished by:

- 1) Extending I-691 from Meriden to RT 9 in Middletown.
- 2) Eliminate the lights on RT 9 in Middletown. (I believe there is a feasibility study for this problem.)
- 3) Create a limited access highway similar to Route 2 from Middletown/Portland to Cromwell to connect to Routes 2 and 11. The current route consists of Routes 66 and 16.
- 4) Complete Route 11 to I 95 (assumed as part of this study)
- 5) Make Route 2 from Norwich to I 95 in Stonington limited access. (I believe Foxwoods is planning a limited access road to its resort from I 95.)

This would create a parallel route to I 95 and could be used by New York travellers to get to the casinos by taking I 91 to I 691 to the above route.