

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2004 11:21 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 Wednesday, September 15, 2004 at 23:21:09

fname: Frank

[REDACTED]
company: Retired Dept Of Defense
[REDACTED]

city: Wellesley

states: MA

textfield: 02482

comments: The I-95 corridor is a transportaton system that has highway, rail, coastal waters, and pipelines. The impact of changing the highway element needs to be assesed with the effects on the other elements within the system. This is also true during any construction phases where the highway element is constrained. How broad will the study be and will it include the impacts on all modes? The regional effects also go beyond the boundaries of the project. Will regional boundaries and concurrent projects beyond the boundries be considered as well. There is a critical need to enhance intermodal freight and double stack clearances along the shoreline to extend the economies of scale to rail freight in New England. Will this expansion of rail capability be explored, as well as coastal shipping?

Freight is an important issue to our economy and redundant transportation systems vital to minimise effects of natural disasters and threats to national defense.

I am a member of the Boston MPO's Regional Transportation Advisory Council, chairman of its freight subcommittee. Thank you for this opportunity to comment and my sincere best wished for the success of your project.

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2004 10:00 PM
To: Ken Livingston
Subject: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Mr. Livingston,

I read an article in the New London Day newspaper regarding the proposals for I-95. Again, I am concerned with the Golden Spur entrance ramp on to 95 N. This entrance on to 95 is do-able if you stay on 95 N but in order to cross 95 N to exit in the left hand lane to get on 395 N you take great risk. I have had two close calls of being hit. The problem is no one obeys the 55 posted speed limit and no one wants to let you in the left lane. After much discussion some of us feel the appropriate solution would be to shut down that entrance way. East Lyme will be served safely with the Society Road and Route 161 entrance ramps to 95 N.

Is this under consideration?
Sincerely, [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Livingston [mailto:klivingston@fhiplan.com]
Sent: Monday, September 06, 2004 12:36 AM

[REDACTED]
Subject: Out of Office AutoReply: I-95 Southeast CT Website Comment

Thank you for your email. I will be out of the office Tuesday, September 7th through Thursday, September 9th. I will reply to your message on Friday, September 10th. If you seek more immediate assistance before this time, please call our main Hartford Office number 860-247-7200.

Ken Livingston, AICP
Principal Planner
Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.
72 Cedar Street, Hartford, CT 06106
Phone: 860-523-8789 Fax: 860-371-2873
klivingston@fhiplan.com
www.fhiplan.com

Main Office Number: 860-247-7200

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 18, 2004 6:09 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 18, 2004 at 18:08:48

fname: Craig

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: Stonington

states: CT

textfield: 06378

comments: After attending the 9/14/04 meeting in Groton I thought I would provide some comments/questions for consideration.

No action should NOT be considered as an option regarding I-95 short comings and current/future conjection.

I fully agree with your near term interchange/ramp improvements in general and for the exits I am most familiar with (82 through 92). Some additional thoughts:

Signage improvements for Exit 87 off south bound I-95 should be considered. I've noted non-locals tend to think that the left lane will end at the exit. This leads to unnecessary lane changes.

Is scenic overlook prior to Exit 90 off I-95 north bound really necessary? (ie. worth the expense to make safer ramps)

Traffic light operation at Exit 91 needs review. During low volume hours (10:00 PM to 8:00 AM) light should be on demand (pressure pads) for vehicle approaching intersection.

Although not an interchange issue, 55 mph speed limit from just before Goldstar bridge to Niantic should be increased to 65. Most people drive through there at 65 mph + any ways. Having a 55 mph speed limit causes greater disparity in speeds increasing danger.

Innovative ideas should be considered for mass transit. A third lane will only provide temporary & modest improvement. That's after years of construction delays. Large price tag to end up right back where we are now by ~2035. Long haul truckers, thru state recreational traffic as well as some local drivers heading to/from work must be coaxed out of their vehicles to reduce volume. You have already stated that a fourth lane will not be feasible. Now is the time to start brainstorming. An upfront higher cost may save much more in the long run. No discussion of the process or assumptions for evaluation of mass transit were provided. We all know that existing mass transit is inadequate and inconvenient. No one said it would be easy, but before spending 1 + billion dollars on a short term fix a greater effort should be made.

Quality of life for residents living near I-95 must be considered. Noise abatement, pollution control, land & animal conservation and reduced energy consumption (bonus goal) need to have greater weighting relative to just cost and driver delays being the final determining factor.

Thank you for your efforts to date and in the future. I know the task is difficult, but it's necessary and you should go the extra mile.

Craig [REDACTED]

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2004 5:49 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 23, 2004 at 17:49:07

fname: Tom

[REDACTED]
states: CT

- comments: 1.It would be ugly but being built on the same basic footprint has an elevated roadway been considered?
2. How would this interact with the massive interchange that will have to be constructed if route 11 gets built as routes 1, 95 and 395 will have to be tied together?
 3. Adding of a right turn lane from route 85 to route 95 north would be making it look like it was not so many years ago. Why did they ever remove it?
 4. Why are all the resurfacing projects being done piecemeal on i95? The section of i95 in New London that was done a few years ago should have been done years before that when the adjacent sections of i95 were done.
 - 5.What is being done with the rebuilding of overpasses without replacing or even repainting the steelwork? I sure this means in the not to distant future that repainting will be done which will cause more congestion as a work zone.

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 4:04 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 Friday, September 24, 2004 at 04:03:30

fname: John

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: Groton

states: CT

textfield: 06340

comments: 2 things:

i`ve heard that an extra lane might be added. i travel between groton and mystic, and 3 lanes is not enough now. the other is something should be done to stop slow moving traffic from using the left lane. many times i have seen people going less than 55 mph in the left lane when the limit is 65 mph. isn`t the left lane for passing only?

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2004 3:29 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 Monday, September 27, 2004 at 15:28:34

fname: Nancie

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

city: Groton

states: CT

textfield: 06340

comments: Congestion does affect the leisure market of the hotel industry in SE CT and with 80% of the business from the NY and NJ market, this property as well as others have seen a decrease in leisure market this past summer. When guests that arrive are asked how their trip was from I95 heading south, they are unanimous in the parking lot status of the highway on the weekends. Repeat customers in the summer are a thing of the past. My concern is not only the need for highway expansion but how you will try and maintain the traffic pattern while construction is underway for multiple years. It it push travel to VT unless it is handled and PROMOTED on how it will be handled in a POSITIVE way.

Submit Form: Submit

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2004 4:39 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, September 28, 2004 at 16:38:34

fname: Tom

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

city: Ledyard

states: CT

textfield: 06339

comments: The Port of New London, one of the finest deep-water ports on the East Coast, is being under-utilized. New London should be seriously considered for development as a Feeder Container Port or as a Major Container Port.

The Federal Government keeps the port dredged to 40ft to accomodate our Naval submarines. This port is suitable for importing containerized cargo from all over the world. All we need to do is construct the required container handling cranes and additional infrastructure. There is plenty of land available for this purpose--from State Pier, North to the Coast Guard Academy.

As a Feeder Container Port (20ft containers) or a Major Container Port (40ft containers), the state of Connecticut could pass legislation requiring all shipment of containerized goods for Connecticut, to pass through the Port of New London.

With a container port in New London, and a requirement for containerized cargo to use the port, traffic on I-95 would be significantly reduced. Container Port development would provide a much-needed boost to the Southeastern Connecticut economy and create many new jobs, while helping to alleviate traffic on I-95.

Many thanks for you kind attention.

Sincerely yours,

Tom [REDACTED]
Ledyard, Ct 06339
[REDACTED]

10/7/2004

Parker, Jeff

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 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 Tuesday, September 28, 2004 at 20:35:44

fname: Priscilla

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

city: North Stonington

states: CT

textfield: 06359

comments: The truck traffic on i95 is extremely heavy all night. My suggestion is to mke an additional 2 or 3 lane highway from Branford to Groton in addition to what is there now. Then finish with the same to the RI border after this is complete.

The current third lane additon if accepted should include all the way to R.I. R.I. traffic is just as heavy as Ct. traffic and there will be no incentive to expand their roads if i 95 does not reach R.I. All traffic does not end at the 92 exit.

There should also be a figure 8 on off at at the exit 92 ramps. Or getting onto the highway should include a type of jug handle ramp for cars tryng to get to i 95 North have a clear way to get onto the highway. An access road carrying the traffic parallel with 95 on this south side would connect to Rt 49 and 95 north. There are other possibilites. Leaving that exit ramp as is and the crossover to pick up 95 North is dangerous with many

potential rear end accidents. That is why so many cars currently travel down 184 instead of picking up 95 north closer to Rt 2. These 184 tourists have passed two school buses with blinking lights in front of me on my way home form work. We need to get these crazy unsafe drivers off our side roads that our school buses are on.

We should have the foresite of 40 years so that growth along i95 will encourage industry like Amgen and other companies. We should acquire undeveloped properties along 95 so that safe alternative can be enacted.

The highway should also expand to the RI line as trucks entering and exiting exit 93 need space for accesability and to be passed. Not completing the highway will create unfinished work like Rt 11 was left hanging for years. Rt 78 in Pawcatuck was supposed to have been carried out to RT 95 30 years ago and that didn;t happen. Now Rt 2 south of 95 that connects to Rt 78 is the dumping ground and will probably end up with signal lights every 20 feet.

There should be a RT i 95 sign NORTH placed under the rt 49 signs at the intersection of Rt 49 and Rt 84 heading east before that red light .Also putting another rt 95 North sign near the Church sign across the road at that intersection would be a reminder that this is the quickest way to 95 north. It also would keep the casino crazy drivers off the roads that school children

are on buses.

Submit Form:
