today. They have since perfected the suspension problems that the American TALGOs had and that their early ones did up until the 1980s. Of course, have been very successful elsewhere. They could be a huge help in Pennsylvania with the right regulations, the right safety.

I'm a safety officer myself in

39

factories and in other situations in the Philadelphia area and up in New York. And so I -- I get that role and how important it is.

But that could -- those type of systems that -- their tilt body, ultra low could go faster than some of the other kinds, I believe.

We're looking for any kind of thing to speed the trains up that we have now, and to build support for the newer lines that we can build some day.

Thank you very much for all of this testimony and everything that's going on here today.

RUBY SEIGEL: Thanks, Scott.

SCOTT MAITS: Mm-hmm.

Okay. I know Scott would like to speak again. Is that right, Scott?

SCOTT MAITS: Yeah.

RUBY SEIGEL: Okay. Come on up. Introduce yourself. There's new people here.

SCOTT MAITS: There are new people here.

Thank you. My name's --

85

RUBY SEIGEL: Stand so Shannon can see you.

SCOTT MAITS: My name's Scott Maits. I've been at many of these hearings and in other cities here and talking about solutions to make what is absolutely necessary for the economic revitalization of these cities, and Wilmington is having some issues here. Philadelphia and many of the cities, New Haven, all up and down the line. New York needs it to just move people.

I believe the railroad is the best when it's done sensitively, environmentally, economic justice. You know, I've already talked about helping Chester, Claymont getting service to Wilmington. There was a gentleman here talking about meeting the commuter service both for himself as an inexpensive way as well his for clients to do.

The current Northeast corridor is fairly well located. Obviously, it was built a

86

long time before the houses were in many places. And there's flooding issues, and there are other lines here that we're not talking about necessarily; although, there is talk about the bypass in Wilmington. That would leave something like eight out of ten trains -- more trains an hour than you get now would come to Wilmington Station under any scenario even with a bypass that would follow existing freight line around Wilmington largely.

The gentleman who was talking about freight -- I have not talked about it very much. I have talked about access to some of these tunnels not running on the main line. Not running on the Amtrak line, except at the river crossings where we need the money that freight can also pay to pay for the tunnels and where they need crossings. They need crossings through New York. They need new tunnels in Baltimore. I believe there's a cheaper way to do it not combined in Baltimore, but swapping

87

tunnels and having one rebuilt before the other -- before it opens if you build a high-speed passenger tunnel.

One unique aspect of going by the airport for the Northeast corridor and from 30th Street is that the existing Amtrak line to Delaware County, the two tracks in the center of the SEPTA line could become freight. There are some clearance issues there. There's clearance talk in Ridley Park, a bridge they want to rebuild there, but that would provide two tracks at very fast service for free down that way before they diverted over to the CSX where it goes along I-95 through the city of Chester. So that's a significant improvement of the other significant improvements to freights to swapping some of the lines.

Down in Maryland, below the Susquehanna specifically, the idea is not to share with the B&O, CSX. It's to swap with them. So that I believe and -- and I proposed that a while ago.

88

I don't know how it was added to the process, but it's -- the way I talk about it is that the Amtrak line that has drawbridges on it, but is a very fast line anyway, but not fast enough for high speed would possibly become the CSX line. And similar improvements in Baltimore as I said.

And also freight can be a huge part. I think the FRA has made that very, very clear, that, you know -- that freight would benefit from this. Would not be harmed. And I think there's even significant benefits that can be incorporated in swapping the lines to a straighter lines where one is straighter than the other.

So I have like three or four more points here, and I'll make them as fast as I can.

The reason I brought up the PA line across Harrisburg, on the existing passenger line and eventually a bullet line across the state is because it is a Northeast corridor

89

line. So there would be a separate passenger right-of-way. Some sharing of the freight. There is a severe reduction in coal usage on that line, I believe. I haven't seen the figures yet, but it would do nothing to interfere with freight if it's done right.

There's room for -- an existing line for even a separate track because it was a four-track line. It's now a two-track line.

But the reason I brought it up in the Northeast corridor is because I'm counting on these trains going to New York City and even going to Boston and coming up from the south and diverting first at Philadelphia to the west, but also later in Baltimore through Harris -- to Harrisburg.

So in that sense, I'm asking that this process consider that -- that line because it's the only one. You can't do the same kind of feeding through the Hudson line at Penn Station or from Washington or any other place. And I

90

don't think you can afford all of them either anyway.

The reason why you can only go to 30th -- if you go to 30th Street can you have this better service for Chester and for down into Wilmington is because the actual better service is not so much that SEPTA would run the expresses. Like there's one a day that runs from 30th Street to Chester and then makes the local stops, but you would be adding the airport to it, and that's something that only Claymont, only Chester, only Marcus Hook could have only if -- in their immediate areas. Chester, for instance, would be the only stop in Delaware County that had a direct stop to the airport versus all the other rail lines, which all go into 30th Street and Center City. So they have an added advantage of both. And that would be, I think, a big boom for the economic development of that area.

I did want to close with some kind of

91

comment on the location that we're at and tie it into the future of this. We're at where Thomas Garrett's house was. There's a mark on the other side of the school. He was the great underground railroad conductor who processed thousands of run-away people. And he was -- he was bankrupted in court for smuggling a family. He was put in jail briefly and lost everything he had. But at the court in the testimony, in his closing statement, he said -- and I'm hoping to, you know, tie into this a little bit. He said, If there's anybody that needs help, you know to send them to Thomas Garrett. Because he defied the court right in the court.

And if there's anybody that has a question, whether it be about freight or anything like that, the FRA has to go back and do a lot of the work and process, and they'll have to move on to some other things. We have to keep this line alive, and the hope and the dream of doing it and doing it better and making

92

sure it's sensitive to the communities, all the other things. So I would love to -- if anyone has a question, we can probably talk about it and make it better and make it work, I think.

So thank you very much.

RUBY SEIGEL: Thank you, Scott.

Okay. Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to make a public statement?

Okay. So just to remind everybody that there are boards reviewing and staff in the open house portion for you to talk to. Private stenographer if you want to make private testimony, private statement. And also email us. Go to the website, submit a comment. We really appreciate everybody being here. Thank you for your interest and stay involved. And at this point, I'm going to close the public comment -- public statement. Sorry. Public testimony portion of the hearing. Good night.

93

(Whereupon, examination concluded at 6:49 p.m.)

The next speaker is Scott Maits. Scott, you can -- you want to stand over here?

SCOTT MAITS: Sure.

My name is Scott Maits. I'm from Philadelphia. I've been a rail fan since I was one, but I also went on the knowledge I learned actually being charged with the special excursion project on New Jersey transit with virtually no training, but the expertise would be the backup to the railroaders and to manage the different railroaders, contractors, volunteers, and others. And I've been studying the Northeast corridor my whole life such that I know it well beyond Philadelphia, Boston to Richmond. Chicago is the next line that is, I think, most important to this country, rather than California.

We do need tunnels in New York. We do

26

need tunnels in Baltimore. We don't need a new tunnel at Philadelphia. The existing line can be fixed, except the Zoo can be fixed for a lot of money, but it's so close to the yards or so close to the station, it's needed for switching. You can come one side to the other and do a whole bunch of things that it's not required to fix it.

One other thing I forgot to say. My father was a train commander in East Germany for the U.S. Army, which is where I get my first set of knowledge on this, and tanks and other things like that. So this is where I get a lot of this stuff.

Anyway, I'm here primarily for a better tunnel idea for Baltimore. Two tracks. Two tracks can fix both passenger and freight problems in Baltimore. Not two just for passenger, not just one or two for freight. It doesn't help the other. Or four even for passenger.

27

What you need to do -- and I spent the afternoon confirming my last year's satellite research that I've been doing. I just spent the time walking around the whole area there where the existing tunnels both are. -- is to build -- to build one high-speed tunnel to the waterfront. Unlike Philadelphia, Baltimore did not grow away from the waterfront. They come uptown because of the tunnels and other things like that. And they expected downtown to move away from the waterfront as Philadelphia has and

continues to do now. So we need to go back. That is where the stations needs to go, obviously, but how can two tracks service a four-track need for passenger trains and do freight? Well, if you build that tunnel first, you can put all Amtrak into that tunnel. It stops right on the waterfront right by the Convention Center area as has been largely envisioned. I looked at how to do it elevated at the waterfront, but then that allows you to

28

close the Penn tunnel to Baltimore and Potomac tunnels, rebuild it to single track in the center. Then it would be high enough for a double-stacked train, probably electric. You can then get the freight trains out of the Howard Street tunnel, which we all saw how exposed that was a couple years ago when that burned. You close that down, rebuild it for double-track commuter trains and slower Amtrak. It crosses the new tunnel, and you have elevator and escalator, and that's also right at that Convention Center that is in play. This becomes a station with fast elevator and other means, and, suddenly, you have four tracks for the price of two. And you're replacing -- you're replacing the freight tunnel, too, which is a great burden on the East Coast also.

If I have other opportunity, I'll speak about a few other subjects. Thank you very much.

RUBY SIEGEL: Thank you, Scott.

SCOTT MAITS: Hi. Thanks for the additional time. I hope it's useful to everyone here.

The problem with the Howard Street tunnel at Penn Station is it's a very tight, very tight, area. I've never seen so many bridges and tunnels and creeks and things in my life, and I, frankly, couldn't get it all by satellite. I mean, I looked at it other times, but not as extensively as I was in daylight today walking around it. So I was able to confirm with the moving of the light rail, the hump, the famous hump of the light rail there that everybody knows about who's ever ridden on it. It's very well-known. To -- to direct the

31

light rail into Penn Station, which is a gross oversight to miss it, and then come back and Mt. Royal Avenue. So actually down by the platforms, as it were, under Penn Station, which would no longer have high speed. The highest speed trains would still be MARC commuter trains. It might have some Amtrak trains that are also stopping down at the waterfront there that make this new sharp turn that I'm proposing. It would be probably just slightly somewhat sharper than the existing turn at the top of the Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel, but, of course, that's right at the station. It's not a couple miles down at the other end. And at mid-tunnel, that slows it down. I've looked at the rights-of-way south of Camden, how to do that. It would have to go over the bay just like light rail does, but there is a way to get this turn from the existing Penn Amtrak station to the Howard Street tunnel.

Further, if I'm correct that the

32

Midwest, which is a larger region than the -- to the Northeast, this could be also where a line from the south from Washington and beyond Washington comes to Baltimore, doesn't skip Baltimore by leaving Washington and actually heads up similar to the way the Pennsy did, but on a new aerial structure. It's the only way I could find out of Baltimore north to pick up a Pennsylvania truck that would be coming down from New York though Philadelphia. And even as high up as Boston if it's two hours to Boston. It's the one high-speed line across the mountains that I think makes the most sense. We

can't afford to build multiple ones for multiple cities.

That's a whole different subject matter, but from Baltimore and leaving from this Howard Street tunnel after stopping at the waterfront would be the way through York and Harrisburg, the way Pennsylvania did it, but without reversing trains like they used to do in

33

the old station. The old Baltimore station would become the commuter station. It would thrive. It would continue to help like Philadelphia. We have multiple downtown stations. We have 30th Street, Suburban, which is City Hall, and Market east down by Independence Hall. So Baltimore would have two, which is about the scale of the city.

So there are details to how this can all work, but I think you get the idea. Then draw it out or other details down by the airport. I'd be happy to talk to you about it.

RUBY SIEGEL: Thank you very much, Scott.

SCOTT MAITS: Mm-hmm.

RUBY SIEGEL: Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to make a public statement? Seeing no hands or hearing no voices, I will close the public comment period at this point, and we will reopen at 6:00 with a presentation, and you'll have the opportunity to speak.

SCOTT MAITS: Thank you. Scott Maits also from Philadelphia, but very interested in the entire Northeast corridor.

To build on the two comments of the previous gentlemen, Tony, who I worked with for

58

many years, and the other gentleman, which, unfortunately, there's not enough young people coming here. I talk to them in Long Island, and they want the train, for instance, but they don't go to the meeting there.

We have to be very careful in the future. There will be a lot of private enterprise to develop some of this stuff, or all of it at some point. And while that can be good and we can do that, we have to keep it within certain parameters so that all the profits at high-speed rail, the top lines, can make money, including construction as the top French and top Japanese have. And that's why I'm still looking at ways to do it cheaper where we don't need tunnels, for instance, in Philadelphia and other places, and using the existing tunnel in Providence that the expensive trains replacement pay for to upkeep of the existing lines. Regional trains to make money to upkeep the existing line, and, of course, that's where

59

price off of the York -- I know you're looking at that service level within -- within the whole study, but, yes, it can be extended down through to Maryland and stuff like that.

One other specific point about extending some commuter service through. I do not believe at some point that in New York that the Metro North could run to see caucus rather than a -- kind of have the bus terminal there. The Port Authority bus terminal on the other side of the river rather than going through the tunnels.

Now, with an open lane of traffic for the highway users, you -- Grand Central trains or other Metro North trains could provide excess capacity needed to capture those thousand buses and not have them on the streets of Manhattan with the Fifth and Sixth tunnel with the connection to Grand Central. And I would hope that that can happen by subsidy of the cheaper trains, because that's all I hear in

60

Philadelphia. How can it be cheaper so I don't

have to ride the Mega Bus? Which is okay, but we know trains can be better.

I just had a couple of comments about Long Island that I didn't want to offer there. And I think I talked enough about the line there and how it could work two tracks, you know, without going into too much detail.

One of the keys in all these lines in Baltimore, in New York, in the Long Island Sound Crossing and in other places is, indeed, freight as -- as the -- or at least as you guys, FRA, have said. I think that we can effectively combine things, as I said in Baltimore, by swapping tunnels and so that the freight has a rebuilt tunnel, gives us the Howard Street that does go to the Inner Harbor that crosses multiple lines once. So it can all work like that.

In New York, the Fifth and/or Sixth, depending on if they can be in one tunnel or two

61

different ones, but also continuing the tunnel under 31st. I've been watching very closely. I'm sure Amtrak has the construction at the Hudson Yards. They did get the box in for the 3 and 4, but I also believe 31st Street, despite the construction over it, has no penetrating footings going through the street. And, of course, 31st goes all the way through to Queens -- to the East River. So it could be 4 and 5. Could be off-peak freight into Sunnyside Yard and then picking up or splitting just before Sunnyside into the Montauk to Jamaica. It would go to Fresh Ponds Yard there. We're talking about reducing the cost of goods in New York and Southern New England. And rather than -- and there's rail through Jamaica actually even with high-speed rail. High-speed rail would be next to the Long Island station, building and offices. There's a yard to the north there, and an avenue to expand a little bit, or four platforms or two platforms for track system,

62

high-speed rail that would take the existing line to Jamaica, the used line, not a tunnel following the Montauk Bridge. Freight could take the Montauk Branch, Babylon Branch, two rights-of-way that Long Island Railroad uses.

I grew up riding on the -- on the Babylon Branch, and I've ridden it a couple times in the last few years, and I've looked at it very carefully. And you can use part of the

existing -- if you build a bullet line in -- through the Garden City area and main line to Garden City that way, that will probably open a little bit of capacity on Babylon. There is room to put a separate line on the Babylon route and for separate freight track with passing signs where needed to go all the way up to near Ronkonkoma, which would become a hub all the lines coming into it to make it work as the last high-speed station on Long Island. Then join the line via Yaphank and Brookhaven as I see can be done.

63

The turn can't be done at Ronkonkoma at all, and that was one of the flaws I pointed out a year or two ago that was totally impossible to build under hundreds of houses like that, but at Yaphank, you can, and that puts you directly in line to Brookhaven State Park, which is closed now. It's got very little use.

One last comment about that whole thing. I believe the auto trains the governor of New York is calling for, a highway bridge, get that money, get the freight money, get all together, you have auto trains to New Haven to Long Island. That could actually even go further south than New Jersey, as I said, and Florida and Virginia. One thing about auto trains, they're very different when you have the drive-in. They actually need to be 14 feet wide. Long Island Railroad, not the high speed, has a third rail. Makes it very difficult because the rails for the cars go so low. In some cases, 14 foot. You could make this tunnel

64

14-foot wide. They're able to handle a train, just this section of corridor, the high-speed trains, but still allow people to drive their own car onto the train, their own truck onto the train. And so not to have service there and just have a short section that clears that.

Thank you very much.

RUBY SIEGEL: Thank you, Scott.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much.

Just in case, there's some people who have come in and signed up to speak once we began the hearings, I just want to remind people that when you come up to the mic if you could make sure you introduce yourself and your affiliation. Everybody has been doing a great job of speaking nice and clear and slowly for the stenographer, I think. Yes, she says yes. And just remind everyone that we are trying to keep the remarks to three minutes.

The next speaker is Scott Maits. Scott, are you ready?

MR. MAITS: Yes.

Hi, thank you very much. My names is Scott Maits, M-a-i-t-s. I'm the former, former vice president of the Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers. I also was the operations manager it's called, it's the yard master, or in New Jersey Transit subcontractor or contractor. We pulled a thousand people in thirty car trains out of Hoboken. I was in charge of the project several weekends for a season, at what -- at pretty good speeds. So I have some rail experience.

But I'm also from biking experience and the alternative transportation experience. And I just want to say and challenge my bike friends, I usually ride bikes to these events. I've done the research for many of the routes up in New England and other places down south. Philadelphia, where I'm from, via bike, I take the train, I take the bus, I take the bike, and I go and I walk and I see what needs to happen and I correlate that with the satellite views and all. But I would challenge our bike friends to not just ask for the roll on, roll off, which is coming, the new baggage cars are here, whether you can go through the bowels of Penn Station in the baggage areas, that could be a trick in certain stations like that. But it is getting much better. And I'm sure you heard loud and clear and people realize how important it is. But I would challenge you to go out and promote this, the high speed rail. If we do not do this, we're not going to have that greener future. We are going to have automated cars, and it's going to be more of the same, slightly cleaner, but more and more of them and we'll have the same virtual problem. So we need to get high speed rail going as fast as we can.

To answer some of the questions that the governor had about trains and the financing of it. And I would say that the first two high speed lines in the world most like the Northeast Corridor have been proven to pay for the capital, not just the operating, such as the Northeast Corridor does with slow speed trains, not true high speed trains, its -- Acelas and regional rail do pay their own way certainly, and actually subsidize the rest of the country, which is well known. But what is not well known is, without the money being spent on other things, as it generally is around the world, continually rolling into the next line and the next line, the top lines like ours, like the Northeast Corridor, the first one in Japan, the first one in France paid theirselves (sic) back in roughly ten years. And I've talked to various officials that know better, and it's been looked at by the University of Illinois. So, if we can drop the cost down, the tunnels that are unnecessary, build the tunnels smarter that are necessary, we can do this and make it pay off in twenty years or something like that.

We do have high costs here. We do have incredible dense areas, but so does Japan. And then when the density isn't there, such as in France, they've still made it pay. When people say well, you can't do it in the United States, I

don't believe that at all. We have the times -- we have the opportunities to do that.

Today I was looking at Port Authority issues that are related to this and how to pay for it through some lines that they could be involved in. Connecting the airports. It's funny, coming back on the PATH just a few minutes ago, there was a horoscope reading, and it said you didn't do what you were supposed to do today but you can very easily get back on track. So here I am, back on track with the Northeast Corridor, which is the most important thing that we can do to really rev up the economy in the traditional economic power house of the United States, which is the northeast.

Specifically looking at the Newark Station site, which I was here last week and again today and studying it since then, I would challenge the FRA, Amtrak, New Jersey Transit and others to get a little bit more proactive on station and right-of-way issues, like the Pennsylvania Railroad was, the masters who built all this stuff. Save the rights-of-way. Decide what is really going to be needed. Where the stations are right outside in front of this building is where the high speed station would obviously go. It would take up a lot of space. I do believe it can be integrated without impacting the community strongly, it can improve traffic. I have several different concepts of how that could work, and it can involve that Ironbound Bank building that they call the Ironbound Train Station, the gateway to the community. These things can be good and they can be very, very good for all aspects of the community.

If we do go the route of privatization, though, the danger is that the profits that these do make in the end goes into -- goes into pockets, are not reinvested in the old lines, are not subsidizing the cheaper trains that are going in the wakes of the faster trains at 100 miles an hour or 125 miles an hour as New Jersey Transit will one day have its commuter lines go. And then we have more and more buses as we know are coming up from Philadelphia and other cities and clogging New Jersey highways.

Thank you very much, and I'll be here for the next session too. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Scott. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: I don't have others signed up to speak at this moment. It looks like there are some hands in the audience, some very kind of -- all right. So I think Scott wants to speak; is that correct, Scott?

MR. MAITS: Yeah, sure.

THE MODERATOR: All right. Just if we can keep it to --

MR. MAITS: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: -- three minutes. That would be great.

MR. MAITS: I'll give you my red flag.

THE MODERATOR: I'm going to take your flag.

MR. MAITS: Yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Don't forget to introduce yourself.

MR. MAITS: Yes, thank you.

Again, my name is Scott Maits. I am a long time advocate for high speed rail. I've been studying this for decades. And I was told about it as a child by what was going to be happening or what the Pennsylvania Railroad had planned to do, and that was the best start on a lot of this stuff, and of course doing the research.

Specifically at Kew Gardens, for instance, that would be all electric trains if high speed rail went through. And it would be also be in a subway underneath the Long Island Railroad for a short section at Kew Gardens itself because there has been an over-build right there at the Union Turnpike, I believe it is, and buildings actually built across the tracks. And the New York City subway system wanted to go that way and they had looked at how to get under the existing Long Island Railroad, and that would probably be where the railroad would look to from their plans to start with. So the impacts of this line are -- can be minimized with greenways, with tunneling, with aerials, with sound barriers and other different things. And we must do this and we can't give in to the NIMBY-ism that is going to come at it.

But we also have to make sure it is minimized. The Long Island Railroad does run trains at 80 miles an hour down these rights-of-way. In sections you're only going to be able to run 100 miles an hour, for instance, between Jamaica and -- even through Harold you can speed up, there's a way to go to the north of Sunnyside to ease that curve. But it's going to be very consistent with what you're seeing now. And it was built for extra tracks there.

A lot of these bypasses are actually going to be four tracks, the added tracks at different times. Like at Frankford Junction, for instance, where the accident of course was.

The current plan or -- well, no, no current plan, but if you just built two tracks whether they went to the east side of the downtown area, not the center of it, at Market East, you wouldn't do anything for the 125 or 150 mile an hour trains. They would still have to go around that dangerous curve that was meant to be bypassed in 1913. But if you did go the way that the Pennsylvania Railroad had wanted this -- wanted to do until the government intervened and said you can't do it, you would today, rather than being on the surface where it's now a highway, you'd be over that highway. East Erie Avenue on an elevated. You could do it in a subway, I think a double high elevated there, but four tracks, and perhaps stacked, two on one side and two on the other

of a relatively wide street with a supporting structure between the two would probably do it. It's heavily commercial, there's very little residential up there. And they're used to the L because that's where the Frankford elevated SEPTA service is, just on the same block actually, crossing, and you'd need to fly over that too.

But there are other four track bypasses that would be necessary to do this. New Haven -- New Brunswick, they didn't leave the space that was left by the engineers so much to build additional tracks, so you'd have to be above the tracks. And then it goes into a four track Metuchen subway tunnel.

The one last point that I would make again, and I've made this before, is that New London, while the low hanging fruit on the north side if we went via Long Island, the logical way to New Haven to Hartford and then Providence, could have high speed trains getting off at New Haven going on the slower tracks. So it would not be the biggest casualty of the Northeast Corridor next generation. If we're not going to the urban center of the town, it's -- you know, but it would still be fast except in that section.

So there's a lot of different trade-offs here, a lot to think about it. And I hope we can all support no matter what comes out because we all know we need this.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Scott.

The next speaker is Scott Maits.

And Scott knows all the rules.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAITS: All right.

Hi. My name is Scott Maits, M-a-i-t-s.

I'm a transportation advocate from Philadelphia, as you guys know, as you guys don't know.

However, today I was riding around the Nassau Hub, which is where I used to live as a child. I think I found the main street that my mother drove me down all the time on her way to Jones Beach today.

Long Island, as people who live here well know, was built by the Long Island Railroad. The Long Island Railroad, however, after it was -- the Pennsylvania had to let it go and where I lived and where the planners were that really made it to what it is and I've come to study them, has -- while I remember them building the aerial structures on the Babylon branch and the disruptions for those, have been continuing to deteriorate in different ways, not being able to keep pace, certainly, not being able to step up to the next level despite its overwhelming service demand, blatant demand, problems with the third track and, frankly, this high speed rail can be the solution.

I know Floral Park. I know Garden City. I know the other areas all the way out to Ronkonkoma and in through Jamaica and Woodside, and how these all can be fixed. They can be fixed and they can be done better than an aerial. Aerials were in 1965, Hicksville. Now they have tunneling machines. And, of course, you still have trenching subways that can be built and then covered over and instead of a two-track train line through a commercial and residential area, you can have a linear park with a bikeway, an improvement.

New York City, Long Island needs freight. Freight would not go this two-track way. Many places on the Northeast Corridor that this is contemplating being built for two tracks, actually we're going to need more. They're going to need improvements to the 125-mile-an-hour line.

In Philadelphia there's -- I think there's a six-track section between the Philadelphia Airport and 30th Street, below the Garden, where a branch comes in on its way to the airport. You just need two tracks. Some high speed commuter trains, as they're done in England on the Chunnel high-speed line, which

is supported by both liberals and conservative parties in England, it's the only thing that they kind of agreed on, services commuter trains on the 200-mile-an-hour or so line to the Chunnel.

They're bullet-nose trains. They look like high speed but they only go 100 and something. And then when they get off into the suburbs, they branch off onto the older lines and continue on local service. You can imagine how well that could work here on Long Island. Because you're above New York, the biggest demand is New York to Washington, to Philadelphia actually. And then the branch off to the west and the lesser populations.

Your two-track line up here wouldn't have that capacity to do other trains very closely, schedule very carefully done, because the existing lines through Connecticut will still have the same service they have now, basically, with some improvements. But we can't go through Connecticut. It's impossible to fix the Shore Line.

The Inland Line would be not as disruptive as what you're imaging this would be in Floral Park or Garden City but it would take hundreds of homes, I believe, up in Connecticut.

At Floral Park, specifically, I believe this would have to go underground. So far underground, you wouldn't even know it was there. You wouldn't know it was dug. You wouldn't know if they were running through there except for any suburban stations that stay on that line. And that's a question to be kind of sorted out.

I have a bunch of other comments. I'll try to save them, the written ones that I have. But we must do this to keep the American economy and rev it up, otherwise it's not going to be the same here as it's been in the past.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Scott.

And if after we let people who are signed up to speak, I'm happy to have you come back.

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks.

Thank you, Scott.

And if after we let people who are signed up to speak, I'm happy to have you come back.

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks.

Scott, it looks like you're up. But if I could ask you just to make sure you hold it to three minutes, okay? I've been very generous with you.

MR. MAITS: Yes, you have. And I've abused it. Sorry.

This is very important stuff and in the weakness of this -- I'm very glad to be able to put comments and everybody's very glad, I'm sure, for putting comments, but to not have questions answered is a difficulty of it -- so.

I mean there's been a number of things that, you know, it's not going down through Mineola. It's not going to Hicksville. If it was a high speed through line, if it was a branch and they went through Connecticut and there was a branch to Long Island, because it's just got irresistible amounts of people living here, then it could -- would get to Hicksville or something like that and you would need a third and a fourth track.

We're trying to avoid the fourth track. And if this was earlier, maybe even the third track through -- through this area, which I've been following, you know, looking at -- talk to some people outside about Garden City issues and all.

So the local stops on the high speed full bullet train would actually be Jamaica, Nassau Hub, which would be somewhere over here where the Coliseum went down. I went over to go see the Coliseum as I remember it and it's gone. I saw concerts there. And Ronkonkoma. So you -- anybody going to Philadelphia, for instance, would go get on a local, go one or three stops up, or drive, and then get on a train - although it may not be the train just stops in the major cities but it would be one in its wake going nearly as fast would take a couple of stops, maybe five stops down to Philadelphia and you would not change at Penn Station.

That's a big pause there.

So anyway, a couple of other comments. Ronkonkoma is going to be an issue. The turn there is difficult. I thought it was impossible myself. I found out -- I found a place to do it further out. That makes it possible to try and go to New Haven because Connecticut desperately does want this. What the United States of America can't afford to go through Connecticut up the central or the coastline. It would just cost way too much and it would be much more disruptive than anything here, which would have some construction impacts but would disappear if it was in a tunnel in places you wouldn't see it at all. And it could run on the

elevated section of the Long Island Railroad in the City, through Jamaica, through Woodside. You can squeeze it through there. The railroad left extra spaces and some -- with some jiggering in some places that those extra spaces have been eaten into, could fix that. So it can all work.

I checked the entire thing very, very carefully and want the best and with the least impact to help Long Island, which I feel is like a home of mine a long time ago. And I just have this -- this understanding because I've been thinking about it for something like 30 years.

So I hope to hell -- if anybody has any questions about how it could actually work, there are already engineers here and -- and as well as myself who knows these things.

One quick comment, New London. I would not like to have it bypass. That would the city that would be the biggest loser in this whole process. I understand it's the low-hanging fruit to fix that section. But if we do go this way, you could have a train come off at New Haven from Long Island and go up through there.

They're building the Connecticut -- or the Cubarb (phonetic) museum there. It will be downtown. It would hurt that area tremendously. The Greenfield Station, replaced it.

I just rode the line and, again, the other day and it's a nice line. It's lovely if you combine it with the bullet line here. And then at the other end of Providence where it would rejoin, it would not be that bad of a ride through there. And, of course, you would have increased local service even with the bridge restrictions because you would not have the non-stopping Acela type trains. You might have some stopping ones there.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Scott.

Yes. Would you like to speak.

(No response.)

THE MODERATOR: I just want to also remind folks that if you go to our website, which is www.necfuture.com, there is a way to sign up for our e-mail blasts and that's a great way for us to stay in touch with you and for you to also stay in touch with us. So I encourage people to do that.

Is there anyone else who would like to make a comment?

Are you raising your hand, Scott?

MR. MAITS: Oh -- okay, yes.

THE MODERATOR: Would you like to make another comment?

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: I couldn't quite tell.

MR. MAITS: Yeah, well, I don't want to be too much.

It looks like I left my pen here too.

Thank you.

Scott Maits from Philadelphia, briefly living in Long Island.

I've been researching this area because it is almost -- it's the only way we can afford to go as a country. We have to do this to revive our economy in the east, which is the traditional economic power of the United States and the entire world, all the major developed countries are building high speed rail. Some of the smaller countries, not as developed in Africa, in the Arabian Peninsula, are building high speed rail.

We have a 100-year old line. The Japanese studied the Pennsylvania Railroad, which included the Long Island and built the next step. We've got some new trains but we didn't upgrade others and mostly rebuilt in place. Some upgrades but we need to do much more and that's what this is. And going through Long Island is the only way to go.

It was the Pennsylvania's plan to eventually go to Boston out the north fork. When they acquired the Long Island Consolidated Lines, when they got ahead of building Penn Station and they became the masters of underwater building technology, it would be very expensive to build this tunnel. But the savings in Long Island, even at a well-built line that is very minimally impactful and mostly in closer to the City where it's next to the existing rail where it's already grade separated and almost ready to go and someplaces absolutely ready to go, six tracks but only four in use.

But better out here and it would, indeed, only be two tracks

where there is no line and what would happen with the short line through Garden City could be incorporated at a different level above or below. I didn't hear about the aquifer. That was one -- the only legitimate concern I really heard that I felt was a real problem tonight. And I heard that -- got that from somebody else in the audience when they were leaving. They had not actually offered to hear and that needs to be looked at with hydrologics -- hydraulic studies that you guys are doing in more detail.

I trust that it'll turn out well or something else you can do. My original plan to go through the area before, you know, I admitted to the political issues here to do that and the power, was to go under Floral Park but surface in Garden City, immediately after Floral Park and go on an aerial. Maybe that is still the solution, the sound walls so you can't hear it. And, again, park at street level, at track level so that the community could get like a spin benefit that they could not say is not a benefit and it would be helpful for them. And I think it's a reasonable compensation for, you know, putting this through even if it has no direct impact until we get to the Nassau hub itself or Ronkonkoma where it has the impacts of -- of development there, which I think is needed.

Again, they took down the Coliseum for a reason. And you would be able to get to New York City in 15 minutes or something to that effect and that would be a tremendous thing for out here.

The tunnel can also be helped paid for by freight and by automobiles. The governor just talked about a new crossing somewhere, whether it's in Connecticut or down further, New Haven is where expressways come in besides the Tappan Zee Expressway, 287, I think. So that is the next nexus of them on the other side to meet.

And audit trains like the trunnel does, a similar length tunnel, actually, it's shorter, but similar in experience that this would be, does do audit trains. You drive it on yourself. It can leave every 15 minutes or half-an-hour or something like that. That could help pay for this and then you would go from somewhere above New Haven suburbs to Ronkonkoma. Or you could go to New Jersey, or it could go to Virginia or Florida. So it would pay for it as could freight by doing this.

So the good thing is, again, we're not taking any new land west of Yapahonic (phonetic)- I think that's how you pronounce

it. And it would be on the existing right-of-way even during construction largely. And, again, most of it would be very -- a separate construction and if it was an aerial, then you could see some -- it would be relatively brief. It can be done in sections and could have very minimal -- if it was a tunnel, it would have no real impact at all it it was able to do that. But perhaps we're not able to do that.

I think that's the only comment I have for now. I do support the Providence routing -- from Hartford. I think that's the only way into Boston that can be done affordably. Again, I don't think you can build along the Mass Pike. I've looked at it. Other people have said the same thing. You can do anything with a lot of money but you already have a high speed line that just needs modifications in the southwest corridor. And, of course, there's Boston at the end of the line three tracks can work if trains are precisely timed coming south to Boston, the two tracks can go north and the commuters can go the other ways that exist.

THE MODERATOR: Great.

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much, Scott.

Thanks a lot.

MR. MAITS: I want to make a statement.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, wait. You want to make a statement?

MR. MAITS: Yeah.

THE MODERATOR: Hold on a second. Hold on one second. If you'd like to make a statement, I'd just ask that you go to the microphone and give us your name and affiliation and carry on.

MR. MAITS: Hi. My name is Scott Maits.

I was hoping to speak at the end of this but I'll give just one comment now. I've, obviously, been poring over this stuff.

I'm from Philadelphia. I've been studying the Northeast Corridor for many, many years, the Great Pennsylvania Railroad for many, many years, as well as this whole process. And I'd be very glad to see it in this country, absolutely needs high speed rail, and it needs the highest level plan, Plan 3, with rationalization of certain aspects.

The one thing I'll talk about now tonight is about Philadelphia. There's talk of building something like a 15-mile tunnel through Philadelphia. Some people said it would take 80 percent of some of the costs, and I don't believe that that's the actual number but it would rank in the double digits of billions of dollars to replace the best station in the country, the 30th Street Station. It's won awards from Trains Magazine. The award's never been given out but twice and it won both times. And it's at the exact right place.

What I object to in the documents is the other Market East Station being called downtown. 30th Street is downtown. It's not in the Center City District, which is an improvement district because there's a University City District.

With the exception of the Com Cast Tower, which is going to be the largest building outside of New York and Chicago, going up actually closer to 30th Street Station than to the Market East location. There is residential going on in Center City but most buildings actually going on in University City. With the Delaware River barrier of only one bridge downtown, the Schuykill -- the small Schuykill

River is more like a water feature with multiple railroad track bridges, tunnels and highways of all kinds. It is not a barrier. It's closer to the center of the Philadelphia region there. It's where the growth is and it's where there's 100, actually 200 acres of growth that Amtrak owns that it would get the benefit of.

We can't -- there's been a game in Philadelphia to try to say that the 30th Street is not in downtown. That is so patently false. Pennsylvania Railroad and something like 13 mayors, up until the current one, who is out in another month, have planned that downtown continuously move up to 30th Street. It was a historical thing that started in colonial Philadelphia and the Delaware waterfront is moved up. As soon as the 1930s, you didn't even want to be in Market East, and it has continued to go and grow towards 30th Street.

I'll have many other comments and most will be in writing by the deadline.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you.

MR. MAITS: But that's a very big one and I think if we get rid of certain plans like that, I love the Long Island going -- via that way. It hits the numbers. There are places where we have to invest - Baltimore, New York, obviously, but not in Philadelphia.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Scott.

Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to speak?

(No response.)

Does anyone else want to make a public statement?

Scott?

MR. MAITS: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Just make sure you introduce yourself, Scott.

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

My name is Scott Maits.

THE MODERATOR: Wait. Hold on, Scott. Hold on, one second. I think we didn't turn the microphone back on.

MR. MAITS: The button there?

THE MODERATOR: There. You've got it.

MR. MAITS: Okay.

Yeah. Hi. My name is Scott Maits, M-a-i-t-s.

I'm from Philadelphia. I was with the Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers and I've been active on this for a number of years.

I'll just have a few more comments here. I'll try to keep this as brief as I can. Let me just work down the cards just a little bit.

I totally agree with Richard Arena that in Boston you can only come in from the southwest, the existing Amtrak corridor. It's already done. It's only three tracks but if you can time trains coming south one track and work with various levels. With high speed rail, there is another corridor for commuters, as needed, for most or part of the way out of the town too.

It's the only way to go because you're going to run into these tremendous amount of opposition as did California to the west, the difficulty, the twisting, the same thing as in Connecticut. I see that in most all the configurations in Connecticut, with the -- with the exception, perhaps, of most of New Haven to Hartford, which is not my preferred way.

I was glad to see, reading today, that Providence -- the tunnel appears to be in use, the abandoned tunnel that's there. It fixes the problems above Pawtucket but I do not see the problems south of Providence, and I don't mean the curve right south of the station, but below -- on the existing line there's a number of curves.

There is another railroad right-of-way. Part of it's being used by a bikeway now.

I was with the East Coast Greenway in the Philadelphia area where we -- I was able to change several rights-of-way there for better ones. And I have a better one for Providence on the south side. It could have been that straight line in New England and something, to a straighter Northeast Corridor to the south towards the airport down there. And then there's ways to connect in to the existing line where there's open areas and parking lots where they can go through and aerial structures.

I'm a big proponent of Long Island. That's -- there's much more population there. We do have existing Northeast Corridor in Connecticut but there's a lot more people it's a lot more constrained in Long Island. It needs transportation. A tunnel across the Sound can make -- can be a trunnel. It can have automobiles. It can have freight if it's done right, if it's done right to New York City.

This is how you free the most constrained place in America that I can see, through the Northeast Corridor. This is how you help to relieve the Long Island Railroad, the most congested line in the country in many ways, that really needs it.

This is how you also free Metro North through Connecticut, not having -- I would still have the high speed trains through it but you would take the pressure off a little bit and you would speed up to New Haven even if you went out Long Island. And I would go straight from Long Island to New London, which can be fixed and we can have a downtown station through that area. It's an all-stop station. The turns wouldn't be bad. It would be elevated so they'd be no more crossings. It's a complex situation. It is something that can be done and I've looked at it very, very carefully.

I was riding around Queens today looking at the right-of-way to JFK Airport, which I'm seeing not being used. They want to -- they're showing using the Montauk line, the old one that's abandoned or just used for freight now.

The current Long Island Railroad main line is built for six tracks. It has four on it. You can get through Woodside Station. I looked at every inch of it. There's a way to do it if you reconfigure it to get two tracks. You're only

going 100 miles an hour in that short stretch to JFK, which is a very, very important station for Jamaica, for the entire Northeast Corridor. I can't tell you how many people in Philadelphia want to get up to JFK Airport.

I'm glad to hear that New York may have a deal together for the tunnel. That's -- that's awesome and that's what we really need a lot. Well, he already said what I have to say. And, actually, I'd just add that 30th Street could actually be faster than the other line, believe it or not, because of waiting, the refinery, because of the four flights of escalators. You'd have to come up 150 feet down because there's 13 traffic lights from where that station would be to a highway through Chinatown on Colonial Streets. 30th Street doesn't have any of that. And it would be faster for Philadelphians and, at least, just as fast as the other line. Actually, I believe faster because some of the other turning constraints that may have to be introduced there.

Glad to see -- and we can go to the airport. So I would use number -- Alternative 2 to go to 30th Street but then to the airport and that is the better growth line, to drive the growth where there's room for Philadelphia.

And I'm very glad to see and -- Maryland through 40 and I believe B&O Corridor, which I've been urging is apparently what is being looked at to avoid the bridges and the turns on the existing Northeast Corridor.

And I think that I may have a good solution for Baltimore and it's the cheapest way of building a tunnel there because it takes care of both freight and passengers.

So anyway, again, I'm very happy; this needs to happen. Very happy this is happening. I do believe it should be extended as far as Richmond and, perhaps, to north of it too.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Scott.

Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to speak?

(No response.)

THE MODERATOR: Quickly or otherwise.

(No response.)

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Seeing no show of hands or audible, I'm going to close the public hearing portion.

Okay. Next speaker, Scott Maits. I thought I saw you.

Okay, Scott. How are you?

MR. MAITS: Two minutes, huh?

THE MODERATOR: Three.

MR. MAITS: Three.

THE MODERATOR: Three minutes. For you, especially.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAITS: I will see you in another city to finish my comments.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAITS: My name is Scott Maits. I'm a long-time transit activist. I hope I bring in the concerns of the youth. I tend to arrive late to these things, would take the train, so I have a very good user perspective on this stuff.

I have to concur with everything I've heard so far, it was really good, with one exception. The Northeast Corridor is hydropowered already except at peak times where they, I think, kick in nuclear, and I'm actually researching a safe nuclear alternative.

It's been shelved for many years, and maybe India is interested in it rather than coal, but maybe you could do something with the Northeast Corridor. And it's completely safe, from what I've been told, on all sorts of different angles.

Anyway, I'm here and I'm going to focus on Philadelphia mostly.

There's several major tunnels that have to be built on this line. They're generally in the vicinity of five miles each, with the exception of Long Island Sound, which I feel its 44 miles or so — and that's doubling because there will be two tunnels, that's the actual distance of tunneling required — are necessary because I believe it would be easier than going through Connecticut.

So we need new tunnels in Baltimore, New York, of course, which looks like they're getting hooked up, and in small places all over.

But this Philadelphia tunnel is something we don't need. You've heard me say this before.

But now having read most of the — you know, whatever the document is like this thick, I've been able to see some of the things in there that you kind of skew it a little bit.

First off, going to 30th Street is the most transformative alternative because the entire new downtown we can expand through there.

That would not happen on Market East. If we were here, if we could afford it — I don't think we can afford it — I think it could derail it.

And 30th Street is where the central downtown is going, from the City Hall to 30th Street.

You may not be aware, two weeks ago or so the second big foreign investment in the city was made by an outside investment firm from Korea.

The first one was 2008, the Germans bought the Comcast Center. I don't think they own it anymore.

But the Central — it's called the Central Post Office because — at 30th Street, it's not at 12th or at City Hall. The Central Post Office, the former one, the IRS Building was bought by Koreans for nearly half a billion dollars.

And I believe they think that they can build maybe the tallest building in the city someday there over the tracks, through the platforms. And they're looking ahead more than some people in Philadelphia are to what is coming.

With the exception of Brandywine who needed — I believe they needed the money to build their other buildings.

So there's a whole bunch of things. Most of it will be in my writing, obviously.

I did notice on the route being projected from 30th Street to the Airport that unlike every other route across the Northeast, the route was off center. It was not on the existing line or right next to it, as you can tell with that scale.

I believe they were trying to pick up something called the Old Trolley Short Line, the Chester Short Line, which the East Coast Greenway wants to use also down in Tinicum.

And that is in the Refuge. The train line, the existing train line, the Chemical Coast for Pennsylvania Freight Line going down to the waterfronts down in Chester and — is kind of — is the boundary of the Refuge.

Now, there is some of the Refuge under the spaghetti bowl of highways in front of the Airport that were kind of just added in, the ponds and all there, and the train is part of that spaghetti bowl, including the SEPTA viaduct that goes up and around.

But I believe we can put the train on the — any new track that is not stopping going into the Airport on Bartram's Avenue's right-of-way, which could be slimmed down.

It was actually built extremely wide because they were going to develop these marshes. They were going to develop it. So they have a six-lane boulevard with two parking lanes, so it's four with two and a median.

Well, if you put those four that you actually need to travel on the one side, where there is — I'm not taking measurements — you can put the high-speed rail on the other side through that most sensitive area of Philadelphia.

There's another solution for Bartram's if we're going this way also to a similar situation where it would actually be underground, not in an aerial.

Bartram's sits up on a hill, and on the other side of the historic right-of-way where oil trains are going through, and there's a very historic cut-in. It was built by Eastwick, one of the first

locomotive builders in the country like Baldwin. He had his house there. He saved Bartram's Garden. So the high-speed line would actually be in a tunnel opposite the house.

Those are the main objections for the Bartram — for the line from 30th Street to the Airport.

And I can go into extreme detail, as I will attempt to on my writing on this subject.

Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Scott.

THE MODERATOR: That was great.

Okay. At this point I don't have any other speakers signed up; right?

Is there anybody here who is interested in speaking before I close out the hearing?

Would you like to say some more, Scott?

MR. MAITS: Sure.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. MAITS: Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Sure.

MR. MAITS: Thank you again. Thanks.

I hope to add some stuff that clarifies. I was looking over my notes. I did not clarify why I was so concerned about down at the Airport. That's, of course, avoiding the Heinz Refuge. We're not trying to bisect it.

I am actually on the environmental watershed group down there. I'm the only one that's riding a bike in that group, too. They're all driving, telling us how — what we have to do.

But I have a very deep concern for there. I clean up the parks where the watershed above — immediately above in Philadelphia, I've been taking care of that. And so making sure that that is taken care of and is impacted as minimally as possible is absolutely one of my goals. So again, we can put it on the roadway, remove paved surface.

So one of the things I didn't also get into was tunnel drives, the length of the Philadelphia tunnel.

The original quotes in the Inquirer — and I was in the story raising the problems of that on the front page of the Inquirer — was that they were talking about a 10-mile — originally this was supposed to be a 10-mile tunnel drive.

Now, you go under the Schuylkill River, which incidentally all used to be marsh, the whole Airport was marsh, the whole Philadelphia was marsh, and then the Swedes came and started filling it in. And I'm the historian down in that area for a lot of that, too. So it's very difficult types of digging.

We were also able to point out that you can't go under the refineries. They're the oldest, leakiest refineries in the nation there. They're known to be leaking. They're trying to pump it out of the air there — out of the ground, and they don't know exactly how far it went.

The Schuylkill River caught fire during World War I. So you have all this stuff in there in the worst kind of soil conditions, unlike New York, for instance, which the tunnel machines blow the rock there.

But, anyway, the distance of the drives — and I just did the estimate this afternoon finally because of my own technical issues — would actually — and this is very well checked and has been partially confirmed in your own documents and all, and seeing different things about that alternative — would actually come up down by Baldwin where the

Northeast Corridor, it would be just before that.

It would actually be in front of the Boeing Helicopter factory area. It's the only place where you get enough of a distance to come out because there's navigable — the Darby Creek is navigable there. You'd have to go 50 feet above it.

There's Tinicum with multiple crossings and residential area and a very narrow right-of-way. You'd either have to go under it or on an aerial that kind of goes up a little bit and can mushroom out just a little bit.

I prefer the aerial myself with sound barriers. And that's what going through 30th Street directly aligns to.

Unlike coming through the — under the Navy Yard, which the Department of Defense may have a very serious concern with, that is still producing ships for the U.S. Navy, and it's one of our few active shipyards in the nation, in addition to them having active units in there, even though most of it's being developed privately at this point.

And other issues about the arc of this tunnel, but it would actually have to start above Bridge Street in Philadelphia. That's well above Frankford, another half a mile or more above where the Frankford Junction accident would be, because of needing, according to Amtrak, separate track tunnels under rivers. That's two tunnels at least part of the way, at least from the Market East Station.

In addition, it's occurred to me that there's going to be so much pressure to have express trains from New York directly to Washington, not even stopping at Philadelphia, which, thank goodness, 30th Street and Zoo junction would not allow.

It — the Pennsylvania Railroad tried to do it and they figured out it didn't — doesn't make sense.

Amtrak tried to do it. It doesn't make sense.

But with a 200-mile-an-hour line, it would make sense. So there's another tunnel through Center City breaking off from the existing one to do — to go by the — not the existing one, the one that they would have to build to a station. So that's quite interesting.

Also, of course, in a high-speed tunnel, there's a sound wave that goes through, knocks people over, knocks you in the head, goes to your eardrums. So you have to actually have a break in the tunnels.

And where in South Philadelphia we can take a square block out so that there's a hole that goes down 150 feet, I can't imagine where they can do that in South Philly.

It might be able to be done in North Philly, but maybe not even there. So that's a consideration.

So my total mileage for this thing, because of those bypasses, because of a bypass at the Airport where most high-speed training would not stop

at, would be 32 miles of tunneling.

Not $3 billion for 10 miles, which is too low for 10, anyway. It's going to be enormous because it's also in these very bad soils and all. So it's quite a lot to do it.

Long Island, I think, would save money going that way rather than Connecticut, tying up and tying into a population that is constrained because they can't get off the island except through New York City and where there's more population in Connecticut. But then you hit Connecticut at New Haven.

So it does make sense, it saves money, you spend it all at once on a tunnel.

In Philadelphia, that's not the case.

On Long Island, you need very little tunneling, just maybe in Garden City, and you can actually use existing line from Harold Tower and Sunnyside to Jamaica.

We do have the Zoo Junction curve. It's the only curve that we cannot fix in Philadelphia, but it's not necessary. You're a mile from the train station. You don't come into the train station with your brakes on fire.

So I'll have some more later. Thank you very much.

THE MODERATOR: Thanks, Scott.

I think that Scott, without further ado, I'm going to swing the podium a little bit. It's not working so well today.

MR. MAITS: We used to — they put them so far back so they were safe from Philadelphians and snowballs.

THE MODERATOR: We didn't design this thing.

(Laughter.)

THE MODERATOR: All right.

MR. MAITS: You know, we snowballed Santa Claus.

THE MODERATOR: All right. So, Scott, introduce yourself.

MR. MAITS: Hi. Scott Maits, M-a-i-t-s, if you didn't get it before. I don't think I spelled it out.

I'm the former vice president of the Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers. I do not represent them. Alternative transportation advocate working in communities in Philadelphia.

I was just asked to join 30th Street's planning, finally. I've been talking about it for years and then everybody else that I was talking to got on the committee and I wasn't, for some reason.

But now the poorest community around 30th Street asked me to help them, so that's kind of what I do around the Airport, with the environmental out in West Philly, and up and down the East Coast for high-speed rail, which I think is one of the best things, because I am going to mention the economic justice here, and I'm going to focus on these inner Philadelphia areas.

One of the problems of going to 30th Street is how narrow the right-of-way gets. It's only six tracks, which sounds like a lot, but high-speed rail, as we know, needs more space between the tracks.

So there is a way to fix that, and this is primarily west of 30th — of North Philadelphia Station, it goes into a cut, largely.

For the record, in the book it says it's on an aerial or on an embankment. That's — it doesn't get to any embankments until much further above Frankford Junction.

So how do you squeeze 200-mile-an-hour trains next to a 150- or 125- or 90-mile-an-hour train is by rerouting SEPTA, similar to what New Jersey Transit is considering in Secaucus, which is a backwards loop after it passes the station. Well, the same thing is the way to connect at North Philadelphia, SEPTA is crossing over on the Trenton Line, is crossing over its own Reading main line at North Philadelphia right at the other — at the end of the platform there. It's quite a transportation complex.

We hope someday that that becomes a big station to help with redevelopment in the area, and I'm talking to City people and others about to do that, there was a study of that.

So that gets SEPTA's Trenton and Chestnut Hill, the Swampoodle Connection, off of going to 30th Street first and they instead go to Temple University.

It's known as the Pretzel Line the way the whole line goes now where they loop through the city and go back out the same way.

That would no longer be the case and would make their operation shorter, more direct, and allow Amtrak, with Conrail has the one zero track space, and they're okay over there.

That would allow four track spaces and then the bridge pillars that are going overhead and it's like 52 feet wide the old narrow way, and then an extra track space on the other side opposite zero track, on the other side.

So in the four track existing space where you have them, you would reduce that to three tracks. So there's your high speed additional space in between the tracks.

And everybody is —SEPTA gets a better service out of it and you get what you need.

It's been said that Zoo Junction Amtrak has said could be speeded up to at least 60 miles an hour. I think with really fancy banking, sort of like Hot Wheels cars that can go faster there for two tracks, anyway, and everybody else can use the other — the ones that are there, improved as much as can be and the switches improved as much as can be.

The other place I wanted to talk about was Chester. Surprisingly, looking through the documents, I did not see any economic justice areas.

As far as I can see — I saw Delaware County mentioned once, but as far as I can tell, Chester appears to be the biggest little city on the Northeast Corridor without an Amtrak or an express service.

And it turns out that if — and why Chester is interesting, because it's very depressed. It's very, very — the most depressed cities in the state of Pennsylvania, but it has like 11 bus lines that go out into the most urban suburban county — that's where I'm from — Swarthmore College and, you know, a well-to-do county and actually out into additional counties from the train stations.

It's a beautiful train station with a beautiful SEPTA transportation hub.

What it doesn't have is fast service to downtown Philadelphia. The other opportunity, if the 30th Street to Airport Line is picked, and that's the only way, is that it could have the only direct service in Delaware County to the Airport.

I guess Marcus Hook can just below it and all, but it would be a tremendous development opportunity for Chester, one which I've talked to them about to some extent and could help to guide that.

And that could be SEPTA service. That could be SEPTA Silverliners, which reach a hundred miles an hour, they come down from 30th Street, stop

at the Airport, too, in addition to the current line with, like, 15 stops. But then they express to Chester, then start the outer portion of their line into Delaware, as they do now.

So that could be very exciting for them where it is absolutely needed to help with them.

I know the smaller cities like Meridian, is it, Connecticut and all are at — would be getting high-speed stations, according to how it's described.

At Frankford Junction, that's the other problem here. These are all inner city issues, as it were.

The line to the tunnel, to this tunnel, which I said was 32 miles of tunneling, in my estimation I think I did a pretty fair job and actually conservative because I didn't put them in two tunnels, I put them in a single tunnel to Center City and then split it, so I was kind of conservative about it.

That tunnel would not fix the Frankford junction accident site, a place that I've been talking about for three years.

I was actually at 30th Street when the accident happened. I went over to ask one of the workers what happened because the trains are stopped — are no longer listed and there's some police action.

And he just said, Wheatsheaf — and he didn't even get the whole street out and I was running out the door to the El, which gets up there fastest.

And this plan to build a tunnel would not fix the problem for the 150-mile-an-hour trains, the 125-mile-an-hour trains. It would not fix it. That curve would still be there, the bullet trains would go a different way through that junction area, and we'd still have the problem.

What we do need is four tracks fixed. SEPTA stays on the existing line with perhaps a stop there. It's right across the bridge from New Jersey, the Atlantic City Line goes that way, too. It could be a super stop for both states, in a sense.

But we need the Pennsylvania Railroad's 1913 plan to fix that. Unfortunately, World War I and the government stopped them from doing, and any talk about this other tunnel was stopped and, thus, now we're fixing.

That is my last comment. It would be four tracks, and I would prefer it actually to be an El at double height running over the existing SEPTA elevated train there. I think that would be the easiest way to do it and acceptable in that area.

Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Scott.

I'm just getting up to see if there was anyone else who would like to speak. We have no other people signed up, but is there someone who got inspired by Scott's remarks?

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #923 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Carolyn

Last Name : Maize

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please don't consider slicing through the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge with a new rail line. The construction would cause permanent damage. The daily disturbance of the trains would add insult to injury. Ignoring the spirit of the Wildlife Refuge laws would set a disturbing precedent for other refuges. There has to be another route.

Sincerely, Carolyn Maize

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1454 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Forest

Last Name : Majors

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Alternative one looks like it will be detrimental to Old Lyme and it's historic district for very little improvement in the corridor.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3045 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Jen
Last Name : Malaguti
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

While I'd look forward to a faster way to get to Boston, half an hour faster is not something that seems worth the cost to our local history and current communities. Cutting through small towns and historical homes is not a price is like to pay. I also do NOT agree with digging a tunnel along the bottom of the Sound.
I would like this project to pause and be brought to the public, especially local communities before moving forward at all. If there were a vote on it today, my vote would be "no" to a high speed train through CT.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2904 DETAIL

Status : Pending

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Thomas

Last Name : Malchodi

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To the Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1872 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Deborah

Last Name : Malcolm

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

You can't possibly be serious about destroying the integrity of a historic village such as Old Lyme...it would have a MAJOR negative impact!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2892 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Debbie

Last Name : Malewicki

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1806 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Akshay
Last Name : Malhotra
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2575 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Anna

Last Name : Malicka

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal for several reason: the most important is that it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven, a prestigious art school. It would also endanger the protected Connecticut River estuary, and destroy nationally recognized historic district of Old Lyme, Connecticut. For those reasons, I hope you will choose an alternative approach. A connection from Hartford to Providence would be a great opportunity to help traffic between those cities. Directing the line according to Alternative 1 would do nothing for central Connecticut while destroying one of the most picturesque and historically and academically important locations in the state.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1645 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Diane
Last Name : Mallory
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To Whom it may Concern:

I was among the first of our town to learn of the proposed NEC-Future, Tier 1 proposal. I was closely engaged in notifying our local officials and residents regarding this proposal which would obliterate our beautiful, historic town. And while there are many questions surrounding the issue of how it got so far along in the process with the apparent lack of communication with the affected communities; I have also been suggesting that now is not the time to point fingers - now is the time for our town to let the NEC know we are paying attention.

It is incredible for most of us to comprehend how a plan could be put forth that would essentially destroy a town where so many federal, state and local dollars have been expended in it's very preservation. Old Lyme stands out as a combination of all that makes Connecticut unique. Old Lyme has environmental, cultural and historic resources that have been the object of preservation efforts for decades. We wonder how it is that suddenly these resources could be of so little value?

How is that the NEC-Future planners were apparently unaware of a 2012 EA which while studying how to improve existing rail service, stated all the reasons that Old Lyme presented a particularly fragile area that must be protected. The obvious lack of coordination, or simple due diligence on the part of those responsible for developing the 30 million dollar + plan, does not encourage confidence in government.

I stand with my town in opposing Alt 1. If we are to expand high speed rail in the NEC the investment should be put to the best use. The plan should include maintenance and improvement of local service. The high speed tracks and accompanying infrastructure should be placed where trains can reach the optimum speed of 220 - farther inland, where is is possible to build straighter tracks. It should not be contemplated along a fragile and busy shoreline, where massive bridges over rivers, marsh and estuary are required; And, as is the case with Old Lyme, an entire historic town obliterated.

Sincerely yours, Diane Mallory

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2625 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Kathleen
Last Name : Malon
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2339 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Dominick

Last Name : Mandeville

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2594 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Monica
Last Name : Mandeville
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2396 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Cecilia

Last Name : Mandrile

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #615 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/8/2016

First Name : Mayra

Last Name : Mangal

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I do not agree with high-speed trains passing through Garden City, NY

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2068 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Robert
Last Name : Mangham
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2657 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Sandra

Last Name : Mango

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Do not compromise the town of Old Lyme by allowing tracks to be built through the town....It is a beautiful, idylic setting and deserves to be preserved...

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #556 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/4/2016

First Name : Steven

Last Name : Manicastri

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Having more efficient transportation will greatly increase the ability for people living in the Storrs-Hartford area to move more freely and reduce traffic. We have large populations of international students and employees at UCONN who are not able to purchase cars and come from countries with reliable public transportation. Not only are they put at a disadvantage by not being able to move with ease, but we also look really backwards when we cannot provide a service that the majority of the developed world provides efficiently. Building a rail system will do wonders to our economy, create better flow of traffic, and most importantly help thousands of people find work by providing reliable transportation.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1183 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : Kathryn
Last Name : Manson
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I own land and house in Old Lyme on the Four Mile River adjacent to the railroad.(Mailing address elsewhere) I use Amtrak all the time to travel there. However, I have heard nothing about this before so I am wondering how my property will be affected. Could you please address what happens at that location. What changes would happen with each alternative. Thank you

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3051 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Stephen

Last Name : Maples

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I would like to encourage selection of Alternative 3 on the basis of it's abilities to to alter mode choice and development in order to maximize climate change mitigation and minimize environmental justice inequities. While the investment may be steep, it will pale in comparison to the worst effects of drastic (or even moderate) climate change.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2065 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : James

Last Name : Marano

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #853 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/11/2016
First Name : Susan
Last Name : Marcus
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I support Alternative 1, in part because I think its more doable than Alternative 2, but also because I live in Kingston RI and depend on the Regional service to get to NYC and Washington.

I have ridden the trains all my long life and would love to think that the Bos-Wash corridor could expand to include train routes through regions of New England that currently are less populated (U Conn), but I don't see American having an appetite for such an expansion of rail service.

Trains should go faster and I realize that means track realignment but that is covered somewhat in Alternative 1.

Some parts of the train line between New Haven and Kingston are unsustainably close to the coast, but again those would be addressed in Alternative 1.

The updating of tracks and tunnels around NYC should be the highest priority or the whole system may fail.

Please keep improving and expanding service. Don't cut service from existing routes! Thank you.

susan marcus

So the next speaker is now Curt Marden.

MR. MARDEN: Yes, it is. Association for Public Transit. I actually have a graphic I'd like to put up, which is actually a follow-on to what Brad was speaking about, passenger delivery.

MS. SIEGEL: I don't know if we have -- I don't know if we can accommodate that, but we can certainly have you send that to the team so we can have it.

MR. MARDEN: Okay. It's just a pdf.

MS. SIEGEL: Can you make your remarks, and then we can exchange the graphics separately?

MR. MARDEN: Certainly.

MS. SIEGEL: Curt, just introduce yourself.

MR. MARDEN: My name is Curt Marden. I'm a professional engineer, registered in Massachusetts, board member of the Association for Public Transit. I have a long-standing interest in transit issues in the eastern part of Massachusetts, particularly rail.

My comments are that the plans that were presented tonight look extremely promising; they have absolutely commendable goals. But following on to what Brad was saying as far as passenger delivery, I want to emphasize also myself that connecting North and South Stations is going to create logistical opportunities for actually being able to have those volumes of trains operating on the corridor.

In order to be able to make up those train sets, you have to have a place to put them. There's real estate on the other side of the Charles River, which is rapidly disappearing, which used to be yards, for example, that are inaccessible to South Station easily.

Additionally, on the passenger delivery side, the number of right-of-ways that have been lost over the past 50 to 60 years is really profound in eastern Massachusetts, and many of them are being targeted for recreational trails, as opposed to being reinvested into feeder connections to our existing spoke network.

As it stands right now, by my analysis of old maps, you have existing right-of-way from basically Lowell to Walpole. If you actually built a loop connection line between those points, you would connect almost all the commuter rails, and that would create the outer rim of the spokes, making a lot more connectivity. There certainly is demand for circumferential traffic, as we can see on 128 and 495 every day.

Additionally, these also go through communities, which I'm not proposing that this would be a high-speed, but it would be a feeder to get into it, because as it stands right now, you've got to come all the way into Boston to get

to the NEC. There is no other way to do it, except perhaps by car. And if you have people coming in, then you have, again, a concentration as opposed to a dispersed network, which will bring more people to the corridor without the associated traffic, per se.

So that's basically what my graphic describes.

So to top it off, I think part of this plan needs to certainly integrate the local NPOs as far as the planning process, and to really bring to their attention that arguing that turning these unused right-of-ways into trails as some sort of traffic or congestion mitigation is patently untrue, and that they're being turned into something which is of far higher value as a mass transit opportunity for the region. Thank you.

MS. SIEGEL: Thank you very much.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1496 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Seibert

Last Name : Margaret

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Alternative 1 seems to gain very little not only in travel time saved but also for future growth and need. The village of Old Lyme is also an historic one and is as important to retain the history of the area as it is to wisely develop rail service to region. It is a small hamlet, whereas the northern routes provide much needed service to Hartford, UConn and Green Airport in RI...plus a great gain in travel time. Alternate 2 would easily be added to future expansions, but there are too many hurdles for Alt 3 to be a viable option in near future. Alternate 1 is shortsighted and just spoils a natural resource and historic district for 35 mins and few additional passengers to be worth it.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #807 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Howard

Last Name : Margules

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Fiqure outr a way to put the RR in a place that does not distroy Olsd Lyme

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1948 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mary Jo

Last Name : Margules

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

This is a bad idea.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2603 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Brian
Last Name : Mari
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2316 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Tip

Last Name : Markmaitree

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

Sincerely,

Tip Markmaitree

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1809 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Vesna
Last Name : Markovic
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2053 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Ted

Last Name : Markowitz

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do NOT destroy the Lyme Academy College environs by choosing Alternative 1. There are better solutions that leave this pristine area as is which have other benefits to the state and its citizens as well such as providing better train access to inland communities.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1903 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Barbara
Last Name : Marks
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal for several reasons.

1. It will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

2. It will destroy the heart of a historic district (town of Old Lyme)

3. It will be a blight on the landscape; negatively and permanently impacting a vital saltwater wetlands area that ought to be preserved, not allowed to perish.

4. Alternatives 2 and 3 are far better in terms of planning for the future, and trying to anticipate need and demand rather than just try to keep up with it.

Respectfully,
Barbara Marks

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #715 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/10/2016

First Name : Howard

Last Name : Marks

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

It's important to offer NEC service at bargain rates to lure students out of energy wasteful and congestion causing buses. It's not enough to cater to the those of means and on expense accounts. Raise the tunnels so double-decker passengers changes with dense seating can service the corridor.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1918 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Stephen
Last Name : Marmon
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am a longtime observer of the Northeast corridor, having covered Amtrak and the Department of Transportation for The New York Times in the early 1970s and also have written about Amtrak for Money magazine. I urge the FRA to favor the CT inland route, which will ensure the shortest runs and improve commuter traffic on the existing corridor.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3054 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Allie
Last Name : Marsh
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

My name is Allison Marsh and
I would like state that I strongly oppose the Alternative 1 plan. There are many studies which show the adverse effects of the air quality near the highway. It is not fair to also subject the people who live near the interstate with the added burdens of excessive noise and vibration from the trains. This creates an injustice for these citizens. Presently the train tracks and I-95 are spread out which lets our citizens share the burden.
I am also concerned with the burden on our environment and the protected areas along the mouth of the CT River and also the Lieutenant River. These areas are special as there are certain species of plants and wildlife which thrive in the salt and brackish waters unique to that part of the river. The view of this part of the Connecticut River - one of the nicest rivers in our country -is beautiful with the historic RR bridge that is existing. Many people have fought long and hard to clean and protect the view of the Connecticut River for generations to come. The diagonal crossing the suggested new RR bridge would only clutter the view. Presently train passengers enjoy a beautiful scenery the way they travel now which happens to be closer to my home than if the proposed tracks go through.
Old Lyme, CT is a beautiful town that generations have prided themselves with the value we place in historic preservation.
I'm sure you also value historic and environmental protection, so please consider eliminating alternative 1 from your further review.
Thank you,
Allie Marsh

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #529 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/3/2016

First Name : Edward

Last Name : Marsh

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The location of the railroad through our town is terrible already and you are suggesting we need another line through our town. The Connecticut River is one of the only, if not the only river on the east coast that has NO industrial eyesores on its banks.It has remained that way because the citizens of the area protected and privately controlled the land on both sides of the river. No real thanks to government. Adding an additional line north of the existing tracks but south of I 95 would ruin the existing river mouth. The existing tracks are and always have been an eyesore. Why do we want to add to that? If you must add new tracks, remove the old ones and move the whole mess further inland. The added service will never amount to much, because no one rides the train in the first place. The rail service just doesn't work well in rural areas. Never has, never will!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3052 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Geoff
Last Name : Marsh
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Hello,

I would like to comment that I strongly oppose the Alternative 1 plan that would essentially further burden the people in Old Lyme who already live near the highway with added noise that would come from the train. There are many studies which show the adverse effects of the air quality near the interstates. It is not fair to also subject the people who live near the interstate with the added burdens of excessive noise and vibration from the trains.

I am also concerned with the burden on our environment and the protected areas along the mouth of the CT River and also the Lieutenant River which would have much disturbance with such a large project. These areas are special as there are certain species of plants and wildlife which thrive in the salt and brackish waters unique to that part of the river. The view of this part of the Connecticut River - one of the nicest rivers in our country -is beautiful with the historic RR bridge that is existing. Many people have fought long and hard to clean and protect the view of the Connecticut Rivet for generations to come. The diagonal crossing the suggested new RR bridge would only clutter the view from the Baldwin bridge and from the River. Presently train passengers enjoy a beautiful scenery the way they travel now which happens to be closer to my home than if the proposed tracks go through.

Old Lyme, CT is a beautiful town that generations have prided themselves with the value we place in historic preservation.

I'm sure you also value historic and environmental protection, so please consider eliminating alternative 1 from your further review.

Thank you,

Geoff Marsh

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #504 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/2/2016
First Name : Linda
Last Name : Marsh
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I have just been make aware of the proposal that would put a railroad right through the heart of our beautiful & historic town of Old Lyme. This plan is absolutely absurd & I can not believe it is even under consideration. This would decimate the heart of our town destroying neighborhoods & historic buildings. This plan needs to be scraped & the present railroad already in place revamped.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3047 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Sophie

Last Name : Marsh

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Hello,

I would like to comment that I strongly oppose the Alternative 1 plan that would essentially further burden the people in Old Lyme who already live near the highway with added noise that would come from the train, not to mention the fact that it would decimate our historic district which is of utmost important to the citizens of our town.

I am also concerned with the burden on our environment and the protected areas along the CT River and also the Lieutenant River which would have much disturbance with such a large project.

We already have our wetlands stressed with the existing train tracks and what's done is done there, but I cannot imagine the detrimental impact this would have on the River banks. The view of this part of the Connecticut River - one of the nicest rivers in our country -is beautiful with the historic RR bridge that is existing. The diagonal river crossing the suggested new RR bridge would only clutter the view from the Baldwin bridge and from the River. Presently train passengers enjoy a beautiful scenery the way they travel now which happens to be closer to my home than if the proposed tracks go through.

Old Lyme, CT is a beautiful town that generations have prided themselves with the value we place in historic preservation.

I'm sure you also value historic and environmental protection, so please consider eliminating alternative 1 from your further review.

Thank you,

Sophie Marsh

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2073 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Catherine J.

Last Name : Marshall

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1161 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/13/2016

First Name : Robbie

Last Name : Marshall

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I don't know how we're expected to comment without knowing the details. They need to call some big meetings in the schools and Town Halls and make presentations; with complete plans, costs, and time frames. Then the different towns can weight in.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1451 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Julie

Last Name : Martel

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I agree that we should invest in the railroad system in the NE corridor. There are areas that can be improved, such as the Old Saybrook bridge over the Connecticut River, which can be ameliorated to improve overall service on current lines. However, I do not see that the benefit outweighs the cost and impact of Alternative 1. Alternative 1 will have a very negative impact on the town of Old Lyme, including the wildlife and natural habitats and does not significantly enhance train travel through the area. Alternatives 2 and 3, which expand rail travel in the northeast, could be beneficial but much more work is needed to study the impacts and refine the cost-benefit. I would like to see Alternative 1 removed from consideration and Alternatives 2 and 3 require extensive study including identifying sources of funding. The first step is to optimize the lines currently in place.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2285 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Donna

Last Name : Martell

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please find another way. Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts has shared immeasurable riches with artists and art communities across the entire country. It's unthinkable that such an icon of the representational art world should disappear.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1021 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/12/2016

First Name : Fred

Last Name : Martin

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Progress in mass transit is important for the U.S. economy, but not at the cost of destroying our heritage and entire towns. Alternative 1 route thru The center of Old Lyme, Ct is a thoughtless proposal inconsiderate of the people and history of this pristine area. It must be eliminated as an alternative!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #314 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 1/27/2016
First Name : James P.
Last Name : Martin
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am a resident of Garden City living in the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed railroad path. This is a highly contested and over utilized area that will definitely be impacted from a quality of life perspective by any more activity taking place near it.

We do not need this proposed railroad adding to the congestion in this area which already includes through traffic from other towns, Stewart School Traffic, Roosevelt Field Mall and other shopping center traffic.

Vote No on this issue.

Sincerely,

James P. Martin

Garden City Resident

Sent from my iPad

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1025 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/12/2016

First Name : Marie

Last Name : Martin

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear FRA:

I am an active volunteer at the Florence Griswold Museum in Old Lyme, Connecticut. Have members of this committee proposing Alternative 1 route of a high speed railway ever visited our museum or walked the town of Old Lyme? If they have, this Alternative would never have been proposed. It is ludicrous to suggest that this route would be environmentally positive to the town of Old Lyme and the historical buildings and land it would disrupt. Therefore I am opposed to this alternative and outraged that it would ever appear on paper or be presented for consideration. Sincerely, Marie A Martin

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2600 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Chris
Last Name : Martinez
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #188 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/16/2016

First Name : Patricia

Last Name : Martinez

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a Long Islander, I am most alarmed by Alternative 3 in this plan. Long Island is too densely populated and too built up to accommodate high speed rail. In my hometown of Floral Park, the high speed rail would follow the LIRR tracks directly through our town. ANY expansion along this line would be detrimental to our village and its homeowners. The tracks run alongside BOTH of our elementary schools, as well as our pool and recreation complex. Many homes and businesses abut the current tracks with little or no room to spare. I cannot begin to fathom the noise, pollution, and danger that trains travelling 160mph to 220mph would bring to our area. We are already able to connect easily to the current NEC via the Long Island Rail Road to Manhattan. There is no need and no room to bring high speed trains to our island.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1782 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Tiffany

Last Name : Martinez

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

Waletzko, LeAnn

From: Amishi.Castelli@dot.gov
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 9:29 AM
To: Waletzko, LeAnn
Subject: FW: Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Draft Programmatic Agreement

FYI (on response, in case you need it). He Cc'd the world, so I accidentally forgot to Cc you on this! –A.

From: Castelli, Amishi (VOLPE)
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 11:25 AM
To: 'David Weeden'
Cc: Ramona Peters; Reyes-Alicea, Rebecca (FRA); Blatnica, Rebecca (VOLPE); Ruby.Siegel@aecom.com; Susan.Anderson@aecom.com; Selina.Zapata.Bur@aecom.com; kfanizzo@achp.gov; cvaughn@achp.gov; cwilson@achp.gov; Patel, Elizabeth (FTA); Koenig, Daniel (FTA); Quagliata, Antoinette (FTA); Serassio, Helen (FTA)
Subject: RE: Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Draft Programmatic Agreement

Hi David and Ramona- Thank you for your comment. As we are in the official comment period for the Tier 1 Draft EIS (and Draft Programmatic Agreement), your comment will be reviewed and addressed in the Tier 1 Final EIS, as is the case for all comments we receive during this period.

However, the Programmatic Agreement will be executed prior to the finalization and release of the Tier 1 Final EIS. Since your comment is particular to the Programmatic Agreement, you can expect to see a response to your comment prior to finalization and execution of the Programmatic Agreement.

Thank you for your comment. Best, Amishi

From: David Weeden [mailto:DWeeden@mwtribe.com]
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 9:39 AM
To: Castelli, Amishi (VOLPE)
Cc: Ramona Peters; Reyes-Alicea, Rebecca (FRA); Blatnica, Rebecca (VOLPE); Ruby.Siegel@aecom.com; Susan.Anderson@aecom.com; Selina.Zapata.Bur@aecom.com; kfanizzo@achp.gov; cvaughn@achp.gov; cwilson@achp.gov; Patel, Elizabeth (FTA); Koenig, Daniel (FTA); Quagliata, Antoinette (FTA); Serassio, Helen (FTA)
Subject: RE: Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Draft Programmatic Agreement

Amishi Castelli,

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe's Historic Preservation Department needs to be added on page N-2 Line 75 (Rhode Island). Our ancestral lands area with the area and are a concern when reviewing projects.
Please send confirmation to the revision requested.

We look forward to working with you as the project develops.

Have a Blessed Day,

David Weeden

David Weeden

Deputy THPO
Historic Preservation Department
Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe
483 Great Neck Rd., South
Mashpee, MA 02649
Ph: 508.477.0208*102
E-mail: Dweeden@mwtribe.com

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2232 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Pankhuri

Last Name : Masih

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2703 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Michelle
Last Name : Mason
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Commission,
I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. The proposal would negatively impact the academic experience of students at the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1697 DETAIL

Status : Unread

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Leslie

Last Name : Massa

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Improving rail travel to move vehicles off the road is a great idea BUT please look at the entire issue not just the one issue. The stretch of 95 from Old Lyme, Ct on eastward is slated for widening to improve the safety of that stretch. The new rail will compete for that space. AND precious coastline and ecosystems are fragile and in direct threat from those projects. So is the historic town of old lyme. Please take a step back and look at the entirety of the project in light of the other very real factors and please reject alternative 1.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1698 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mark

Last Name : Massa

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Although I support investment in improving our northeast corridor rail service, I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option for the following reasons:

1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character. This may seem insignificant to those of you who have never visited Old Lyme, but our town represents an historic jewel. The village of Old Lyme is only a few blocks long, but our town was the epicenter of the American Impressionist art movement over 100 years ago. The quiet village, the tranquil marshes and the surrounding Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers have provided inspiration for thousands of artists and their paintings ever since those early days of the Lyme Art Colony. The area mapped for the new rail line cuts right through the town center, and its construction would forever change the Old Lyme landscape currently characterized by the Lyme Art Academy, the Florence Griswold Museum (a National Historic Landmark), the tranquil Lieutenant River and other historic gems.

2) Alternative #1 would adversely affect the wildlife of the Lieutenant River and Connecticut River, home to osprey, eagles and the amazing "swallow phenomenon" that has captured the attention of the Audobon Society and birders from all over the world. This dramatic behavior, called murmuration, occurs when over half a million swallows swarm in a tornado-like congregation and descend in unison on the marshes of the lower Connecticut River, each evening at dusk in August and September. This natural phenomenon is so large that it can be seen on weather radar. However, the nature of bridge construction as well as the high speed train itself will restructure the marshland habitat through noise, pollutants, vibrations, and habitat fragmentation. As has been documented repeatedly in the scientific literature, these factors will inevitably have a lasting and irreparable impact the survivorship of these birds as well as all other species in the fragile marshland ecosystem.

3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won't get us there. Large businesses are lining up to leave the state because our transportation infrastructure is virtually nonexistent and our taxation policies are crippling. We need an innovative economic plan and the large scale investment needed to connect ALL of our major cities, not just a small patch of new rail through the town of Old Lyme. We need to implement a rail system that will connect our capital city, Hartford, to New Haven, Providence, Boston and New York. We need to connect UCONN, our largest public university and medical center that is currently isolated in Storrs, CT to these cities as well. Alternative #2 would accomplish both of these objectives and would help put Connecticut back on track to be a competitive force in New England and an attractive option for business growth.

Thank you for your attention

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1707 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Michael
Last Name : Massa
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am 24 and grew up in Old Lyme. Since then, I have traveled and worked in some very beautiful places in the world but still consider the coastal communities of eastern Connecticut to have a natural and historic beauty that is worth protecting fiercely. I support investment in improving our northeast corridor rail service, but I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option for the following reasons:

1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character. This may seem insignificant to those of you who have never visited Old Lyme, but our town represents an historic jewel. The village of Old Lyme is only a few blocks long, but our town was the epicenter of the American Impressionist art movement over 100 years ago. The quiet village, the tranquil marshes and the surrounding Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers have provided inspiration for thousands of artists and their paintings ever since those early days of the Lyme Art Colony. The area mapped for the new rail line cuts right through the town center, and its construction would forever change the Old Lyme landscape currently characterized by the Lyme Art Academy, the Florence Griswold Museum (a National Historic Landmark), the tranquil Lieutenant River and other historic gems.

2) Alternative #1 would adversely affect the wildlife of the Lieutenant River and Connecticut River, home to osprey, eagles and the amazing "swallow phenomenon" that has captured the attention of the Audobon Society and birders from all over the world. This dramatic behavior, called murmuration, occurs when over half a million swallows swarm in a tornado-like congregation and descend in unison on the marshes of the lower Connecticut River, each evening at dusk in August and September. This natural phenomenon is so large that it can be seen on weather radar. However, the nature of bridge construction as well as the high speed train itself will restructure the marshland habitat through noise, pollutants, vibrations, and habitat fragmentation. As has been documented repeatedly in the scientific literature, these factors will inevitably have a lasting and irreparable impact the survivorship of these birds as well as all other species in the fragile marshland ecosystem.

3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won't get us there. Large businesses are lining up to leave the state because our transportation infrastructure is virtually nonexistent and our taxation policies are crippling. We need an innovative economic plan and the large scale investment needed to connect ALL of our major cities, not just a small patch of new rail through the town of Old Lyme. We need to implement a rail system that will connect our capital city, Hartford, to New Haven, Providence, Boston and New York. We need to connect UCONN, our largest public university and medical center that is currently isolated in Storrs, CT to these cities as well. Alternative #2 would accomplish both of these objectives and would help put Connecticut back on track to be a competitive force in New England and an attractive option for business growth.

4) from what I have been told, the improved speed is not very significant and the costs (financial, environmental, natural, historic) seem monumental.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #550 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/4/2016
First Name : Ed
Last Name : Hood
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please see attached

Ed Hood
Executive Director
Opacum Land Trust
www.opacumlt.org
P.O. Box 245, Hardwick, MA 01037

MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership Coordinator
www.opacumlt.org/massconn

Office: 413-477-1061, Mobile: [redacted]

MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership
c/c/o Norcross Wildlife Sanctuary ~ 30 Peck Road ~ Monson, MA 01057
http://www.opacumlt.org/massconn

NEC FUTURE
U.S. DOT Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

February 4, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

I submit these comments to the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on behalf of the MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership (MassConn), and with the approval of its steering committee, cc'd at the bottom of this letter. MassConn is a voluntary association of land conservation organizations, municipal, state and federal agencies, and foresters serving a region of 38 towns spanning the border of South-Central Massachusetts and Northeastern Connecticut. MassConn partners work together to indentify key areas for conservation, promote sustainable forestry practices, and organize public educational events. Recognizing that political boundaries are irrelevant to plant and animal communities, we work together to ensure contiguous and connected forested areas for species to migrate, interbreed, and shift their ranges in response to changes in the environment. We applaud the effort that went into this process, but have a number of concerns that we feel need to be addressed during the next planning phase.

Our primary concern after reviewing the EIS is that the maps are not sufficient to truly analyze the impacts associated with this project. It is not clear exactly where the intended new rail lines would lie on the landscape and many protected parcels including land trust properties, private properties conserved with conservation easements, and municipal lands are not taken into account. Providing a geospatial line for the public to insert into their own geographic information systems (GIS) will allow interested parties to better assess the impacts that the project will have on natural and recreational resources.

The area of greatest concern to MassConn is Northeast Connecticut, which is proposed to be traversed by Alternatives 2 & 3. This region is known as the Quiet Corner and provides an important connection for wildlife moving north and south from northern New England to Long Island Sound. This region is part of The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor designated by congress in 1994. It is also designated as a Forest Legacy area by the U.S. Forest Service and received over 2 million dollars in federal funding for forest conservation in 2015.

The importance of this area lies in the large tracts of open forest and farmland including Natchaug State Forest and Mansfield Hollow State Park that provide sanctuaries and stopovers for migrating species. Additionally, relatively sparse development in this region makes it a stronghold for many species. Bisecting this

region with a railway will immediately create forest fragmentation which will change many forest interior habitats. Many species rely on large unbroken tracts of forest for breeding, feeding, etc. and when these forests are cut with roads, railways, or development, edge habitats are created. These edges cause an increase in predation, an increase in sunlight that changes species composition, and ultimately many of these factors lower survival for key interior species. The railway will also have a compounding effect on these increasingly rare habitats. Once a rail line is established in this area, it will increase the development pressure on the region causing more land conversions and ultimately reducing the amount of available forest or open space for wildlife.

Additionally, the EIS very clearly states that no field investigations occurred as part of the analysis. Without field investigations, it is impossible to know the true impacts to key habitats like high-quality wetlands and vernal pools or rare pitch pine forests which often are not represented in current GIS data. These sites are home to rare species and important breeding habitats that cannot be replaced when destroyed.

Lastly, as a group of land conservation organizations that have been working on land acquisition in Connecticut for decades, Alternatives 2 and 3 do not seem feasible or cost effective. Connecticut is a densely populated state with mostly small acreages spread across the landscape. With property costs averaging some of the highest across the country, the cost of solely acquiring the land needed to establish these new corridors would be exorbitant and would take decades to accomplish if even possible.

For the many reasons listed above MassConn favors Alternative 1 that mostly follows current railway lines, but makes many necessary improvements to increase passenger rail for the future. Thank you for your consideration of MassConn's comments.

Sincerely,

Ed Hood

Ed Hood
Coordinator, MassConn Sustainable Forest Partnership
Executive Director, Opacum Land Trust

Cc, the MassConn Steering Committee:
Dan Donahue, Norcross Wildlife Foundation
Leslie Duthie, Norcross Wildlife Foundation and Town of Monson, MA Conservation Commission
James Gage, Northern Connecticut Land Trust
Cynthia Henshaw, East Quabbin Land Trust
Michael Hveem, Joshua's Trust
Bill Labich, Highstead Foundation
Jennifer Ohop, Norcross Wildlife Foundation and Opacum Land Trust
Lindsay Suhr, Connecticut Forest & Parks Assoc.
Mark Wamsley, Kestrel Land Trust

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2998 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Cheryl
Last Name : Dustin
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Good Afternoon,

Please find the attached letter addressed to Rebecca Reyes-Alicea and signed by Stephanie Pollack, Secretary and CEO of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If you have any question or if I can further assist, please do not hesitate to contact me at (857)368-8892.

Regards, Cheryl Dustin

Cheryl Dustin
Executive Assistant to
Stephanie Pollack
Secretary & CEO
MassDOT
10 Park Plaza, Suite 4160
Boston, MA 02116
(857)368-8892

Attachments : LTR - Reyes-Alicea - NEC Future - 2.16.16.pdf (142 kb)

Charles D. Baker, Governor
Karyn E. Polito, Lieutenant Governor
Stephanie Pollack, MassDOT Secretary & CEO

massDOT
Massachusetts Department of Transportation

February 16, 2016

Rebecca Reyes-Alicea
USDOT, Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Railroad Policy & Development
Mail Stop 20
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Re: NEC Future

Dear Ms. Reyes-Alicia:

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation has a longstanding and strong interest in the Northeast Corridor (NEC) and its future. There are many reasons for this:

- The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority owns and operates service on the line that the NEC uses in Massachusetts. That line includes South Station, which is the northern terminus of the NEC and Boston's largest commuter rail terminal.

- Over 50% of Boston-New York travelers reportedly use Amtrak. This is an important connection for Boston's financial and innovation sectors and other parts of Massachusetts' economy.

- Because Amtrak's NEC service is available, Massachusetts can maximize the capacity of Boston's Logan Airport for international and longer distance domestic destinations.

- Massachusetts and the Federal Railroad Administration have made substantial investments in the Knowledge Corridor, improving economic opportunities in the Pioneer Valley by facilitating access to the mainline NEC.

Massachusetts needs and benefits from intercity passenger rail. Our appreciation of intercity passenger rail increases with every business person who chooses Acela over a flight from Logan to LaGuardia, with every student who takes the Northeast Regional service to Northampton or Boston, and with every tourist who uses Amtrak as a pleasant way to begin a New England vacation.

Massachusetts long ago acquired our portion of the NEC because we knew then that it would become a pivotal part of our transportation system. We understand its current importance and are confident that its regional significance will continue to increase. We want to share in an NEC that is in a State of Good Repair (SGR) and that provides reliable and frequent service that connects Massachusetts' cities to key locations throughout the Northwest. We understand

Ten Park Plaza, Suite 4160, Boston, MA 02116
Tel: 857-368-4636, TTY: 857-368-0655
www.mass.gov/massdot

that the NEC can transform not only the way we travel in the Northeast, but also the way that the region's population centers grow and connect.
With that background, we offer the following comments on NEC Future:

1. The clearest need for the Northeast Corridor is achieving a State of Good Repair (SGR). Yet the NEC Future Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not contain an alternative that would simply accomplish that goal – a condition that is basic to good service, but which has been has been consistently out of reach. This document would have been far more relevant if it had provided a framework for getting this chronically underfunded publicly owned railroad into a State of Good Repair. [1] Because neither the No Action Alternative nor Alternative 1 clearly represents a State of Good Repair, it is difficult to determine what it would cost to reach SGR – a threshold that the Corridor states have traditionally identified as a starting point for further state investment.

2. While not specifically a plan to achieve SGR, Alternative 1 identifies several chokepoints that are well known as places where additional investment would improve the reliability of current service (p. 4-45). Canton Junction to Readville in Massachusetts is certainly one such chokepoint and we greatly appreciate its inclusion in Alterative 1. We also heartily endorse the categorization of South Station's expansion, which is listed as a "universal" project that would be included in all the Action Alternatives (pp. 10-3, 5). South Station expansion is an important investment in the future of both Amtrak and commuter rail service in Massachusetts. It would have been helpful to have more detail on the other elements of Alternative 1, particularly those that might be categorized as State of Good Repair or as programmatic upgrades of existing facilities such as the signal system between Providence and Boston.

3. The high level concepts presented in Alternatives 2 and 3 are difficult to grapple with. Alternative 2 seems to generally follow the existing right of way in Massachusetts, but it is not clear whether the new segments would require any land taking – an issue that would be important for state and local stakeholders to understand. The depiction of Alternative 3 on pages 46-47 and page 25 in the Mapping Atlas seems to suggest a wholly separate new right of way through Worcester County with an aerial structure going through Worcester and tunnels on either side of that city. Page 25 in the Mapping Atlas also indicates a 20+ mile tunnel coming into Boston from the west, an 8+ mile tunnel coming in from the south, and an aerial structure being used on the approach to Back Bay Station. These are radical proposals that could have significant local impacts, yet there is only minimal information about them in the text. [2]

---

1. The No Action Alternative does not include reaching a State of Good Repair (p.4-34) or the critical infrastructure projects (such as the Baltimore Tunnels) that will plainly need to be addressed at some point (p. 9-6). Alternative 1 "maintains the role of rail as it is today" but is not focused on condition and includes new services to meet expected new demand.
2. Some of the information is confusing and contradictory. Figure 4-21 seems to propose two "new" stations for Alternative 3: one at Beacon Park and another inexplicably close to existing Back Bay

4. The NEC can offer significant economic benefits to the cities and regions that it serves, particularly if it is to be as transformative as NEC Future suggests. Massachusetts is therefore very disappointed that Alternatives 2 and 3 exclude any route that would include Springfield, Massachusetts. The Commonwealth and the city of Springfield have actively supported Federal and State investments in rail projects such as the Knowledge Corridor and Springfield Union Station, having identified improved rail service and connectivity a major economic strategy. Even if there is a valid rationale for not running the new NEC route through Springfield and instead making it part of a regional service, this document should provide more information on that regional service – what would it include, how would it be defined, what its service characteristics would be, what populations and travel patterns would it serve, and how much would it cost. Such information about this and other regional services feeding the NEC could help generate the broad support that the NEC Future's vision seeks to create.

5. There is no clear connection between NEC Future's high level plans and the ongoing planning undertaken by the corridor's host communities. In Massachusetts many municipalities are relatively small and local planning is the mainstay of land use. Except where the work contemplated is confined to the existing right of way, the information provided lacks the detail needed to identify any synergy or conflict between an Alternative and the host community's vision for its future. An Alternative that proposes a new right of way, a tunnel, or a viaduct somewhere in a broadly defined corridor stretching across an area that includes several cities and towns does not help either the public or local officials determine whether and to what extent they are potential stakeholders.[3]

6. The document provides much less information than was hoped for on how freight and intercity passenger rail can share the system. Is a costly new right of way the only alternative? The discussion of other options in section 5.3.1.3 is extremely brief. This is a topic that is particularly important to Massachusetts since we have invested heavily in preserving freight rail corridors and we regularly provide state-funded grants to improve industrial rail access.

7. It is difficult to understand the overarching logic that produced the distribution of service in Figure 5-6. Under some scenarios a few currently served stations would see service increase from 10-20 trains to 220 trains per day (Newark Liberty and New Rochelle) or from some 5 trains per day to 275 trains per day (Hartford). The increases at major stations are generally more modest. These outcomes may represent logical choices given the constraints at major stations and new growth that could occur in smaller cities. However, the text does not clearly address the degree to which these service patterns represent railroad constraints or regional

---

station. Yet neither new station appears in the Mapping Atlas (p. 25) showing the representative route for Alternative 3 in Massachusetts.

3. Not all resources in Massachusetts have been identified and Table 7.4-6 does not clearly identify the parks described. Also, in Table 7.5 Boston Harbor is incorrectly named Boston Bay.

growth choices. Both can be important factors and we would like to understand their interplay.

8. While we understand that it is very hard to deal with costs and funding in a Tier 1 EIS and so little information is traditionally required in those areas, the document would have benefited from a more detailed unpacking of the cost estimates that are provided and from some discussion of cost control measures that might help reduce the enormous funding gap between available resources and even the No Action Alternative. It is very unlikely that any combination of state and current Federal funding could address the identified need, so what will be the framework for prioritizing and funding the investments that are ultimately recommended through this process? That unknown inhibits Massachusetts' appreciation for the vison of NEC Future. Without a better sense of what these investments will cost and how they could be funded issues, it is difficult to understand how the Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak would move forward to not only transform the railroad, but also potentially change the growth patterns of the states and major cities along the Corridor.

We want to thank your staff and the consultants who have worked so hard on the Tier 1 EIS. They have helped to guide us through the process and have fielded many questions. Given the scope of their task – and the variety of interests and challenges on the Corridor – their work has been remarkable. As our comments above indicate we feel that there are still many very important issues to be addressed through this process, but we look forward to a stronger NEC and we appreciate the vision and determination that NEC Future has brought to achieving that end.

Very truly yours,

Stephanie Pollack
Secretary & CEO
Massachusetts Department of Transportation

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #992 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/11/2016
First Name : Erik
Last Name : Madsen
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

High speed rail lines are more than just solutions to congestion in transportation. We should fully appreciate the other intrinsic benefits of high speed rail to a civilization. High speed rail systems are:

-Iconic of the identity of the place
-A point of pride of the place
-Symbolic of having future vision
-Representative of complex collaboration of government and industry
-Indicative of economic solvency
-Evidence of a vision to plan for the future
-Anticipatory of an increase in transportation demand
-Able to concentrate development around transit stations
-Raising real estate values
-Cosmopolitan
-Freeing people's commute time to do other things than drive
-Likely to attract individuals and businesses to locate in the region
-Likely to motivate individuals and businesses to stay in the region
-A safer means of transportation
-A less costly means of transportation
-A less polluting means of transportation
-Faster than automobile travel

These intrinsic benefits of high speed rail can have a net economic value much higher than the cost of the project itself. Does anyone think the Japanese Bullet train was a novelty in 1964? Who bemoans the ease and speed one can move about the EU? Could China, Taiwan, South Korea, Sweden, and Turkey all be misguided?

The USA should have embraced high speed rail decades ago. The consequences of not doing so are:
-An economy hobbled by poor transportation.
-Higher prices for goods and services
-The exodus of people and industry from urban centers due to a lack of infrastructure
-Investments in road infrastructure that never relieve congestion
-Attempts to brand buses as a superior alternative to rail

Yes high speed rail is expensive. Urban areas pose complex challenges for new projects. Planning will take years. Many years will be needed for construction. So be it, let's get started. Politicians must concentrate on having a vision for the future and act on that vision today. This is the most powerful and technologically advanced country in the world that deserves to have a transportation system it can be proud of.

All other high speed rail lines in the world have succeeded and expanded over time. We can expect similar success if we focus on a new high speed rail line from DC to Boston.

Although more costly to construct, the option of new service from NYC to Danbury to Hartford to Providence will integrate all the metropolitan regions of Connecticut into the system thus greatly adding to the overall viability of the system. Furthermore increases in ridership on Amtrak will also raise use of Metro North and vice versa. These same gains in ridership will not be achieved if the route remains on the coast of Connecticut. Additionally concepts like commuter rail from, white plains to Danbury, and Waterbury to Bristol could fail to be viable without this route. If this route as conceptualized parallels Interstate I-84 which has high vehicle traffic it would be wise to make use of this proximity to convert automobile traffic to commuter rail traffic. Thus it would seem logical and justified to add a third and forth track to the line to efficiently handle local traffic too. The two dedicated local tracks would also function to collect passengers for the high speed rail stops and also to transfer to Metro North. Therefore it would be best to implement this new line as four tracks rather than two. The high value of local service along the route would be effective at offsetting local objections to the negative impacts of a limited access high speed rail line. Think about it, why would Connecticut agree to a new rail line that passes through state without citizenry able to access it?

Another important consideration is that high speed rail and freight are incompatible. This line should be be high speed rail only.

This project should seize upon the fact that the CT DOT is in the planning stages of replacing the I-84 viaduct in Hartford. The existing Hartford rail line is crossed twice by the viaduct. Now is the time to anticipate the needs of high speed rail at this location before the opportunity is lost. If Hartford were to choose to heal the damage done by I-84 to its neighborhoods then the highway would need to go below ground . A tunnel could be the best option that could also also go under the CT River. Similarly the rail line could go below ground too.

People 100 years from now will praise the DC to Boston high speed rail line for bringing prosperity to CT. Let's not disappoint them. No half measures! Be bold! Think big! Build it!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #895 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Thomas

Last Name : Mastanduono

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

This would not be good for Long Island.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1804 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Anthony

Last Name : Mastromarino

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1627 DETAIL

Status : Unread

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : JOSEPH

Last Name : MASUCCI

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear NEC Future,

This effort aims to address a problem with solutions that are technologically antiquated, overly expensive, environmentally hazardous and essentially amounts to inefficiently 'catching up to the past' when one considers the size of the capital investment relative to the outcome.

Magnetic levitation technology already exists for almost 100 years. Trains in Japan are faster and safer than what you are looking to build in this plan. To spend this amount of capital and not be considering it, dooms this effort to be damaging to the environment and residential communities, unsafe to the public, and a waste of money and human capital...to produce an outcome that is expensive, antiquated, and ineffective at solving the transportation problem it is aiming at in the first place.

Lastly, plan alternative 3 is completely unrealistic and impossible to implement without doing major economic and environmental damage to Queens and Long Island. Using LI as a pass through to CT, requiring tunneling the sound and irreparably damaging suburban communities, seems over and above wasteful in terms of construction spending compounded by destroying small residential villages. And surely if a pass through LI is the best plan, then there is a better route through than the one being considered. Northern Blvd and Sunrise Highway would seem to have the scale to accommodate this much better. It makes one question the due diligence that has gone into this plan, that's for sure.

This alternative makes it seem as if a bunch of college summer interns came up with the plan, and cast a shadow of doubt over the whole plan, as well as the entire NEC Future organization. Unless you are talking maglev technology, this problem needs to be addressed by other transportation modes (e.g. air) that do not require tracks and electricity.

Sorry if that's not in the best interest of the rail industry, but the rail industry needs to get real and realize it is not the 19th century any longer, and we need capital expenditure in 21st century technology to avoid 'catching up to the past' and being wasteful with taxpayer dollars, human capital and antiquated in our technology.

Thank you,

Joe Masucci
[redacted]
Garden City, NY 11530

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2327 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Maryann

Last Name : Matano

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corrider Futures proposal. Why would you even consider destroying the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts? I strongly oppose this . It's a terrible idea.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2252 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Kimberly
Last Name : Matarese
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

There is no better route than plowing through a historic district and impacting a fragile ecosystem. Digesting. All for a 30 minute train ride.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2984 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Judy & Paul
Last Name : Mateer
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

i wish you would choose a different route. The historical area of Old Lyme is very important to us who live in the area. Another route would be a better choice.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2646 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Edward

Last Name : Mathews

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2982 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Vishal
Last Name : mathur
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2480 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Jill
Last Name : Matthew
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy not only the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven, but the priceless beauty and character of our historic town as well as some of its critical wildlife habitat.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #156 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 1/12/2016
First Name : Mj
Last Name : Max
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Subject: PANYNJ

Sir,
Congress gave Port Authority of NY NJ its power but no one is watching this dysfunctional agency ???
The Port Authority of receives federal funding grants for DOT 49 cfr part 40 for testing, training and grants for PANYNJ . The PA are not in compliance with DOT and FTA drug and alcohol testing (49 CFR Part 40 and part 655) is a continued receipt of federal funds under Sections 5307, 5309, or 5311 but still receive MILLIONS? Annual compliance is required! Education and training program for all covered employees, for supervisors/company officials. WHY does the PA not in compliance but still receive federal funding? WHY??? Wouldn't the BILLIONS be better spent on GATEWAY TUNNELS or rail roads improvement. All federal agencies have turned a blind eye. Christie and Cuomo both said " they have no control over the PA" unless it's to place a childhood friend in a six figure job. The PA needs federal monitoring..... We have a court case involving DOT, lack of due process and PA, it's an excellent read! The PA' s federal funding should be taken away!! BILLIONS that can go towards MTA or NYNJ taxpayers??? Love to send case???
Thank you for your time,

Mjmax227@[redacted]<mailto:Mjmax227@[redacted]>
Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1791 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Daniel

Last Name : May

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven in Old Lyme.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #970 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Joan

Last Name : May

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do not ruin one of the most beautiful towns in America, Old Lyme, CT, by running Amtrak train tracks through picturesque town property. I work in Old Lyme. It is an historic gem, which cannot be duplicated anywhere. Save our special American New England historic towns. Please!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2673 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Philip

Last Name : Mayer

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do everything possible to improve rail service between Washington, DC and Boston. The trains should be able to go far faster and the trip should take 1/2 the time it does now.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2812 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Jack

Last Name : Mayoros

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #702 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/10/2016
First Name : Walter
Last Name : Maze
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

You need to run more trains. Open up service from Allentown pa. To Newark nj..and Allentown pa to Philadelphia PA. To help with highway congestion. Don't wait years do it this year

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1887 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Michelle
Last Name : Mazerolle
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

I attended the University of New Haven for my master's degree many years ago and I have been proud to see the university and its programs flourish. Alternative 1 would destroy so much of what UNH has tried to grow and develop over the past 20 years. Other, more inland, alternatives need to be explored and developed further.

Sincerely,
Michelle Mazerolle

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2819 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Marc

Last Name : Mazzalupo

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Due to the "60-mile bypass between Old Saybrook, CT and Kenyon, RI" stated in Alternative 1, I am concerned about the proposed route and OPPOSE this plan. While I believe strongly there is a need for improved service throughout this region, as a resident of Old Lyme it appears the impact on homes, businesses, and schools would decimate our town. My support is to explore Alternative 3 at this time.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #74 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 12/15/2015

First Name : Briab

Last Name : Mazzarella

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I like alternative 3. Please run the train through Waterbury CT and to Hartford CT.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1729 DETAIL

Status : Pending

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Kenneth

Last Name : McAdams

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

For true Hi-Speed service, run the new line from NYC to Hartford, then on to Boston. It is shorter distance, ie faster. The shore route would destroy vacation villages and totally destroy Old Lyme. Hartford needs rebirth and this would helpe

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1731 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Kenneth

Last Name : McAdams

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

For true Hi-Speed service, run the new line from NYC to Hartford, then on to Boston. It is shorter distance,meaning faster. The shore route would destroy vacation villages and totally destroy Old Lyme. Hartford needs rebirth and this would help.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1888 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Richard

Last Name : McAndrew

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1297 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Tammy

Last Name : McAraw

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do not destroy the beauty and history of one of the few true small towns found in our country.
Old Lyme has worked to preserve the true nature of it's surrounds and it's history.
Please use one other other alternative plans. Do not use plan 1.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #194 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/18/2016

First Name : Joseph

Last Name : McArdle

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Although unfortunately I cannot attend tomorrow's hearing in Newark, I fully support the Tier 1 proposals is in order to improve rail travel in the future on the NE corridor. On a different subject-commercial traffic and shale oil shipments must continue to be closely monitored by FRA- some CSX trains carrying mixed loads including oil are exceeding the 30 MPH limit. I reside less that 200 feet from this line.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1340 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Pat and Blair

Last Name : Mcbeth

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Given the amount of significant strategic deterioration in the U.S .infrastructure to spend vast sums of money that Washington does not have to shave off a few minutes time is both irresponsible and tragic in destroying both Federal and State historical landmarks. At best this is a waste of taxpayers money and at worst a criminally negligent act. How many bridges are crumbling and collapsing and may actually cost real lives are in need of repair? Spending money on this nonessential project , destroying a historic village and property values is an outrage .

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #387 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/29/2016

First Name : Lynn

Last Name : McCaffrey

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a resident of Old Lyme whose property will be affected by the proposedTier 1 Draft.. I am opposed to the plan. The impact on the town's Historic District's character and the plan's proximity to the Region 18 main campus as well as the overwheling damage to the environment makes this an outrageously ridiculous idea. Has anyone on the committee actually seen the town ? Please reconsider this disatrous plan !

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1354 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Kay

Last Name : McCall

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am very disturbed by Alternative 1, and what would be a horrible impact on the beautiful and historic town of Old Lyme.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #599 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/8/2016

First Name : Andrew

Last Name : McCann

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do not destroy Floral Park, Stewart Manor, Garden City, and many other fine communities with your 3rd option. The plans clearly would destroy dense, long-established neighborhoods with much character, history, and high property values. It's hard to find such places so close to NYC. Please try to find a route that goes thru less densely populated and/or more commercial stretches. If you're ever in this area, please feel free to contact me or someone in town, and we'd be happy to show you the beautiful neighborhoods that should continue to exist. Please note that I am not against building out the transportation network but would like to see less impact on quality of life.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3046 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Susan

Last Name : McCann

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I just want to make sure that the plans are considering all impacts to our historic and environmental preservation for generations to come.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1457 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Hilary

Last Name : McCarthy

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Option 1. I believe it will have a detrimental impact on the town of Old Lyme.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #930 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Judy

Last Name : McCarthy

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

My comment is really a question. Has anyone actually been to Old Lyme and looked at the impact that this plan would have on the town and the surrounding sensitive environment? If they have I cannot believe that this plan would still seem feasible. It would destroy the only commercial center in town as well as a beautiful art school. Hopefully common sense will prevail.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2441 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Dr. Keith
Last Name : McCarthy
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly oppose the NEC Alternative Plan 1.
This option will have severe detrimental consequences to the citizens and the infrastructure of Old Lyme, as well as to the environment of the local region.
Furthermore, Alternative 1 is extremely short-sighted, and although it is the least expensive option (other than doing nothing), it results in only limited improvement to the existing service. As outlined in your summary, the Connectivity, Capacity, Performance, and Economic Growth essentially remain unchanged from their current status. With respect to Resiliency, the estimated increase in annual riders (up to 69 millon), appears significant, however this estimate seems quite optimistic, and frankly unrealistic, since there is very few new connections along the existing corridor, which essentially does not change. I can only imagine then, that the estimated increase must be only in those communities outside of Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and therefore offers no benefit to these States. From a local perspective, and as a commuter myself, commuters in these states need more accessible, & local access to the rails. Reduced travel times and cost are obviously desirable, but Alternative 1 does not accomplish any of these in the New England States. Therefore, Alternative 1 will only result in profound negative impacts to the local regions in New England. As such, I am strongly opposed to Alternative 1.
With respect to the other Alternatives. I do believe it is important to invest in the railway infrastructure not only in the Northeast, but for all of the US. A functional, efficient, sustainable and visionary rail system is vital to the economy and to the environment. As such, I am also opposed to the "No-Action" plan.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #899 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Lisa

Last Name : McCarthy

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

It would destroy homes, businesses, The Lyme Art Academy as well as have a very big negative impact on our fragile wetlands.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #582 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/7/2016

First Name : Anne

Last Name : McCarty

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Does Amtrak's vision for NE Corridor include protecting wetlands? Migratory birds? Fragile ecosystems? Cutting down on noise pollution? De-valuing properties? Destroying historic districts? Destroying businesses? Destroying the essence of a community by tearing a town in half and running a railway through it? Seems that not much thought actually went into this plan other than perhaps the long-term profit to be made from "people-moving." It is my hope that this will mobilize folks from several of the communities that will be devastated by this plan to take action and we will work ceaselessly to educate the public about the dire consequences if this project is allowed to carry through.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1494 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Susan

Last Name : McCawley

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Come see what we have and you won't want to change a thing.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1420 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : James

Last Name : Mcclave

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The environmental and residential impact would outweigh any positive.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2524 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Virginia

Last Name : McCormack

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please do not allow railroad tracks to be built in historic areas, "downtown" areas and zones currently occupied by businesses, educational institutions, religious institutions, medical institutions, parks and cemeteries. Nor should they be built in areas where they could damage fragile, environmentally sensitive areas, such as wetlands. Railroads should provide a safe, convenient alternative to use of interstate highways, but they should not be allowed to destroy the irreplaceable areas noted above. If railroads are allowed to destroy the heart of Old Lyme, then they could destroy my town and even yours! Thank you, Ginny McCormack

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1622 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Dana
Last Name : McCoskey
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Ms. Braegelmann:

As a former citizen of Maryland and a lover of our state's few remaining wild places I am writing this letter in strong opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan.

This proposal fragment 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge including pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats, critical to a number of at-risk bird species. It would destroy this valuable wildlife habitat in a region of Maryland where development has taken an immense toll on natural resources, and in so doing would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland—also recognized by Audubon Maryland-DC as an Important Bird Area (IBA) in 2006 because it provides habitat for several declining bird species, including Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler. It would further imperil species that are dispersal limited like salamanders. It would further create landscape edge and facilitate invasive species movements into the refuge.

The Patuxent Research Refuge was established in 1973 specifically for the purpose of upholding and promulgating the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. The Act was passed to more effectively meet the U.S. migratory bird treaty obligations through the acquisition of land and water for the perpetual preservation for birds.

While the DC-MD-VA area needs increased public transportation options, allowing the proposed rail line to destroy a publicly-owned natural resource at the Patuxent Research Refuge would set a dangerous precedent for the country's most beautiful and biologically diverse landscapes. Feasible and less destructive alternatives to incising a wildlife refuge exist. There are a plethora or roads and highways that already exist and should thus be scoped for to find the best option that would enhance regional sustainability and promote smart development. Please choose an alternate that does not disturb a national treasure.

Sincerely,

Dana

Dana N. McCoskey
Freshwater Biologist
NWT- supporting EERE Wind and Water Technologies Office
U.S. Department of Energy

MS Student, Environmental Science and Public Policy
George Mason University

Email: dana.mccoskey@[redacted]
Mobile: [redacted]
Website: [redacted]
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com[redacted]
Twitter: [redacted]

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2648 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Jacqueline

Last Name : McCreedy

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1141 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : Fred
Last Name : McCullough
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a resident of Old Lyme, CT. I am concerned and shocked at the proposed path of "alternative 1." While improvements are needed the proposed route is too destructive. Improve what exists.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #35 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 12/3/2015

First Name : Karen

Last Name : McCullough

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I have taken the Northeast Regional train many times from Connecticut(Windsor Locks) to Washington,D.C. in order to visit my cousin,who lives in Reston,Va. Also,since we retired and moved to Hedgesville,W.V.,just outside of Martinsburg,W.V.,I have taken the train many times to go back home to Ct. to visit with family and friends. We love the train.I just take the Capitol Limited from Martinsburg to D.C,then wait for the Northeast Regional to take me to Windsor Locks,Ct. I wish there wasn't that long layover in D.C.,but I can live with it. We lived in Vermont for 25 years and we still took the train down to D.C. via the Vermonter out of White River Junction. It is just a pleasant way to travel with no worries about weather,traffic or directions! We are both big train fans. I remember taking the train when I was 12 out of the now defunct Enfield,Ct station to travel to the New York World's Fair. I just have so many memories of train travel. We are currently looking into a three-week Amtrak excursion out West. The trains offer a viable alternative to the hassle of driving or flying.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #708 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/10/2016

First Name : Neil

Last Name : McDonald

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Historic Alexandria, VA, houses an attractive and traditional rail station that lacks adequate parking facilities for even minimal provision of services for the millions of potential riders who now inhabit Northern Virginia. Please consider this station in your planning process.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #900 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Helen

Last Name : McDonald

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The plan for putting a train thru Old Lyme is a ridiculous notion. We will go to Old Saybrook. Why disrupt a quiet, historic community that only has Lyme Steet and the Lyme Acad. I vote NO!!!!!!!!!!!!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1003 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : William

Last Name : McDonald

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Has building a rail route within the right of way of I 95 been throughly been investigated as an alternative to a new right of way through the Conn. Shoreline communities? The quality of lore considerations are obvious.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2903 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Kathryn
Last Name : McDonough
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."
It will also ruin the historic district of Lyme right by the Florence Griswold Museum.

Is it necessary to destroy Lyme Academy which is a landmark in the area and one of the few Fine Arts Academies of its kind in the United States?
The entire beauty of the Lyme area would be violated. Don't do this.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1065 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/12/2016
First Name : Dennis
Last Name : McEnery
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Attached please find comments which are hereby requested to be included in regards to the NEC Future EIS as fully set forth herein, including but not limited to the following issues with attached comments incorporated herein by reference as needing to be addressed:

(See attached file: Public comments to EIS 2-12-2016.pdf)

Adverse Growth Aspects of the Proposal
Aesthetic resources
Air Quality
Alternatives
Alternative Studies Information
Archaeological Resources
Architectural Historic Resources
At Grade Crossing Elimination
Community Disruptions
Community Facilities and Services
Community Outreach and Involvement
Construction Impacts
Cumulative Impacts
Disclosure Issues
Displacement and Property Acquisition
Electro Magnetic Fields
Energy and Utilities
Freight Operations
Hazardous materials
Independent Verification and Review
Infrastructure
Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitments or Destruction of Resources
Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy
Lighting
Local tax base Impact
Mitigation measures: To be done FIRST and foremost
natural resources
Neighborhood character
Night time activities
Noise and vibration

Open space and recreation
Operating restrictions and regulations need to be established in perpetuity
Parking Analysis
Parkland
Pedestrian analysis
Police and emergency response responsibilities
Projections and estimates verification and validity
Public advocate appointment and grievance procedures
Public Health considerations
Public and agency participation
Revitalization
Ridership and freight usage
Safety and security
Shadows and height of project
Significant adverse impacts
Socioeconomic conditions
Sound and light elimination or barriers
Suburban design and visual resources
Traffic and parking
Traffic analysis
Transit and Pedestrians
Transit Analysis
Transportation
Trip generation
Unavoidable adverse impacts
water supplies, solid waste and sanitation services

Given that the NEC Future project appears to be potentially incorporating any changes made to the MTA LIRR main line corridor between Queens Village and Hicksville on Long Island, the attached issues raised are as applicable to the NEC Future EIS as the Third Track scoping documents. To the extent it needs to be said, please replace the term "Scoping Document" with "NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)" as needed.

Dennis J. McEnery
[redacted]
Floral Park NY 11001
[redacted]

********** PLEASE NOTE **********
This message, along with any attachments, may be confidential or legally privileged. It is intended only for the named person(s), who is/are the only authorized recipients. If this message has reached you in error, kindly destroy it without review and notify the sender immediately. Thank you for your help.

Attachments : Public comments to EIS 2-12-2016.pdf (8 mb)

Title of Project

The title of the megaproject should be its accurate historical identification, the "LIRR Main Line Third Track Project" which is also in accordance with its designation within the federal legislation which is primarily funding the megaproject. The recent public relations efforts to recast it as the so-called "Main Line Corridor Improvements Project" is misleading and the inference that what is being proposed is an "improvement" is in and of itself the subject of much debate.

Notice Issues

The notice of the Scoping Meetings was seriously flawed and deficient. The notice of the public meetings was apparently mailed only to 16,000 addresses within a quarter mile of the track, so addresses in many sections of the adjacent political subdivisions were not even mailed to by the MTA LIRR. The Scoping Meeting notice brochure itself failed to have the times and place of the Scoping Meetings. Also, if the addressees primarily read Spanish or another language, like so many in the impacted adjacent communities, the MTA LIRR documents were only published in English. Most deficient of all, however, is that even though Community Board 13 in Queens covers over 200,000 residents, and is the location of the MTA LIRR's headquarters in Jamaica Queens, no Scoping Meetings took place in Queens. The public notice and the scheduling of the Scoping Meetings also coincided with the end of the school year and were held even on the day of local school budget elections. In addition, the MTA LIRR included additional comments and clarifications at its last meetings in Hicksville which were not mentioned at its initial meetings in Mineola. The MTA LIRR also did not make any transcript of the Scoping Meetings available on its website or for free for the asking to the public. This all appears to negatively impact the public's right to know and be heard.

Goals and Objectives

The proposed goals and objectives are completely arbitrary and were prepared in order to be outcome determinative. The authors obviously have a single conclusion and outcome in mind, i.e. construct an additional electrified railroad track from eastern Queens to Hicksville, and then have fashioned the goals and objectives to coincide with that conclusion as the only possible answer to the question. It appears to be a predetermined question in which the MTA LIRR knows the answer it wants and then fashions its goals and objectives to fit its answer. This is completely unacceptable and a cynical attempt to limit and suppress a full and fair public debate.

The MTA in another current project, the JFK Downtown link, for example, lists 5 separate goals and over 20 objectives to be met. This project should have every goal simply and logically stated, along with the dozens of objectives which should be inclusive in such a massive megaproject through the very heart of the communities in eastern Queens and western Nassau County.

Alternatives

The Scoping Document and an EIS are required to analyze all reasonable alternatives that may achieve the Proposed Action's goals. The MTA must at least consider as many options as it did for Westchester in constructing an additional track on the Harlem Line of the Metro North, and the following comments are based upon such previous MTA projects.

In addition to MTA LIRR's preferred configuration of the Main Line Third Track (the ``Preferred Alternative"), there should be at least seven (7) other Alternatives which should be defined and evaluated in the EIS: three (3) build Alternatives, three (3) Operational Alternatives and the No-Build Alternative. The MTA LIRR's self chosen Preferred Alternative involves the construction of an additional 11.5 mile third track from eastern Queens to Hicksville. The MTA LIRR must separately identify and evaluate whether the new track will be constructed north or south of the existing mainline tracks, as the potential impacts are dramatically different depending on which side of the mainline the additional track is located.

The Build Alternatives should involve construction on the north side of the MTA LIRR's right-of-way, as well as separate evaluations involving construction on the south side of the MTA LIRR's right-of-way.

Every Build Alternative should evaluate each mile of the megaproject on its own merits and considerations. If an additional available track already exists within a particular area, such as the additional tracks west of the Hempstead Line joining the Mainline in Floral Park, or the already existing additional track constructed over Herricks Road as part of the on grade crossing elimination project begun in about 1994 and not completed until 2000, then they should be evaluated for preferred inclusion, so as to eliminate the construction of yet another track in such areas.

Another Build Alternative would involve an alignment that includes the construction of the third track between existing station areas and any grade crossing eliminations and remaining as a two track configuration in other areas.

Under all Build Alternatives, the portion of the third track should be built on MTA LIRR property, and the present grading and natural physical state maintained. Only under dire circumstances should retaining walls be utilized, and any building of such retaining

walls must be minimized and be designed to be in keeping with the esthetics of the neighboring communities.

The No-Build Alternative presents conditions with service provided with the existing track configuration.

In addition to the Build and No-Build Alternatives, other Alternatives should consider modifications to MTA LIRR's operations without changing track configurations; reducing signal spacing and train speeds; installing communication-based signaling; and consolidating and/or eliminating service at certain stations to allow for additional service to other stations. One alternative should include the building of rail yards east of Hicksville, which based upon the MTA LIRR currently abandoned plan to construct one on the Port Jefferson line due to community opposition, results in at least SEVEN empty trains that have to travel on the Mainline in order to get to Port Jefferson each weekday morning.

In addition, the MTA LIRR should study alternatives which would construct a second track in areas where only one currently exists. For example, a speaker from the Farmingdale area and a former member of the MTA LIRR Commuters Council urged the construction of a second track in that area, before the MTA LIRR embarked upon building a third track on the Mainline.

Another alternative the MTA LIRR should study alternatives which would construct a third track or increase service on the South Shore lines and the Port Washington line.

All alternatives, including the No- Build Alternative, should involve lengthening of trains or the use of double decked trains as needed and as feasible.

Purpose and Need

The MTA LIRR has not provided compelling reasons for the undertaking of such a massive megaproject. While earlier discussions of the MTA LIRR descriptions of the additional track focused upon the alleged need for increased freight traffic impacting the area, the current proposal is completely void of the evaluation or consideration of the adverse impact such freight traffic will inflict upon the neighboring communities. To the extent that so-called reverse commuters are the primary beneficiaries of this megaproject, there was not a SINGLE SPEAKER in the six public hearings who provided support for this major premise. Given that numerous speakers caste overwhelming doubt on this premise, it must be stricken from the record as being unsupported.

In addition, there are no disclosures on the number of trains and passengers that already travel within the impacted area. The Scoping Document must also consider the cumulative impact that the Hempstead and Belmont spur inflict on the area. The Scoping Document also does not identify the number of empty trains, such as work trains or deadhead trips which rumble through the target area.

The Scoping Document also takes a broad brush approach on purpose and need issues, without any analysis of whether there is any compelling need for an additional electrified third track in communities which have already accepted more than their fair share of the transportation needs of the entire region.

Description of the Proposed Action

The description of the Proposed Action is woefully inadequate. As compellingly demonstrated by the testimony of the Mayor of New Hyde Park, the Scoping Document provides the public and elected officials with virtually no guidance or specifics about the proposed action. As a result, it is difficult to comment upon something with specificity when the description itself is so vague and non-specific that it makes reasoned analysis all but impossible.

The Scoping Document proposes that its study area only extend 1000 feet from the tracks, which is unacceptable. The Federal Rail Administration Train Horn Rules to establish Quiet Zones notes that train horns can impact a normal conversation almost 8000 feet from the tracks. The Scoping Document must therefore be expanded to at least 8000 feet and not its mere 1000 feet.

The Scoping Document **should, in fact, to be required to encompass the entire population of any local government subdivision which is adjacent to the Main Line. The MTA's Downtown JFK Scoping Document, for example, utilizes large census tracks which include populations south of 14th Street in Manhattan, rather than 1000 feet from the World Trade Center site. A similar "wide net" approach should also be utilized within the Scoping Document at issue.**

Analytical Framework

The Draft Scoping Document makes NO ATTEMPT to provide an analytical framework upon which to comment. The Scoping Document should be required to assess the environmental impacts of all alternatives in accordance with NEPA and FTA regulations. The Scoping Document and the environmental review process should also satisfy the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) in addition to any more stringent federal provisions.

To fully assess the future effects of the Alternatives, the Scoping Document should consider a number of analysis years, including but not limited to those within each phase including specifically: construction-period; opening year; and design year. The framework for these analysis years is described below:

· **Construction Period**: The Scoping Document must consider the potential environmental effects of construction. A qualitative analysis of the construction period must be conducted and where site-specific issues may arise such as potential

exposure to hazardous materials, effects to historic or archaeological resources, or utility relocation, and the potential impacts will need to be disclosed. A quantitative analysis of a reasonable, "worst-case" construction conditions must also be conducted. This analysis will characterize potential impacts including those to transportation, air quality, and noise during the peak construction period.

· **Opening Year**: In consideration of potential cumulative effects, an analysis of opening year conditions should be included in the Scoping Document.

· **Design Year**: Typically, the analysis of impacts associated with transit facilities anticipates future conditions at a period of 20 years after its initial operation, also known as the design year. The design year varies from the initial year of operation because it anticipates future development that might increase transit demand and behavioral changes that may result in varied patterns of travel. The selection of the design year will take into consideration other transportation projects, including but not limited to: the East Side Access Project; the Downtown JFK Link Project: the Pilgrim Intermodal Freight Project: the Port Jefferson Line Railyard Project, and regional forecasts, including those prepared by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC), the region's metropolitan planning organization.

It is further urged that the guideposts, such as the following, be established upon which the megaproject can be evaluated:

5 May 2005 – The baseline day from which to establish the "before" picture of the proposed impact area. This is the date that the MTA LIRR unleashed its Scoping Document upon its notice and publication in the Federal Register. As a result of this notice alone on this date, the impacted communities have had to begin dealing with the "ripple effects" the proposed megaproject has already caused. Therefore, much like September 10, 2001 is frequently cited as a "before" guidepost of our world in general, so too should 5 May 2005 be utilized as a "before" picture of the microcosm of the world impacted by the proposed megaproject.

6 May 2007 – The two year anniversary of Federal Notice. It is anticipated that the effects of the proposed plan in and of itself can be evaluated.

6 May 2009- The fourth year anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that the construction phase of the megaproject could be underway and the impact of construction can be evaluated.

6 May 2011- The sixth year anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that this could be the "peak" of intense construction in phase one of the megaproject and the impact of the "peak construction in phase one" be evaluated.

6 May 2013- The eighth year anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that this could be reflective of the winding down of the so-called "phase one" of the megaproject, yet the "gearing up" of "phase two" of the megaproject and the impact of the interim period when phase one is completed and phase two is underway. In

addition, the MTA's East Side Access Project is projected to be completed thereby placing additional burdens and strains on the targeted neighboring communities.

6 May 2015- The tenth anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that this could be the "peak" of intense construction on phase two of the megaproject and the impact of the "peak construction in phase two" be evaluated.

6 May 2017 –The twelfth anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that this could be reflective of the winding down of the so-called "phase two" of the megaproject, yet the full implementation of operational and train traffic increases have not yet matured.

6 May 2025- The twentieth anniversary of the Federal Notice. It is anticipated that this could be reflective of the full implementation of all operational and train traffic growth at its matured point.

By setting and studying such bench mark dates, which can be altered to reflect the MTA LIRR's expertise and knowledge of the most likely date that these milestones will take place, the megaproject can be more properly and fully evaluated. As currently proposed, the Scoping Documents is woefully deficient in making any serious attempt to segregate and isolate the different phases and impacts that the megaproject will have.

Adverse Growth-Aspects of the Proposal

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. Particular attention must be provided to the potential "urbanization" of the currently "suburban" communities within the 11.5 mile target zone area communities.

Aesthetic Resources

The Scoping Document needs a separate section on the Aesthetic Resources and considering potential changes to the visual character of the surrounding communities.

Air Quality

The Scoping Document does not adequately address the Air Quality impact of this megaproject. This includes the construction phase as well as the introduction of additional diesel train traffic, especially freight train traffic with multiple air polluting engines. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Alternatives

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. This should include other modes of transportation including automobile, public transportation vehicles, marine and the construction of roads, bridges or tunnels to improve or relieve the congestion within the 11.5 mile target zone area communities

Alternatives Studies Information

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken

Archaeological Resources

The Scoping Document must identify such areas within the impact zone.

Architectural Historic Resources

The Scoping Document does not adequately evaluate the unique architectural historic resources in the potential impact area. There needs to be special provisions to ensure that older buildings and facilities are not undermined due to the increased construction, vibrations or noise. In Floral Park this includes the Village Hall, the Village Library and the Atlantic Avenue Fire Station

At Grade Railroad Crossings Elimination

The Scoping Document does not adequately describe the implementation of eliminating or closing at grade railroad crossings. While the Scoping Document identifies a handful of proposed railroad crossings that will be eliminated or permanently closed, it does not describe the specific methodology which will be utilized to fulfill the goal, including but not limited to the seizure or condemnation of specific property. The Scoping Document must identify whether such crossings will be raised or lowered at grade, or a combination of both. If the project requires that the railroad track grade not be raised no greater than at a three percent grade, then a complete analysis of the impacts, especially the potential retaining walls or buffer areas that will required, must be described in particular detail.

The Scoping Document is deficient in mandating that the grade crossings elimination is not identified as the highest priority within the megaproject. In fact, the Scoping Document infers that the crossing eliminations may not even be completed, which is completely unacceptable. The Scoping Document should require that the

implementation or addition of an additional electrified track can only be undertaken AFTER at grade crossings are eliminated.

Community Disruptions

The Scoping Document needs to address all temporary and secondary effects associated with construction and operations of all aspects of the proposed megaproject that are implemented which could potentially affect adjacent neighborhoods and communities. The Scoping Document needs to provide an evaluation of the potential for cumulative impacts to occur to neighborhoods as well as the impacts due to construction phasing.

Community Facilities and Services

The Scoping Document does not adequately identify or evaluate the many community services that will be impacted. In Floral Park alone, testimony demonstrated severe and significant adverse impacts include but are not limited to: Schools; Fire Protection; Police Protection; Emergency Response; Traffic; Village Courts; Public Assembly; Library; Parking; Commerce; Traffic; Recreation; Baseball Fields; Pool; Pedestrians; Refuse; Water; Natural Resources; Trees; and, Crime.

The Scoping Document must identify every Community Facility and Services impacted during each and every milestone point in time. These include community facilities/institutional uses such as schools, hospitals, police stations, firehouses, recreational areas, churches, pedestrian walkways, nature preserves, etc. This analysis should include the heaviest construction phase in each specific location, and the short term and long term impacts.

Community Outreach and Involvement

The Scoping Document is woefully inadequate to identify or evaluate the level of neighboring community opposition or support for the megaproject. Having a sincere community outreach program for active community input requires the sponsors to provide concise information, clear goals, the setting of priorities within the Scoping Document, a completely transparent disclosure and decision making process and a full, open and robust public debate of all aspects of the proposal.

Public meetings must be scheduled at mutually convenient times and locations throughout the potential study area including locations in close proximity to each passenger station within the study area. It is important that the sponsors obtain a consensus among local elected representatives prior to the scheduling of such presentations and meetings within their community. The citizen involvement at every public meeting or presentation should include open question and answer sessions, and

the sponsor management should not be allowed to conduct public meetings at which no responses are provided to participating citizens.

The guiding principal must be that the citizens are entitled to be informed of the potential consequences to their neighboring communities with specificity and with full and fair disclosure. The sponsors must operate under the guiding principal of full disclosure and information and not be permitted to conduct themselves in silence or secret. The citizens have an overriding right to know, rather than being left by the sponsors to guess or rely upon incorrect information or even unsubstantiated rumors.

Construction Impacts

The Scoping Document does not adequately address the Construction Impacts of this megaproject. The Construction Impacts evaluation must be done on a continuous mile by mile basis. What the Construction impacts on Bellerose and Floral Park are completely different than what is experienced in New Hyde Park, Garden City or Mineola. The Construction Impacts must evaluate whether the grade crossings are or are not eliminated.

The Construction Impacts must include the identification of Construction equipment which will be used; where it will be stored; and what Construction staging areas will be required, including the parking for construction workers and equipment that will be needed. If any streets are to be closed or impacted by Construction, that must be evaluated. Consideration should be given to providing local businesses and workers with preferential treatment in both their retention and their supplying of goods and services.

The Construction Impacts must also include the temporary or permanent closure of current pedestrian and road right of ways, including, by way of examples, the pedestrian walkway near the Floral Park Bellerose School, the pedestrian walkway near the Floral Park Recreation Center and the automobile passageway on Tanners Pond Road in Garden City. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Cumulative Impacts

The Scoping Document needs to have an extensive section on the Cumulative Impacts that may result from the proposed megaproject, especially on each individual neighboring community. This cannot be myopically viewed in a vacuum, without regard to the adverse impacts already afflicting the neighboring communities, including aircraft traffic, automobile traffic, and major congregating facilities including the Jamaica Transportation Hub, Belmont Park, Franklin Avenue Nassau County government area, Roosevelt Field, Nassau Coliseum, Eisenhower Park, the heavily congested Old Country Road area, as well as the Route 106 Broadway Mall area. The megaproject must also evaluate its potential impact in conjunction with other projects being planned,

to avoid the possibility of an otherwise isolated and myopic point of view governing the Scoping Document. Secondary impacts ("growth inducing impacts") resulting from the implementation of the sponsors' proposed megaproject must also be fully assessed.

Disclosure Issues

The MTA LIRR's attempts to provide for a full and responsive public disclosure have been woefully inadequate. The six Scoping Document meetings, for example, were not aired by the MTA LIRR on the public airways, either television or radio, and the transcript of these meetings were not been made available for free to the public during the public comment period ending on August 31, 2005. Although the Scoping Documents incorporates by reference many previously prepared documents, some as stale and outdated as 1988, these referenced documents were not attached to the documents mailed or made available to the public on the MTA web site during the public comment period.

It was also not generally known only until well after the public meetings were concluded, that mercury contamination by the MTA LIRR is present within the study area. The failure of the MTA LIRR to fully disclose this information within the Scoping Document or during the public meetings is a serious omission and failure to disclose by the MTA LIRR. The credibility of the completeness or accuracy of the MTA LIRR information is therefore to be questioned.

The MTA LIRR did, however, see it fit to demand that members of the public pay the MTA LIRR for documents relating to the megaproject. The Scoping Document and the conduct of the MTA LIRR should be governed by a guiding principal of full disclosure, including the prompt free availability of such documents and information being promptly disclosed and available on the MTA web site.

Displacement and Property Acquisition

The Scoping Document is woefully inadequate in identifying with particularity the potential temporary and permanent displacement and property acquisition which may take place. The MTA LIRR has already effectively placed adjacent landowners under the dark cloud of the threat of imminent eminent domain takings.

Adjacent landowners must be provided "most favored nation" status, wherein the MTA LIRR must agree to treat every similarly situated landowner equally and fairly. This includes a completely transparent and open negotiation process, in order to avoid uninformed and unfair negotiations. The MTA LIRR must encourage adjacent land owners to obtain independent legal advice and agree to reimburse them for any

resulting legal fees. The MTA LIRR must also expeditiously identify and confirm which adjacent property is NOT at risk for potential displacement and acquisition.

Electro Magnetic Fields

The Scoping Document needs to have a section which will identify the nature of Electric and Magnetic Fields associated with the existing third rail and whether the megaproject will result in any increase in exposure to those EMF's.

Energy and Utilities

The Scoping Document does not adequately address the Energy and Utilities usage impact of this megaproject. The Scoping Document should be required to identify the impact on any sewage, electrical, water, telephone, cable television, cellular telephone sites or any other potentially impacted infrastructure throughout the 11.5 mile target zone before the megaproject is commenced. There will be potential for relocations of existing utilities and an increase and added strain on the local power grids and facilities that obviously must be addressed. The Scoping Document should also incorporate the removal and burying of adjacent overhead power lines as part of the megaproject. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Freight Operations

While earlier MTA LIRR descriptions promoting an additional track focused upon the alleged need for increased freight traffic impacting the area, the current Scoping Document is completely void of the evaluation or consideration of the adverse impact such freight traffic will inflict upon the neighboring communities. The introduction of additional diesel freight train traffic, especially with its added noise and vibration from freight cars and engines, is of particular concern and must be addressed.

The Scoping Document must also assume that the proposed Cross Harbor Freight Tunnel and the Pilgrim Intermodal Freight Projects are implemented, and what the potential impact of such other known projects would be in conjunction with this Scoping Document. It is noted, in particular, that the Pilgrim Intermodal Freight Project specifically calls for unrestricted Trailer on Flatcar/Container on Flatcar (TOFC/COFC) clearances on the Main Line and "UNRESTRICTED OPERATING WINDOWS" usage on the LIRR's tracks. All other issues aside, the Scoping Document references to "operational flexibility" must explicitly EXCLUDE any expansion of the current operational hours of freight traffic permitted on the Main Line. Freight train traffic must continue to be permitted only during non-rush hour time periods.

The Scoping Document is seriously deficient in not honestly addressing freight related issues. The only way it could be removed from consideration, however, is the irrevocable stipulation in perpetuity that an additional track can NEVER be allowed to be used for by freight train traffic, much like the left hand lane of the Long Island Expressway or the Grand Central and Northern State Parkways, which PROHIBIT their use by all commercial and trailers.

Hazardous Materials

The Scoping Document does not address the Hazardous Materials which will be present or introduced into the impacted communities. According to just released information, for example, the MTA LIRR admits that there is mercury already present on its various power substations due to unsafe business practices. The Scoping Document also does not address the potential Hazardous Materials which may be encountered during the construction phase of the megaproject.

An evaluation must also be undertaken determining if there will be any particular Hazardous Materials that the MTA LIRR will or will not allow to be transported on its proposed additional track, including but not limited to radioactive material, garbage or municipal refuge. In addition, the current agreement in effect within Queens which prohibits the movement of waste materials on the Main Line, including radioactive waste, must be extended to the entire 11.5 mile study area by way of a permanent irrevocable prohibition. The Scoping Document must evaluate the effects of all the activities arising from an additional electrified track on the surrounding environment, including on soil and groundwater conditions, and identify measures to be implemented to prevent any adverse impacts. The Scoping Document must address Hazardous Materials, in all forms.

Independent Verification and Review

The Scoping Document fails to provide for the independent verification and review by qualified experts and consultants on behalf of adjacent political subdivisions to ensure that the megaproject is subject to proper review. This includes, but is not limited to, independent auditors, environmental experts, economic experts, engineering experts, legal experts, transportation experts and others who should be available to provide knowledge and expertise like that of those maintained or retained on behalf of the sponsors. To the extent that the sponsors maintain or retain the services of experts and consultants in conjunction with the megaproject, the sponsors should encourage and fully reimburse adjacent political subdivisions to maintain or retain the services of similarly situated experts and consultants. This includes, but not limited to, experts and consultants knowledgeable in relation to the various issues addressed within the sponsors' proposed Draft Environmental Impact Statements.

Infrastructure

The Scoping Document does not adequately address what Infrastructure in the adjacent communities will be impacted by the megaproject. This should include the area of every political subdivision, and should not be limited to the woefully inadequate proposed 1000 foot study area.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments or Destruction of Resources

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. Particular attention must be provided to the potential destruction of resources which may be impaired or destroyed as a result of the implementation of any Build alternative. This includes the destruction of mature trees and vegetation which is already established and present within the target zone.

Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy

The Scoping Document does not adequately address land use, zoning or public policy considerations. It does not identify the particular land that will be impacted and completely ignores or minimizes the public policy issues.

The Scoping Document must do a complete block by block analysis of the current land uses and zoning in the impact zone and public policy considerations require that the sponsors hold hearings in conjunction with each adjacent political subdivision to address the public policy issues specifically impacting each particular political subdivision, including for example, the incorporated villages of Bellerose, Floral Park, New Hyde Park and Mineola, among other political subdivisions.

Lighting

The Scoping Document does not address the overhead and ambient lighting impact of this megaproject. This includes the construction phase as well as the introduction of additional overhead lighting, especially in the train station areas with multiple overhead lighting needs. This should include the complete replacement of lighting with downward directed fixtures and the inclusion of natural lighting. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Local Tax Base

The Scoping Document needs a separate section on the tax base related impacts on all taxing authorities including local school districts that may result from the proposed megaproject. This includes the full analysis of the current taxing authorities within each adjacent political subdivision and the potential loss of tax revenues, including those due to the condemnation of land or the decrease in property values. The MTA LIRR should provide guarantees and "in kind" payments and financial assistance to potentially negatively impacted political subdivisions and school districts.

Mitigation Measures: First and Foremost

Mitigation measures must be given the highest top priority and be implemented and completed BEFORE any other activities are undertaken. In this way, the potentially adversely affected areas will already have the appropriate mitigation measures in place prior to the adverse impacts actually taking place. By way of example, in Floral Park, the mitigation measures relating to the schools, public library, fire stations, recreation center, pedestrian walkways, or station parking areas must be completed prior to the first construction activity. Mitigation Measures must also be completely funded and completed whether or not the anticipated adverse impact activity itself actually takes place.

Specific and detailed mitigation measures need to be developed and implemented as part of each issue addressed within the Scoping Document. This information should also be summarized with particularity on a community by community basis within a separate section. This section must identify all the potential adverse impacts and describe with detail and particularity the mitigation measures proposed to minimize or avoid them wherever possible. Where adverse impacts are identified, mitigating measures will need to be described. Mitigation strategies to be explored should include:

· Impact avoidance (e.g., through design modifications, especially through the use of construction methodologies and technologies that reduce environmental impacts);

· Impact minimization (e.g., through changes in design or through buffering of the impact, either by physical means or through coordination); and

· Impact mitigation (e.g., through replacement or relocation).

Principles of environmental construction management and resource protection such as New York City Transit's Green Design for the Environment Guidelines (2002) and Long Island Rail Road's Sustainable Design/Design for Environment - Generic Guidelines

(March 2003), developed pursuant to New York State Executive Order 111 "Green and Clean" should be considered for incorporation into the alternatives.

Natural Resources

The Scoping Document does not address the proposed destruction and removal of the mature trees and plantings. In addition, the impact on the air, water and ground natural resources must also be conducted.

Neighborhood Character

The Scoping Document does not address the potential that the megaproject will significantly contribute to the "urbanization" of a currently suburban community. The megaproject will significantly impact a residential area with the introduction of many "urbanization elements" including destruction of natural buffers, increased train traffic and potentially unsightly retaining walls. The Scoping Document must study each area street by street and block by block. What the impact may be in Floral Park could be significantly different than that which takes place in Hicksville.

Night time Activities

The Scoping Document does not address the Night Time impact of this megaproject. Given that the MTA LIRR asserts that it is currently maximizes its track operations during its rush hours, it is anticipated that it will utilize a disproportionate amount of off hour and night time construction operations. This requires an even higher degree of sensitivity in order to avoid negatively impacting neighboring communities during times that the quiet enjoyable of their homes is at its highest level. This is particularly true during the construction phase and all the other milestone points as well with the introduction of additional train traffic, especially projected increases in both commuter and freight train traffic. Night time activity generated in residential and other sensitive areas, such as within hospital zones during weekend and night hours, is an important concern that must be studied and addressed.

Noise and Vibration

The Scoping Document does not adequately address the Noise and Vibration impact of this megaproject. This includes the construction phase and all the other milestone points as well as the introduction of additional diesel train traffic, especially projected increases in both commuter and freight train traffic with added noise and vibration from cars and engines. Noise and vibration generated in residential and other sensitive

areas, such as within hospital zones during late night hours must be an important concern.

The Scoping Document should address the implementation of FRA Train Horn Rules Quiet Zones through the entire 11.5 mile corridor. This includes operational changes such as elimination of the current practice of sounding train horns when traveling through stations, especially those in Floral Park, Bellerose and eastern Queens.

The Noise and Vibration evaluations must be done on a continuous mile by mile basis. What the Noise and Vibration impacts on Bellerose and Floral Park are completely different than what is experienced at a grade crossing in New Hyde Park, Garden City or Mineola. The Noise and Vibration must evaluate if the grade crossings are or are not eliminated. The Noise and Vibration must include the inclusion of trains traveling on the Hempstead line through Floral Park, Bellerose and eastern Queens. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Distance to residential and sensitive land uses must be taken into account in a comprehensive screening assessment. Existing noise levels should be monitored within multiple locations within each adjoining political subdivision, with the proposed megaproject's noise levels being predicted at each such location. Service conditions associated with the alternatives need to be analyzed to determine if they would result in increases in noise (air- or ground borne) at existing or future sensitive receptors in proximity to the MTA LIRR right-of way.

Noise levels during construction from the generation of temporary power, demolition activities, and use of construction equipment need to be assessed for the potential to create impacts on nearby neighborhoods. This analysis should occur in accordance with established FTA procedures for transit noise and vibration assessment along with other criteria established by the MTA LIRR and/or the State of New York. The transit noise and vibration assessment should also consider local ordinances as appropriate for the determination of potential future impact and the need for mitigation features, including the implementation of local Quiet Zones.

Open Space and Recreation

The Scoping Document does not adequately attempt to identify or evaluate the community open space and recreation that will be impacted. In Floral Park alone, testimony demonstrated severe and significant adverse impacts include but are not limited to: Recreation; School Playing Fields; Baseball Fields; Roller Rink: Community Center; Tennis Courts; Basketball Courts; Play Fields; Soccer Fields; Lacrosse Fields; Volleyball Courts; Shuffle Boards; Pool; Barbeque areas; Pedestrian Walkways; Natural Resources; Trees; and, the Mature Natural Canopy on the MTA LIRR right of way

Operating Restrictions and Regulations Established In Perpetuity

The Scoping Document needs to identify and describe Operating Restrictions and Regulations which firmly establish the rules governing the use and operations within the 11.5 mile main line corridor. These include any promises and representations made by the sponsors in the Scoping process. By way of example, representations have been made that there are no plans to close any of the train stations within the 11.5 mile study area. This representation must be required to be guaranteed in perpetuity. There have been representations made that freight service will operate only during non-peak times. This representation must be required to be guaranteed in perpetuity. The sponsor has already agreed not to transport hazardous waste through Queens without permission, which should be extended to encompass the entire 11.5 mile study area and be required to be made in perpetuity.

The Scoping Document needs to identify and describe any guaranteed increases in service or prohibit any further service reductions for the stations within the 11.5 mile study area. For example, while Floral Park had approximately 100 trains stopping to provide service in the early 1960s, that service has steadily decreased to about 41 scheduled trains. Therefore, guarantees must be provided that there will be substantial increases in service in conjunction with the increase in the number of trains utilizing the study area. For example, there should be operating regulations in perpetuity that all additionally scheduled trains utilizing tracks within the 11.5 mile study area must make stops at stations within the study area. The Scoping Document should require that the adversely impacted communities receive in perpetuity more service as a result of an additional track, and under no circumstances, any less service.

Parking Analysis

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Parkland

The Scoping Document needs to identify and describe impacts with a separate section on the impact on Parkland. Parkland includes any natural or bird sanctuary areas, including but not limited to the Garden City Bird Sanctuary on Tanners Pond Road.

Pedestrian Analysis

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Police and Emergency Response Responsibilities

The MTA maintains its own full time police force, which must be utilized to the greatest possible extent, in order to minimize and eliminate the need for neighboring communities to divert limited public safety assets to the megaproject. The MTA must maintain its own constant police presence wherever activity relating to the megaproject takes place. The MTA must also maintain its own emergency response medical presence, in order to avoid the potential for demanding that community medical emergency volunteers be called away from their homes and businesses to attend to medical needs arising from the megaproject. Should non-MTA police and emergency responses take place, the MTA must agree to fully reimburse local communities for any related costs.

Projections and Estimates Validity

The Scoping Document contains numerous projections and estimates which have no basis in fact. The Scoping Document must identify with particularity the basis upon which each such projection and estimate has been provided. In particular, given that MTA LIRR ridership peaked in 1949, during the time that it was able to function with two main tracks, the projection that 120,000 new jobs will be created on Long Island and that a significant number of them will rely upon the MTA LIRR is unproven.

Public Advocate and Grievance Procedures

The Scoping Document does not address the establishment of a permanent public advocate, community liaison or ombudsperson to address issues arising from the megaproject. There should be explicit provisions made for providing an avenue and standardized procedures to expeditiously resolving the concerns or disputes of impacted citizens within the neighboring community. This should also include the use of voluntary local community based mediation facilities to be established and maintained by the sponsors until the megaproject is completely finished. The facilities should include well publicized convenient toll free dedicated telephone lines and web access maintained by the sponsors to provide ready and easy access to such services.

Public Health

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. The analysis needs to consider the currently present and potential health issues that might be raised by the presence of the current tracks as well as an additional track. This includes the potential exposure to hazardous materials which but for the megaproject would remain in place and

undisturbed, including but not limited to soil containing mercury or PCB's already present within the MTA LIRR right of way.

This evaluation should also include the mental health implications due to the stress and potential displacement of local residents, including the utilization of community based mental health outreach programs, especially for children and senior citizens whose lives may be disrupted by the megaproject.

Public and Agency Participation

The MTA LIRR's efforts for full and active Public Participation have been woefully inadequate. The six Scoping Document meetings were void of any question and answer periods. The President of the MTA LIRR failed to make a presentation of any sort during these meetings. Although the MTA LIRR promised to hold public meetings, there is no information on its web site informing the general public of where and when such other public meetings have been scheduled to take place. Public meetings should be regularly scheduled within every impacted community with as large of participation of the community as is possible. The MTA LIRR has even demanded that interested members of the public pay the MTA LIRR for documents relating to the megaproject. The MTA LIRR has also failed to publish the full transcript of the Scoping meetings prior to the close of the comment period of August 31, 2005. The public's participation has been impeded by the actions of the MTA LIRR, which appears to be frustrating at least the spirit and legislative intent of public participation requirements.

The preparation of the Scoping Document and EIS should be guided by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of representation based upon the participation and providing of testimony at the Scoping Meetings. The TAC must include representatives from every political subdivision potentially impacted by the megaproject. The mayors from each affected community must be provided membership on the TAC along with at least one other elected official from each such political subdivision, a government official from each such political subdivision as well as a member from the general public from each such political subdivision. There should also be membership provided to New York City Community Board 13. There should also be membership provided to each state legislator and state senator whose district is within the proposed 1000 feet study area. TAC membership need not be extended to include representatives of special interest groups or reverse commuters, given their failure to demonstrate any interest in the process, as evidenced by the fact that no reverse commuter even provided testimony during any of the six public Scoping meetings.

The TAC agency participation should include members from the MTA LIRR, the NYC Departments of City Planning and Transportation, the New York State Departments of Transportation and Environmental Conservation being offered membership on the TAC. Federal resource and agencies which should be invited to participate include the

Federal Homeland Security Agency, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency. A Public Advisory Committee (PAC) comprised of elected officials, interested individuals and representatives of community organizations and advocacy groups can also be established to widen the Public and Agency Participation.

Revitalization

The Scoping Document does not adequately address what particular Revitalization efforts will be associated with its megaproject. What particular proposed upgrading and improvement of its facilities, including its stations, parking, public address systems, public train schedule monitors, platform access, elevators, walkways, escalators and other facilities are completely unknown. What Revitalization efforts will be undertaken in neighboring business and public areas are also completely unknown.

Ridership

The Scoping Document should develop and implement transportation modeling to determine current and future ridership levels in the megaproject study area for both eastbound and westbound commuters at all service times, including the Hempstead and Belmont spur lines. This should include the current passenger and trip usage with specificity to each such regularly scheduled train as well as unscheduled train trips. The ridership models need to specifically identify and to take into account verifiable and regionally accepted and recognized forecasts of population, labor force and employment including but not limited to those prepared by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC).

Safety and Security

The Scoping Document needs a separate section on the Safety and Security impacts that may result from the proposed megaproject. This analysis needs to describe with particularities the measures to be taken to safeguard the safety and security of the entire 11.5 mile corridor, including the surrounding communities. This includes the full analysis of vulnerabilities to potential terrorist acts as have taken place in Madrid and London.

Shadows

The addition of another track will result in increased shadows. There has been no discussion of the retaining walls, where they will be located, how high they will be; what they will look like; what they will be made of; will they encourage the roosting of pigeons like the MTA LIRR's current facilities; or, how many trains will rumble through the area causing additional shadows. The Scoping Document must also evaluate whether or not retaining walls will be constructed and factor the impacts of a retaining walls or no retaining walls alternatives.

Significant Adverse Impacts

There must be a finding that there will be Significant Adverse Impacts, both of a certain length of time and permanent, which will result from the proposed Scoping Document.

The Scoping Document needs to have an extensive section on the Significant Adverse Impacts that will result from the proposed megaproject, especially on each individual neighboring community. This cannot be myopically viewed in a vacuum, without regard to the significant adverse impacts potentially affecting the neighboring communities, including all of the issues which are identified, including those discussed herein. The Scoping Document's current suggestion there will be no significant adverse impacts either in the short term or the long term is simply incorrect.

Socioeconomic Conditions

The Scoping Document makes almost no attempt to evaluate the socioeconomic conditions. It does make unsupported statements that the megaproject will encourage young residents to stay in the area. What area is it referring to? It states that property values will increase. Which property is it referring to? It states that businesses will grow. Which businesses will grow, as virtually all of the testimonies by local business owners believe there will be a decline or even an elimination of business?

For example, in Floral Park, the socioeconomic impact of the potential loss of the only provider of essential funeral services for a community of 16,000 residents should be addressed.

The Scoping Document must address the socioeconomic conditions with specificity. If adjacent landowners and businesses experience a decrease in property values, it must be addressed. The MTA LIRR must identify which particular businesses will grow and

where they are located. If the MTA LIRR asserts that young residents will be encouraged to stay in the area, then the increase in MTA LIRR fares and cuts in service could discourage young residents from staying in the area.

Sound and Light Barriers

The addition of another track will result in the need for sound and light barriers. There has been no discussion of the use of sound and light barriers, where they will be located, how high and wide they will be; what they will look like; what they will be made of; will they encourage the roosting of pigeons like the MTA LIRR's current facilities; or, how many trains will rumble through the area causing additional sound.

The MTA's Port Jefferson Line Yard study, for example, studied the use of sound absorbing berms with mature evergreen plantings. Ironically, the current Main Line already has mature evergreen plantings which should be preserved rather than destroyed. The Scoping Document must also evaluate whether or not sound and light barrier walls will be constructed and factor the impacts of sound and light barriers or no sound and light barrier alternatives.

Suburban Design and Visual Resources

The Scoping Document does not address the potential the megaproject will significantly contribute to the "urbanization" of a currently suburban community. The megaproject will significantly impact a residential area with the introduction of many "urbanization elements" including destruction of natural buffers, increased train traffic and potentially unsightly retaining walls.

Traffic and Parking

The Scoping Document does not address the local Traffic and Parking usage impact of this megaproject. There will be an increase and added strain on the local traffic patterns and parking facilities that obviously must be addressed. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken, and should include a station by station, community by community evaluation. Once again, the milestone event and dates should be required. This includes the projected increases or even decreases in train traffic and train service to each and every station. If any station is potentially closed, this must also be evaluated, and if so, what the increased load of traffic and parking could have on the stations remaining open.

For example, an analysis must be undertaken as to the practical impact and legality that MTA/LIRR's project will have on the various parking facilities that are the subject of

the thirty (30) year "Long Island Rail Road Parking Program Agreement for Floral Park Station," which was entered into by MTA/LIRR and Floral Park on April 1, 2003.

Traffic Analysis

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Transit and Pedestrians

The Scoping Document does not address the local Transit and Pedestrian usage impact of this megaproject. There will be an increase and added strain on the local pedestrian traffic patterns and associated transit interconnections that obviously must be addressed. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken, and should include a station by station, community by community evaluation. Once again, the milestone event and dates should be required.

This includes the projected increases or even decreases in train traffic and train service to each and every station. If any station is potentially subject to an increased bus or other transit traffic, this must also be evaluated, and if so, what the increased transit traffic could have on the stations and the surrounding communities. The Scoping Document must also assume that the proposed Nassau Hub Project and the Pilgrim Intermodal Project are implemented, and what the cumulative impact of such other known projects, if implemented, would be in conjunction with this megaproject.

Transit Analysis

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

Transportation

The Scoping Document does not address the effects the new rail could have on transportation, including parking and traffic, as well as potential interconnections of the present MTA LIRR stations with additional bus and/or intermodal connections. Based on projections of increased train traffic anywhere from 25 percent to almost 50 percent rumbling through the impacted communities or other such potential changes in service, the analysis needs to consider the impacts to local roadways and parking capacity of MTA LIRR passengers driving to and parking near affected rail stations

It will also need to evaluate the localized effects on vehicular traffic that might occur because of new trains being added, MTA LIRR lines being eliminated or consolidated, changes in roadway operations resulting from the megaproject, and changes in operations and/or safety at nearby at-grade crossings that are not eliminated, including but not limited to the at-grade crossing on Covert Avenue on the Hempstead line.

There will be an increase and added strain on the local pedestrian traffic patterns and associated transit interconnections that obviously must be addressed. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken, and should include a station by station, community by community evaluation. Once again, the milestone event and dates should be required.

This includes the projected increases or even decreases in train traffic and train service to each and every station. If any station is potentially subject to an increased bus or other transit traffic, this must also be evaluated, and if so, what the increased transit traffic could have on the stations.

The Scoping Document must also assume that the proposed East Side Access, JFK Downtown Link, Cross Harbor Freight Tunnel, Nassau Hub Project and the Pilgrim Intermodal Projects are implemented, and what the cumulative impact of such other known projects, if implemented, would be in conjunction with this megaproject.

Trip Generation

The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. The evaluation must with specificity identify the current amount of usage of each particular regularly scheduled transverse of the present train tracks, including the number of freight and train cars and passengers on each such trip.

The evaluation should provide a full disclosure of the ultimately projected passenger and freight traffic, including the assumption that the East Side Access Project, the JFK Downtown Link Project; Cross River Trans-Hudson Freight Tunnel Project, the Pilgrim Freight Intermodal Project, the upgrading of tracks for increased weight and the elimination of any height restrictions for freight cars, unrestricted freight access to the Main Line are all implemented.

In short, assuming the MTA obtains all of its proposed transportation infrastructure needs over the next 20 years, what the impacts will be on this particular 11.5 miles of communities on the Main Line corridor must be evaluated.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

There must be a finding that there will be Unavoidable Adverse Impacts, both of a certain length of time and permanent, which will result from the proposed Scoping Document. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken. The goal of the megaproject, however, is to AVOID adverse impacts at any reasonable cost, with priority given to neighboring property and communities over the potential inconveniences to non-residents or remote non-adjacent communities, such as those outside of the identified 11.5 mile target zone area.

Water Supplies, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

The Scoping Document does not adequately address the Water Supplies, Solid Waste and Sanitation Services impact of this megaproject. The evaluation of these issues must be undertaken.

CONCLUSION: INADEQUATE & INCOMPLETE SCOPING DOCUMENT

The current Scoping Document is a woefully inadequate and incomplete Scoping Document. Given the MTA has been responsible for a significant number of past, present and future Scoping Documents, our public servants at the MTA LIRR have a duty and obligation to give their best efforts to produce the most comprehensive and complete Scoping Document that is possible. The Scoping Document should address any and all reasonable issues, including the ones noted above, which this megaproject may generate.

Please note that many of the above noted issues have been based upon information derived from various Scoping Documents already available to the MTA. Therefore any suggestions that such issues are unable to be adequately addressed by the MTA are undercut based upon the MTA's collective prior knowledge and experience.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1329 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Dana

Last Name : McFadden

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

While I am in favor of expanding rail service to provide an alternative to car travel, I oppose the alternative 1 option to route a high speed train across the Connecticut River alongside the Baldwin Bridge. Alternative 3 is a better option that will serve many more communities and accommodate more passengers with less disruption to the adjacent communities, by routing the rail service through areas with more vacant land.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2098 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Glenn
Last Name : McGee
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,
I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2665 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Summer

Last Name : McGee

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #546 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/4/2016

First Name : Paul

Last Name : McGill

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a resident of Old Lyme, CT, I am submitting testimony in opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. This action will significantly alter my livelihood and decimate my community. Impacts include potential for destruction of homes, businesses, schools, etc in the Historical District, including removal of wetlands, open space and natural resources. I request you to use alternatives, such as running the train line along/beside the existing track.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #902 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Kevin

Last Name : McGlinchey

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As an Amtrak frequent traveler, while I am in favor of progress and improvements to the Northeast Corridor, the current plan will effectively eliminate the historically and culturally significant village center of Old Lyme. Please consider removing Alternate 1 from consideration.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #629 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/9/2016
First Name : Tracy
Last Name : McGlinchey
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To Whom It May Concern,

Please consider an alternate route for the high speed federal train proposed to run though our small, historic town of Old Lyme, Connecticut. I am vehemently OPPOSED to this proposed plan. It would destroy our wildlife along with many of the historic buildings in our well preserved town. This proposed railway would run by our schools located in the center of our town, clearly not the best learning environment for young minds.

Also, I am asking that you hold a public forum in or around our town of Old Lyme so residents can get first hand knowledge regarding this preposterous plan. It's my understanding there were public hearings in New Haven & Hartford, not anywhere near the town(s) being affected most.

Thank you,

Tracy McGlinchey
14 year Old Lyme Resident
[redacted]

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1325 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Susan

Last Name : McGrath

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am opposed to putting rail service through a historical and arts centered part of Old Lyme,CT. This would affect art schools, museums and an area that draws people of all ages for entertainment and educational purposes . Please look at other alternatives to improving rail service. Our family frequently uses Amtrak between Boston and DC and understands the importance of this service. Thank you

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2656 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Brendan

Last Name : McGuire

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

It has come to my attention that Alternative One, the possible high speed route which would run along the coast of Connecticut, is currently the most likely to be accepted. As someone who spends a large part of each year living and working in that area, I am concerned about the impact of such an undertaking. As I understand it, the route would have to pass right through the town of Old Lyme, an area of significant historic, scenic, cultural, and environmental significance. If the new high-speed route would follow the existing Amtrak line, I would not see a problem, but as it is likely that Old Lyme's historic district and the ecologically important Connecticut River's mouth area would be threatened, I strongly recommend that the inland route, which would serve Danbury, Waterbury, and Hartford, be reconsidered instead. Thank you for your attention.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #481 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/1/2016

First Name : Carolyn

Last Name : McGuire

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am opposed to Alternative 3 - The Long Island option. This option will ruin the village of floral park, destroy many businesses and demolish homes. It is also extremely expensive.

RUBY SEIGEL: Thank you. Okay. Yes. I see a hand in the crowd. All right. Come on up. Just make sure you give us your name and affiliation so we know who you are.

BOB MCGURK: Could we bring up pages 13 and 14 of the atlas, map atlas?

RUBY SEIGEL: I actually don't have the ability to do that.

BOB MCGURK: Okay.

RUBY SEIGEL: But you're welcome to give comment, and we're welcome to talk to you about it in the other room if you like.

BOB MCGURK: Okay. Good evening. My name's Bob McGurk here on my own behalf. I'm a registered professional engineer in Delaware.

78

Primarily here to talk about freight access for users on the Delmarva Peninsula and in Delaware County.

I would like to thank the Northeast corridor FUTURE Team for taking a good look at the alternatives and develop- -- and paring them down and really presenting them in a very easy-to-understand format that can be easily evaluated by the general public and also by property owners and potential investors.

I do think as a taxpayer alternative 3 is a little over and above what is realistic from a financial perspective given the potential corridor capacity, but I also think the no-action alternative is disrespectful to the current users of the system.

And, you know, alternative 1 and alternative 2 are reasonable and prudent alternatives that should be considered for further development and refinement.

Regarding the alternative 1 plans

79

between Perryville and we'll say the Delaware/PA line in Claymont, further expansion of the third and fourth rail along the Chesapeake connector, I think that's great. We're expanding capacity in that area. That is definitely a known chokepoint, and eliminating those chokepoints is really going to cost effectively expand passenger service for the area for the corridor.

However, some of the alternatives presented -- or some of the improvements presented in alternative 2, especially the off-alignment alternatives, really hinder potential expansion and connectors for freight rail.

We're considering investment in the

port of Wilmington, and key to that is double-stacked, 24-hour freight rail access. You know, it -- it -- there are issues when you have freight and passenger rail on the same tracks sharing -- you know, sharing time. Both freight and passengers lose efficiency. So

80

providing alternate corridors for them to use, such as CSX corridor from Perryville all the way up through to Philadelphia as a dedicated freight rail corridor through there with some clearance projects through Delaware County, that corridor. And then can be double-stacked clear, and that opens up double-stack clear for CSX from Baltimore all the way on up north.

Partner that with a loop rail at -- on the property that MARC is currently considering for a maintenance yard just east of Perryville. A loop connector between Norfolk Southern Port Road and the CSX rail and a clearance project in Chambersburg could provide both Norfolk Southern and CSX double-stacked, 24-hour rail access to the Boxwood facility all the way out to Chicago. And that route for CSX through reciprocal switching would only cost them an extra ten miles rather than having to go through Baltimore, yet they can realize double-stacked access. Something that if you -- if you watch

81

CSX rail going through Delaware County and through New Castle County, you know, those containers aren't double-stacked, and that's wasted dollars right there. That's wasted movements and, you know, additional cost for users, shippers, and ultimately the consumer and taxpayers.

So we'd like to see further investment in freight rail on that CSX corridor, but the -- especially along the Perryville to Newark route.

In alternative 2, it calls out for an off-alignment split from Perryville to move up to Route 40 through Northeast, and then switches over to the CSX rail up through Newark crossing back over and joining in Newark. And that -- that off-line or new segment would really hinder the use of C- -- of the CSX rail for -- for unrestricted freight access.

We'd also like to see further consideration of connectors across the Northeast corridor. Freight users in Delaware and

82

Delaware County have major issues getting across the Northeast corridor, because, number one, we don't have 24-hour rail access. And, number two, we don't have double-stack access. And that can really open up opportunities economically for properties along the Delaware River, in Delaware County, New Castle County, and further down in Sussex and Kent and down the Delmarva Peninsula.

So as we move forward -- or as the Northeast corridor team moves forward with those alternatives, please consider specific access improvements for freight that enable separation of passenger and freight rail so that ultimately both freight and passenger can thrive.

Thank you.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1858 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Eileen
Last Name : McInerney
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Re: NEC Futures Alternative 1

This option proposes to install new tracks, beginning in Old Saybrook, proceeding across the Connecticut River shaving about a half hour off the time between Washington DC and Boston.

Other project options with the exception of doing nothing are estimated to be more expensive. The price of being a half hour faster seems to be unreasonable given the costs, the environmental, economic, historic, educational impacts yet to be defined.

Please keep me informed.

James McInerney

[redacted]

Old Lyme CT 06371

Sent from Windows Mail

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1756 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : James
Last Name : McInerney
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Re: NEC Futures Alternative 1

This option proposes to install new tracks, beginning in Old Saybrook, proceeding across the Connecticut River shaving about a half hour off the time between Washington DC and Boston.

Other project options with the exception of doing nothing are estimated to be more expensive. The price of being a half hour faster seems to be unreasonable given the costs, the environmental, economic, historic, educational impacts yet to be defined.

Please keep me informed.

Re: NEC Futures Alternative 1

This option proposes to install new tracks, beginning in Old Saybrook, proceeding across the Connecticut River shaving about a half hour off the time between Washington DC and Boston.

Other project options with the exception of doing nothing are estimated to be more expensive. The price of being a half hour faster seems to be unreasonable given the costs, the environmental, economic, historic, educational impacts yet to be defined.

Please keep me informed.

James McInerney

[redacted]

Old Lyme CT 06371

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2161 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Anne-Marie

Last Name : McIntyre

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. We need to save these special schools!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2209 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Aaron

Last Name : Mckee

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose a high speed rail that will displace the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts. Please find another path for the rail to take. The art school is an important institution, and needs to stay where it is!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2968 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Jody

Last Name : McKee

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

This cannot happen! The impact on the environment and historic districts is too great! Let alone the expense. Too much money has already been spent on a poirly laid out "plan".

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2021 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mark

Last Name : McKee

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #888 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Kathleen

Last Name : McKeever

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please take this proposal off the table. Old Lyme's historic district is a beautiful, SMALL, area in Old Lyme. If this proposal goes through, it will RUIN this area of town.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #243 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 1/23/2016
First Name : Marie
Last Name : McKeon
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Strongly opposed to Alternative 1. It makes no impact on increased passenger use and stands to disrupt our community irreversibly.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #449 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/1/2016

First Name : Marie

Last Name : McKeon

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a 4th generation resident of Old Lyme, not only do I strongly oppose Alternative 1, I question how this ever came to be an option.It clearly would be a waste of taxpayer money with no significant change or improvement for rail travel. It would however destroy a very beautiful small town with protected wetlands, diverse wildlife and an historic art community. I would really like to know by name, the party or person who came up with this. There is no logic behind it.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #36 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 12/3/2015

First Name : Eugene

Last Name : McKeown

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The new tunnel under the Hudson is needed - URGENTLY
It will cut down on auto emissions, and improve the economy of New Jersey and New York
I go from Shenzhen China to Chaoshan China on a high speed train. They built tunnels and bridges for this high speed line. It use to take by car 7 hours, now I do it in 2 1/2 hours - that is why China is becoming a powerful nation. We can't even build a high speed line or tunnel in the Northeast

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #539 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/4/2016
First Name : Barbara and James McKie
Last Name : McKie
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

We urge you to find a different route than the one currently being proposed for re-routing the railroad tracks through the center of Old Lyme, ruining the town's historic and art districts.

A letter with more detail is attached.

Barbara and James McKie
[redacted]
mckieart@[redacted]

Name Barbara and James McKie
Address [redacted]
City Lyme, CT (right on the border of Lyme and Old Lyme

Date: February 4, 2016

NEC FUTURE
U.S. DOT Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

RE: Federal Rail Administration NEC Draft Plans

To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of the Town of Lyme just next to Old Lyme, we want to express opposition to the Northeast Corridor Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement "Alternative 1" proposal. Our concern lies in the fact that this proposal will significantly alter the historical and art oriented areas in the beautiful town of Old Lyme. It will give great problems to residents, and the plan has the train going through the beautiful Lyme Academy of Fine Arts where both of us studied art.

We see no need to make a trail into the historic and artistic parts of Old Lyme only to go diagonally across the river, versus going next to the current track! It would not only ruin the town, and the school, but also cost more money to build!

Moving the Amtrak tracks inland through Old Lyme would have severe social and environmental impacts on our town. As "Alternative 1" currently stands, these impacts would include the potential for destruction of homes, businesses, and the Old Lyme Historic District (which includes our town hall, schools, library, art galleries, shops, homes, the Florence Griswold Museum, and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts) and it would have significant environmental impacts such as additional pollution and the removal of wetlands, open space, and natural resources.

We therefore request that the proposed rail changes that affect Old Lyme be removed from 'Alternative 1' and I urge you to look at other solutions regarding improving the Northeast Corridor. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara and James McKie

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1227 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : Peter
Last Name : McKillop
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Opposition to NEC rail expansion through Old Lyme is short sighted. The future economic benefits of a high speed train (stopping in Saybrook) far outweigh the relatively modest dislocation. Much of the land in question had already been set aside for the expansion of I95 in the 1960's. It hardly cuts Old Lyme in half as it is next to a highway that did that generations ago and no one has objected in 70 years. Old Communities that will be serviced by this train will be at the center of growth in decades to come. Those not, will be economic backwaters.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2032 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Craig

Last Name : Mcknight

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative #1 for the rail expansion project because it would destroy a portion of the historic village, would bisect the Lyme Art Academy campus and would endanger nearby wetlands. Alternative #2 makes the most economic sense for our state, connecting both Hartford and the UCONN campus to Providence, New Haven and Boston. This will provide the economic driver we need for CT to be competitive in the Northeast.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #583 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/7/2016

First Name : Nicholas

Last Name : McKnight

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I have been a resident of Old Lyme, CT for over 20 years and would like to ensure that my town is not changed, nor the environment harmed by the process of modernizing the rail system. I understand a need for better railway, and support that. I just would like to see minimum damage to our beautiful home and the Old Lyme salt marshes.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1091 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/12/2016
First Name : Nicholas
Last Name : McKnight
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Although I support investment in improving our northeast corridor rail service, I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option for the following reasons:

1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character. This may seem insignificant to those of you who have never visited Old Lyme, but our town represents an historic jewel. The village of Old Lyme is only a few blocks long, but our town was the epicenter of the American Impressionist art movement over 100 years ago. The quiet village, the tranquil marshes and the surrounding Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers have provided inspiration for thousands of artists and their paintings ever since those early days of the Lyme Art Colony. The area mapped for the new rail line cuts right through the town center, and its construction would forever change the Old Lyme landscape currently characterized by the Lyme Art Academy, the Florence Griswold Museum (a National Historic Landmark), the tranquil Lieutenant River and other historic gems.

2) Alternative #1 would adversely affect the wildlife of the Lieutenant River and Connecticut River, home to osprey, eagles and the amazing "swallow phenomenon" that has captured the attention of the Audobon Society and birders from all over the world. This dramatic behavior, called murmuration, occurs when over half a million swallows swarm in a tornado-like congregation and descend in unison on the marshes of the lower Connecticut River, each evening at dusk in August and September. This natural phenomenon is so large that it can be seen on weather radar. However, the nature of bridge construction as well as the high speed train itself will restructure the marshland habitat through noise, pollutants, vibrations, and habitat fragmentation. As has been documented repeatedly in the scientific literature, these factors will inevitably have a lasting and irreparable impact the survivorship of these birds as well as all other species in the fragile marshland ecosystem.

3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won't get us there. Large businesses are lining up to leave the state because our transportation infrastructure is virtually nonexistent and our taxation policies are crippling. We need an innovative economic plan and the large scale investment needed to connect ALL of our major cities, not just a small patch of new rail through the town of Old Lyme. We need to implement a rail system that will connect our capital city, Hartford, to New Haven, Providence, Boston and New York. We need to connect UCONN, our largest public university and medical center that is currently isolated in Storrs, CT to these cities as well. Alternative #2 would accomplish both of these objectives and would help put Connecticut back on track to be a competitive force in New England and an attractive option for business growth.

Thank you for your attention.

Nicholas McKnight

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1813 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Robert

Last Name : McKnight

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #801 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/10/2016
First Name : Susan
Last Name : McKnight
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Although I support investment in improving our northeast corridor rail service, I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option for the following reasons:

1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character. This may seem insignificant to those of you who have never visited Old Lyme, but our town represents an historic jewel. The village of Old Lyme is only a few blocks long, but our town was the epicenter of the American Impressionist art movement over 100 years ago. The quiet village, the tranquil marshes and the surrounding Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers have provided inspiration for thousands of artists and their paintings ever since those early days of the Lyme Art Colony. The area mapped for the new rail line cuts right through the town center, and its construction would forever change the Old Lyme landscape currently characterized by the Lyme Art Academy, the Florence Griswold Museum (a National Historic Landmark), the tranquil Lieutenant River and other historic gems.

2) Alternative #1 would adversely affect the wildlife of the Lieutenant River and Connecticut River, home to osprey, eagles and the amazing "swallow phenomenon" that has captured the attention of the Audobon Society and birders from all over the world. This dramatic behavior, called murmuration, occurs when over half a million swallows swarm in a tornado-like congregation and descend in unison on the marshes of the lower Connecticut River, each evening at dusk in August and September. This natural phenomenon is so large that it can be seen on weather radar. However, the nature of bridge construction as well as the high speed train itself will restructure the marshland habitat through noise, pollutants, vibrations, and habitat fragmentation. As has been documented repeatedly in the scientific literature, these factors will inevitably have a lasting and irreparable impact the survivorship of these birds as well as all other species in the fragile marshland ecosystem.

3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won't get us there. Large businesses are lining up to leave the state because our transportation infrastructure is virtually nonexistent and our taxation policies are crippling. We need an innovative economic plan and the large scale investment needed to connect ALL of our major cities, not just a small patch of new rail through the town of Old Lyme. We need to implement a rail system that will connect our capital city, Hartford, to New Haven, Providence, Boston and New York. We need to connect UCONN, our largest public university and medical center that is currently isolated in Storrs, CT to these cities as well. Alternative #2 would accomplish both of these objectives and would help put Connecticut back on track to be a competitive force in New England and an attractive option for business growth.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1216 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : Tory
Last Name : McKnight
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Although I support investment in improving our northeast corridor rail service, I am strongly opposed to Alternative #1 as a proposed rail investment option for the following reasons:

1) The proposed new bridge and rail will bisect the charming and historic village of Old Lyme, ruining its unique character. This may seem insignificant to those of you who have never visited Old Lyme, but our town represents an historic jewel. The village of Old Lyme is only a few blocks long, but our town was the epicenter of the American Impressionist art movement over 100 years ago. The quiet village, the tranquil marshes and the surrounding Connecticut and Lieutenant Rivers have provided inspiration for thousands of artists and their paintings ever since those early days of the Lyme Art Colony. The area mapped for the new rail line cuts right through the town center, and its construction would forever change the Old Lyme landscape currently characterized by the Lyme Art Academy, the Florence Griswold Museum (a National Historic Landmark), the tranquil Lieutenant River and other historic gems.

2) Alternative #1 would adversely affect the wildlife of the Lieutenant River and Connecticut River, home to osprey, eagles and the amazing "swallow phenomenon" that has captured the attention of the Audobon Society and birders from all over the world. This dramatic behavior, called murmuration, occurs when over half a million swallows swarm in a tornado-like congregation and descend in unison on the marshes of the lower Connecticut River, each evening at dusk in August and September. This natural phenomenon is so large that it can be seen on weather radar. However, the nature of bridge construction as well as the high speed train itself will restructure the marshland habitat through noise, pollutants, vibrations, and habitat fragmentation. As has been documented repeatedly in the scientific literature, these factors will inevitably have a lasting and irreparable impact the survivorship of these birds as well as all other species in the fragile marshland ecosystem.

3) We need economic development in Connecticut and Alternative #1 just won't get us there. Large businesses are lining up to leave the state because our transportation infrastructure is virtually nonexistent and our taxation policies are crippling. We need an innovative economic plan and the large scale investment needed to connect ALL of our major cities, not just a small patch of new rail through the town of Old Lyme. We need to implement a rail system that will connect our capital city, Hartford, to New Haven, Providence, Boston and New York. We need to connect UCONN, our largest public university and medical center that is currently isolated in Storrs, CT to these cities as well. Alternative #2 would accomplish both of these objectives and would help put Connecticut back on track to be a competitive force in New England and an attractive option for business growth.

Thank you for your attention.

Tory McKnight

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1714 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Tory
Last Name : McKnight
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly believe that Alternative 1 will rob Connecticut of more than it will give us. Alternative one is barely faster than 2 and 3, but will bisect the town of Old Lyme and ruin its character and historical value. The historic district of Old Lyme would be bisected by alternative one; this district was an epicenter for impressionist art and is known as an "artist colony". The Congregational church in the historic district of Old Lyme is the most painted church in Connecticut. This district is also home to the Lyme Academy of Fine Art, the Florence Griswold Museum, and the Lyme Art Association. Other than that, the other issue is that this railroad will bisect the marsh ecosystem. This marsh is a breeding ground for the osprey, which are an endangered preditory sea bird. These osprey which have cripplingly low populations in the world, actually THRIVE in Old Lyme, but they will leave or die if their home becomes bisected by a 150mph train. These populations will not be able to be sustained elsewhere, and we will drive them even closer to extinction... The Old Lyme marsh is also home to one of the most amazing wildlife phenomenon in North America: the Swallow Murmuration. I would urge you to look this up on youtube, as it is one of the most amazing wildlife phenomena you will ever see. At dusk and dawn in August and September, half a million swallows swirl together in a tornado formation and swoop and twirl in unison over the marsh of Old Lyme CT. It is mindblowing, and has attracted attention from tourists world-wide. The train would disrupt these birds home, and potentially stop the murmuration forever...I would strongly urge you to consider the cost of Alternative 1 in terms of things which truly matter, like history, heritage, endangered wildlife, and enchanting phenomenon like the murmuration, which will no longer be possible.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #302 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/27/2016

First Name : Darie

Last Name : McLaughlin

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The effect needing study is China's rescinding of the one child policy and its affect on how the public will be introduced to a once a year commute as the only realistic use for upgrading the rail system in the east and connecting L.A. with San Francisco in the west.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1120 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/12/2016

First Name : Matthew

Last Name : McLaughlin

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am looking into investing in some more property along the shoreline in southeastern CT. I will not do so if there is a chance that a rail line might suddenly appear in the backyards- That would ruin property values. Why can't the existing rail lines be improved? That would have to cost far less money and take far less time; I'm sure there are many places along the NEC that need the money more. I hope there will public meetings and discussions far in advance of any possible decisions. Thanks

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #514 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/3/2016

First Name : Marcia

Last Name : McLean

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The current plan for the NEC (Alt 1) which will go through the center of the historic village of Old Lyme, is not only devastating to the community, but also impractical. The historic district of the town is in the center of the proposed rail bed, this includes an art museum, a college of fine arts; historical houses and the town's only commercial district. This plan will ruin the small businesses that are located in town and will eliminate the historic district, a place of national importance to the American Impressionist movement. If the intention of the plan is move the rail beds away from the shoreline and the potential for flooding, storm damage etc. moving them parallel to I95 does nothing to accomplish this goal. The center of town is also within a flood zone due to the number of rivers that flow into the Connecticut River - the Lieutenant River, Duck River, Back River and other small tributaries are all in or very close to the center of town and run under the I-95 corridor. I understand the need to modernize the existing bridge crossing the CT river, but there is no need to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on rerouting the entire NEC. What does this accomplish? The desire to move Amtrak service closer to Hartford is not served by moving the rail beds further north by less 10 miles, and Hartford is a city that is in decline. Connecticut's high corporate tax is not going to attract business anytime soon, so why cater to a declining population?? What benefits are had by moving the rail beds to the center of an historic village - I can't think of one, but I can certainly think of many disadvantages. If the bridge needs updating that is understandable, and it can be replaced, but spending millions of money to redesign the entire NEC seems like government bureaucracy at its best.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1644 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Carol

Last Name : McMahon

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am opposed to NEC Future Alternative I. It effectively decimates the historic district of Old Lyme and its only commercial district. I am concerned about the environmental impact as well.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2495 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Joyce
Last Name : McMullen
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

The University of New Haven strives to continue furthering the education of all students whom have enrolled for a better academic career and to disrupt it with a railroad is inexcusable. There must be alternative routes that can be implemented.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2990 DETAIL

Status : Pending

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Martha

Last Name : McNair

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I grew up in Old Lyme, and when the center of town became an historic landmark, we children were told that it would be preserved by the government from all future attempts to modernize. Is the government planning on going back on its word?

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1846 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Kasey
Last Name : McNatt
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven and detract from the beauty and quaintness of Old Lyme.

Sincerely,

Kasey McNatt

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1831 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Dennis
Last Name : McNerney
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1466 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : David

Last Name : McNiff

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please don't consider alternative one as it would not offer much improvement and would seriously and negatively impact the Ct shoreline. The area around the CT river where it joins Long Island Sound, in particular, is a great natural and historical treasure and should be preserved from the disruption which would be caused by Alternative One. On the other hand Alternative Two would link CT's capital city to the NEC and have far greater overall benefits, including creating alternative routes to northern NE.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1103 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/12/2016
First Name : Judy
Last Name : McQuade
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

STOP, STOP, STOP this plan which would have horrific effects to our historic district and our local environment which has been an inspiration to artists for generations, it would decimate the only business area our small town has and for what? I/2 hour decreased time on the Washington, DC to Boston route!! --and for 60 billion dollars? You can't destroy an entire town for so little gain!!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #560 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/5/2016

First Name : Susan

Last Name : McQuade

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

It is absolutely unconscionable that Amtrak would think to re-route their tracks through the center of Old Lyme. I grew up in Old Lyme and have a cottage at the beach. Old Lyme is a very small community and your proposition to re route through the center of the town would totally destroy the entire town as it has been and we know it. It will have to be re-built elsewhere causing great financial stress for the residents & business owners. Secondly re routing the tracks would cause irreparable harm to the marshes, wildlife and the CT river banks. Amtrak use the tracks that are currently in place!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #557 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/4/2016
First Name : Tracy
Last Name : McQuade
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I grew up in Old Lyme and have spent years exploring all the waterways in these and neighboring towns. From kayaking at the mouth of the CT river to crabbing under the train bridge, the train in it's current costal route has been a fairly pleasant part of the soundtrack to many of those years. I come from a perspective of being a big supporter of goals for improved train services and wanting to do so with environmental considerations.
With that said, my very strong reaction is to the first plan which, with total incredulity, seems to route the train directly through the center of historic Old Lyme. While train services should have touch points and accessibility near towns for fantastic commuting benefits, routing directly through a historical center is inconceivably poorly planned. It's damaging to historical value, quality of life, town aesthetics, traffic variations etc.

Haven't we learned from the vastly negative impact that occurred when major highways were cut through communities with the same disregard? How many major cites (Boston's big did etc.) are now spending vast resources to remove these legacies to poor planning and return neighborhoods to a more whole state. Why would that be repeated?
Again- improved computer lines with great access by communities? Great. Moving lines inland vs. having it teeter on the edge of the shore? Exciting possibility. Train lines directly though the center of existing communities? Very poor plan- please lets go back to the drawing board on that one.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2992 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Greg
Last Name : Golden -DNR-
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Thank you for providing the opportunity for the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) to review and provide comments on the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northeast Corridor (NEC) Future study, a rail transportation planning effort for the northeastern United States, from Washington, D.C. to Boston, Massachusetts. The study is being coordinated by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration.

We understand that the project may eventually involve construction of both new segments of transportation infrastructure and/or replacements. The project alternatives as defined, and their descriptions and analysis, were clear and easy to understand and review. Later study will describe in more detail the potential local and regional projects and effects that may occur with each alternative.

The Tier 1 EIS document is admirably detailed and thorough, keeping in mind that it is a Tier 1 document, with future studies, planning, and documentation to be conducted for the overall project, resulting later in a Tier 2 study. We are appreciative of the many detailed chapters and sections, ranging from introduction and summary, detailed table of contents and index, detailed Purpose and Need section, many descriptive and analysis chapters, and detailed appendices. We have had the opportunity to attend two earlier interagency meetings in Maryland for this study, and we have understood based on those meeting discussions that the level of detail and "zoomed-in" examination of certain resources in the Tier 1 study is limited by definition. Later study will conduct that closer examination. The Tier 1 document did provide many areas of helpful detail and analysis, for many topics.

We also appreciate the stated focus of the study on both environmental sustainability and economic growth, two very important concepts in Maryland for emphasizing and balancing, with application of expert analysis and management. In addition to our appreciation to see these planning elements stated, we are glad to be a part of the related review as the study continues.

Regarding natural resources, we note that most of the focus in the Tier 1 document is on Federal resource categories in the ecological section, which

is of great review interest for us. As explained in this section and several others, further examination of State level resource categories will be in the subsequent Tier 2 analysis. As we have noted at the earlier meetings, MD DNR stands ready and available to help scope and screen ecological resources such as fisheries and other aquatic natural resources; State listed rares, threatened and endangered species; sensitive habitats of various types; forest resources; Coastal Zone areas and topics managed by the State; etc., to help provide a foundation for further ecological study and analysis.

The Tier 1 document also listed and discussed a number of public lands areas, included State Parks managed by MD DNR. We will be able to provide further coordination on those public lands as well in later studies. MD DNR has a separate but parallel review process specifically for public lands review, in addition to our review process for external projects such as this study. We will be able to involve the public lands review process as further detail is incorporated into this study.

As with most of the environmental review work we conduct, after assessment of the natural resources involved with any given proposed project, and consideration of the requirements for their conservation, we approach the review with a focus on project purpose and need; alternatives analysis; and project impact avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation. We will be prepared to assist with such review assessments for this project.

Note that in addition to the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Program, the State of Maryland has a State Scenic and Wild River Program which should be included in coordination during further study. Other major programs within MD DNR, including the Forest Conservation Act, Public Lands Management, and the Coastal Zone Management Program which is referenced in the Tier 1 Draft EIS, should be included in later coordination.

In summary of these comments for the current Tier 1 study, we are appreciative of the study details to date, and emphasize the importance of further study of State level natural resources and further detailed review focus as the study continues, with our assured availability to participate and contribute in the continued review.

If you have any questions on the comments above, please contact me at your convenience.

Greg Golden
Project Review Division

Integrated Policy and Review Unit
MD Department of Natural Resources
410-260-8331
please note my new email address: greg.golden@maryland.gov

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2908 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Bradley

Last Name : Smith, AICP

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please see attached for comments from the Maryland Department of Transportation on the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for NEC FUTURE.

[http://www.roads.maryland.gov/OCImages/511_logo_sm.JPG]Maryland now features 511 traveler information! Call 511 or visit: www.md511.org<http://www.md511.org/>

P Please consider the environment before printing this email

LEGAL DISCLAIMER - The information contained in this communication (including any attachments) may be confidential and legally privileged. This email may not serve as a contractual agreement unless explicit written agreement for this purpose has been made. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or any of its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender indicating that it was received in error and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system.

Attachments : MDOT comments on DEIS 2_16_2016.pdf (43 kb)

Maryland Department of Transportation
The Secretary's Office

Larry Hogan
Governor

Boyd K. Rutherford
Lt. Governor

Pete K. Rahn
Secretary

February 16, 2016

Ms. Rebecca Reyes-Alicea
Northeast Corridor Joint Program Advisor
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York NY 10004

Re: NEC FUTURE Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Reyes-Alicea:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Northeast Corridor (NEC) FUTURE project.

Under separate cover, the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) has already provided joint comments with several Northeast states and the NEC Commission on the DEIS. In addition to those comments, MDOT offers the following input.

The NEC is an integral part of Maryland's multimodal transportation network and supports critical intercity passenger, commuter and freight operations. With approximately 20 percent (90 miles) of the NEC located within Maryland, there are a number of major backlog projects and capacity needs within the State. As such, MDOT has partnered with Amtrak and FRA to advance planning studies for these projects including the B&P Tunnel in Baltimore City, BWI Rail Station Improvements and 4th Track project south of Baltimore, and the Susquehanna River Rail Bridge project between Harford and Cecil Counties. It is important that once planning is complete, these projects are able to secure additional federal funding and move into the next phase of project development.

Given the significant needs along the NEC and the expected growth in overall passenger and freight demand, MDOT does not support the No Action Alternative. As the FRA moves towards identifying the preferred build alternative and completes the NEC FUTURE service development plan (SDP), MDOT requests that FRA continue to consider all users of the NEC. It is critical

that FRA identify a preferred alternative that allows for incremental improvements along the NEC and maintains operations at existing levels (at a minimum) during construction of any improvements. This approach is particularly important in Maryland, where sections of the corridor are utilized 24 hours a day by passenger and freight operators.

MDOT requests that FRA also consider the needs of freight railroads as it indentifies its preferred alternative. Norfolk Southern carries out much of its operations in Maryland along the NEC between Baltimore and Perryville. Operating windows, dimensional limitations, and overall capacity create existing constraints on freight movement along the NEC and will only get worse over time as demand increases. With multimodal goods movement such an important component of Maryland's economy, MDOT requests that freight accommodations are considered when determining the preferred alternative.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments. MDOT looks forward to providing additional input as FRA finalizes the environmental documentation and SDP processes.

Sincerely,

Bradley M. Smith, AICP
Director of Freight and Multimodalism

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #668 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/10/2016
First Name : Scott A.
Last Name : Smith
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Ms. Carol Braegelmann
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
1849 C Street, NW-MS 2462-MIB
Washington D.C. 20240

Dear Ms. Braegelmann:

I am concerned that any government or non-governmental entity would propose or consider a railroad through the Patuxent Refuge. The Refuge is more than just one of the few remaining large green spaces in that part of Maryland and an important area ecologically, it is THE iconic birthplace of landmark wildlife research, such as that of Rachel Carson, who alerted the world to the dangers of DDT on our wildlife. And this proposal raises one of the greatest fears of those in the conservation community: that conservation lands, which in most cases took great effort to be preserved in perpetuity, can in the blink of an eye or the pen of a politician be forever lost to someone's vision of "progress". This is sacred ground. Find an alternate route.

Regards,

Scott

--
Scott Smith
Wildlife Ecologist
Maryland DNR-Wildlife & Heritage Services
PO Box 68
Wye Mills, MD 21679
(O) 410-827-8612 x103

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #639 DETAIL

Status : Action Completed

Record Date : 2/9/2016

First Name : Scott

Last Name : Hansen

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Ms. Reyes-Alicea:

The Maryland Department of Planning submits comments (attached) regarding the NEC Future: Tier I Draft EIS. A hard copy with signature is in the mail.

Please contact me with any questions.

Thank you,

*E. Scott Hansen**Transportation Planner*

Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street, Suite 1101
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Phone: 410.767.4611
Toll Free: 1.877.767.6272
Fax: 410.767.4480
Email: scott.hansen@maryland.gov <scott.hansen@maryland.gov>
Web: http://planning.maryland.gov/

*****Please update your contact information with my new email address: scott.hansen@maryland.gov <scott.hansen@maryland.gov>. *

Attachments : NEC Future DEIS Planning Comments.pdf (311 kb)

Larry Hogan, Governor
Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor

David R. Craig, Secretary
Wendi W. Peters, Deputy Secretary

Maryland Department of Planning
Maryland Historical Trust

January 20, 2016

Rebecca Reyes-Alicea
NEC FUTURE Program Manager
Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

Re: NEC FUTURE Investment Program
Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and
Section 106 Draft Programmatic Agreement (PA)

Dear Ms. Reyes-Alicia:

Thank you for providing the Maryland Historical Trust (Trust) with a copy of the DEIS and Draft Programmatic Agreement prepared for the NEC Future Investment Program, for review and comment.

The Trust, Maryland's State Historic Preservation Office, has appreciated the opportunity to participate in the consultation and negotiation of the multi-state agreement document for this undertaking, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Trust staff carefully reviewed the final draft PA and we find it largely consistent with the previous versions of the agreement discussed in our regional and state-specific conference calls over the course of the last year. We have a few minor suggestions, noted below, for your consideration in preparing the final agreement for signature.

1. Page 6, line 125: This Whereas clause references invitation to "statewide historic preservation commissions" to participate as consulting parties. We suggest changing the term "commissions" to "organizations" as commissions are typically governed under specific legal mandates at the local level and we assume this clause is referring to statewide non-profit organizations focused on historic preservation issues.

2. Page 9, line 277: Stipulation III.B establishes relevant Standards and Guidelines and should add "any additional requirements specified in a State-specific appendix to this PA, as applicable."

3. Pages 20-22, Signatory Parties / Concurring Parties: Please add names and titles for the various individuals who will be signing the agreement, so it is clear who actually signed the document as formal signatory or concurring parties.

4. Page C-2: Stipulation D Standard Treatment #4 Archaeological Resources needs to be expanded to specify the applicable parameters and consultation process for employing data recovery as a standard treatment and should follow a similar format to Stipulations A.1-4 and B.1-4.

5. Page E-1: For the Maryland Historical Trust's entry in the Tier 1 Consulting Parties List, the Status of Invitation Acceptance column should read "Signatory to the PA" as we positively responded to the invitation via email on 12/17/14.

6. Page J-7: Please add names and titles for the various individuals who will be signing the State-specific agreement, so it is clear who actually signed the document as formal signatory parties.

7. Careful proofreading and editing of the final PA are needed to correct minor typos, punctuation and format errors.

We await submittal of the final PA for signature, when available. We look forward to working with the involved parties to implement the agreement for relevant undertakings in Maryland as the program moves into Tier 2. If you have questions or need further assistance, please contact Beth Cole at beth.cole@maryland.gov / 410-514-7631 or Tim Tamburrino at tim.tamburrino@maryland.gov / 410-514-7637.

Thank you for providing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hughes
Director / State Historic Preservation Officer

EH/EJC/TT/201505034

Maryland Department of Planning

Larry Hogan, Governor
Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor

David R. Craig, Secretary
Wendi W. Peters, Deputy Secretary

February 9, 2016

NEC Future
Rebecca Reyes-Alicea
Federal Railroad Administration,
U.S. Department of Transportation
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

Re: NEC Future Tier I Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Reyes-Alicea:

The Maryland Department of Planning ("Planning") appreciates the opportunity to review the Tier I Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for NEC Future, a Rail Investment Plan for the Northeast Corridor. The development of a rail investment plan for the nation's busiest rail corridor is a vital component to help improve Maryland's rail passenger and freight travel and grow Maryland's economy.

The proposed action alternatives in the DEIS provide interstate and regional rail service via Amtrak and MARC in Maryland and support the economy by providing increased passenger and freight mobility, reducing congestion and associated wear and tear on regional roads and Interstates, and helping to attract private development near existing or proposed stations. Planning supports the action alternatives 1, 2 and 3, but does not support the no-action alternative.

The NEC is too important to Maryland's mobility and economic future not to study long-term investments that address insufficient capacity and aging infrastructure in Maryland, such as at the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel in West Baltimore and the Susquehanna River Rail Bridge in Harford and Cecil County. The no-action alternative cannot accommodate projected future ridership or freight demand, nor does it improve reliability or address gaps in connectivity.

We appreciate the Federal Railroad Administration's Interagency project coordination and extensive public outreach process. Planning looks forward to continuing participation of the NEC Future study to address environmental and community impacts of the project while balancing the needs of Maryland's growing economy.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please contact Scott Hansen of my staff at scott.hansen@maryland.gov or by telephone at 410-767-4611.

Sincerely,

Stu Sirota, AICP

Assistant Secretary,
Planning Services

CC: Chuck Boyd, Planning Coordination Section
Kristen Mitchell, Infrastructure and Development Unit
Bihui Xu, Infrastructure and Development Unit
Scott Hansen, Infrastructure and Development Unit

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2829 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Melody

Last Name : Me

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

We are as a community amazed. This proposal should have been, and now must be, detailed and discussed thoroughly, intelligently and transparently to avoid the destruction and disruption of cultural, historical, financial and personal landmarks of the very country and citizens it purports to serve. Anything less is unconscionable, and almost certainly illegal.

MEADOWLANDS REGIONAL CHAMBER

Building Essential Connections That Drive Business Growth

February 9, 2016

NEC Future
U.S DOT Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

Re: NEC Future Tier One Environmental Impact Study - Comments

The Meadowlands Regional Chamber (MRC) has had a long history of transportation advocacy in this region for over 40 years. We are membership organization representing a broad range of economic interests in the region, from small family businesses to international corporations, to educational institutions and non-profits and we currently serve over 1100 companies.

Transportation and infrastructure issues are a high priority for us, as they provide the foundation for economic opportunities and prosperity for our members and the community at large. We are thus very pleased to see that the Gateway project is moving forward on several fronts, and that the NEC Future Tier 1 Alternatives Report Study is evaluating alternatives for the future of the intercity rail corridor.

We are also in agreement with the DEIS identification of the Frank R. Lautenberg Station in Secaucus as a hub station for intercity rail services. At present, there is no Amtrak stop at this station. This is a critical issue for the MRC and its membership, particularly in light of the economic linkages between New York and Northern New Jersey, as well as the existing and future destinations near the station, such as the Meadowlands Sports Complex and American Dream. Development around the station continues to grow, including both industrial and residential projects. A Northeast Corridor stop at Secaucus would provide regional connections to New Jersey Transit rail lines and Metro-North, within New York, New Jersey and beyond. In addition, economic development and investment would be further accelerated within the Meadowlands area as a result of this new accessibility.

The MRC strongly supports the additional tunnels to New York, the heart of the Gateway project, and views the project as essential to the region and the nation. We urge that a stop at Secaucus continue as an integral part of the project as the environmental impact studies and project design are finalized. Our ability to maximize the billions of investment that is currently being made and leverage those investments for a long term sustaining economy here are

Meadows Office Complex | 201 Route 17 N., 2nd Floor | Rutherford NJ 07070
Phone: (201) 939-0707 | Fax: (201) 939-0522 | www.meadowlands.org

dependent on mobility options. Further, these studies should also review the potential for implementing this stop in the near future, not waiting until the completion of the Gateway project. This essential piece in realizing the potential of the Lautenberg Station as a critical regional hub must be recognized and implemented as soon as possible.

We also want to emphasize the importance of the Bergen Loop in the future regional rail network. This improvement merits a somewhat minor mention in the DEIS, but is a significant element for thousands of New Jersey commuters.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment, and offer to meet at your convenience to discuss the MRC's perspective on the NEC improvements.

Respectfully,

James Kirkos
Chief Executive Officer

JK/lt

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1956 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Meghan
Last Name :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

Next speaker is Neil Mehrotra.

MR. MEHROTRA: Hi. My name is Neil Mehrotra. I'm a professor at Brown University, a professor of economics. I guess I come here today as sort of an interested citizen, as a user of the Northeast Corridor.

I've had a chance to travel to Europe and Japan and to countries where they have great high-speed networks and where it's easy to get around. You can now make the trip from Milan to Naples in three and a half hours, and you kind of wonder why we don't have that here in the U.S.

I like the fact that we are trying to get high-speed rail here, but the costs in this plan are frankly outrageous.

It's fashionable to think that we have a funding problem. We don't have a funding problem; we have a cost problem. This plan is riddled with unnecessary scope, a failure to focus on how we first optimize operations and scheduling rather than building new track, new tunnel, failure to optimize rolling stock. Those are the kinds of things that we should be focused on in order to present a plan that has a cost that is politically palatable. Even Alternative 1 is orders of magnitude too expensive.

To give you an example, in Japan, they're building a maglev that will travel at 300 miles an hour for $80 billion from Tokyo to Osaka. That's roughly the distance from New York to Boston. It will travel at 300 miles per hour. 90 percent of the maglev is underground. It will make the trip in 67 minutes. Alternative 3 is more expensive per mile and will make a slower trip over a similar distance.

So I think that this plan needs to benchmark its costs against Japanese and European costs and try to identify those drivers of why is it costing so much for us to build high-speed rail here in the U.S. and focus on incremental improvements, on trying to optimize first scheduling and operations before focusing on very expensive changes in route and changes in engineering.

MR. BAER: Thank you.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #55 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 12/8/2015
First Name : Nancy
Last Name : Melius
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Federal Railroad Administration,

Please find below my input In regards to the NEC:

TRAINS
1) Silent train cars
2) More options for discount or affordable fares
3) Place to store luggage
4) Better food and beverage options (more artisan and healthy)
5) Seats with drop-down trays

TRAIN STATIONS
1) Clean, well-designed, safe train stations
2) Clearly marked and strategically placed up and down escalators and elevators (For handicapped, luggage, and strollers)
3) Light, airy and safe waiting areas
4) Places to sit (non-waiting area)
5) Counter tops with hooks underneath (to hold handbags) where commuters can stand and place a laptop, or cup of coffee, etc. (It is very difficult, particularly for women, to get something out of their handbag when they have no place to put down other items they may be carrying)
6) Artisanal food and beverage kiosks and shops
7) Lockers and/or storage facilities
8) Public showers for business commuters (In London Train Stations, commuters pay to use the public restrooms and showers)

Thank you for listening.

Kind regards,

Nancy Melius

Nancy Melius
[redacted]

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #59 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 12/8/2015
First Name : Nancy
Last Name : Melius
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Thank you. I would like to add one more comment, if I may.

"We all spend 10-20+ hours a week commuting. Perhaps we should start looking at our commute as part of the journey instead of simply getting from one place to another. If the decision makers in America's transportation business started looking at commuting in this way a whole new set of ideas could emerge and our lifestyles greatly enhanced."

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Nancy Melius
[redacted]

On Dec 7, 2015, at 1:49 PM, "comment@necfuture.com" <comment@necfuture.com> wrote:

Thank you for your comment.

Please note that comments received on the Tier 1 Draft EIS during the formal public comment period will be addressed in the Tier 1 Final EIS, anticipated to be released in late 2016. We appreciate your interest in NEC FUTURE.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2519 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Georgia

Last Name : Mellos

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #199 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 1/19/2016
First Name : RICHARD
Last Name : MENGES
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I forgot to mention what an IMPRESSIVE amount of work you have done!!! thank you for your service. Richard Menges

On Tuesday, January 19, 2016 11:26 AM, "info@NECFUTURE.com" <info@NECFUTURE.com> wrote:

Thank you for your comment. Please note that comments received on the Tier 1 Draft EIS during the formal public comment period will be addressed in the Tier 1 Final EIS, anticipated to be released in late 2016. We appreciate your interest in NEC FUTURE.

http://www.NECFUTURE.com/

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #198 DETAIL

Status : Pending

Record Date : 1/19/2016

First Name : richard

Last Name : menges

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

question on page 73 point 4: 2 additional tracks? "30th st north and east of river; east side of I-76" does this mean taking land from what currently is park??? (art museum side along river) if so, I strongly OPPOSE altering existing park land along the river

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2253 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Carlin
Last Name : Menzin
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,
I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #795 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/10/2016

First Name : Anthony

Last Name : Merante

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Forty years ago, while stationed with the U.S. Navy in Japan, I had the good fortune to ride the ShinKanSen (New Tokaido Line) the full lenght of its original line from Tokyo to Osaka. Fantastic experience. Two generations later, this country, which introduced railroads to Japan in1858, has, ashamedly, nothing even close. And Japan has gone WAY beyond that original single line. Then take a look at what is being done to our fantastic Interstate system, especially during "rush hours" across this country.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #466 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/1/2016

First Name : Melissa

Last Name : Mercado

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

RE: rerouting the line North of the coastline of $60 billion. The plan to build a new Connecticut River rail bridge North of the current one then have the rail line continue through the center of OL, CT.

This will have a severe negative impact on our community as well as our family directly. We purchased our house almost 1/4 mile from these tracks in 2006 at the height of the real estate market and lost almost $80K in value (our entire equity and then some). After 10 years, we are almost at the point where we may be able to take a second mortgage to fix our roof, driveway and fence falling down however, if this goes through, the value of our house may further deteriorate and we may never be able to repair to be able to get what we owe, let alone the $80K we've already lost.

Others of our neighbors are in the same situation as we are and I urge you to consider the economic damage this would cause to the residents around this proposed rail upgrade.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #175 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/14/2016

First Name : Meta

Last Name : Mereday

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As an advocate and facilitator for growing veteran businesses to provide true job creation to reduce veteran unemployment, I am appalled at the clear lack to significant outreach to veteran organizations such as mine and inclusion of veteran businesses particularly with federal dollars being involved. These projects violate the law and nothing is done about it unless a tragedy or scandal calls attention to it, thus costing lives and wasting tax dollars.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #349 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/28/2016

First Name : Leroy

Last Name : Mergy

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The re-routing of the track through historic Old Lyme will destroy the community. The beauty of the tracks along the shore has become part of the pleasure for train riders and the neighborhood has adapted. changing that now would destroy both the beauty of the ride and the town

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2333 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Corinne

Last Name : Merjave

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1689 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Jill

Last Name : Merola

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

We do NOT want a high speed rail going through our community. The risk to people and wildlife isn't worth the extra time savings.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1876 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mary

Last Name : Merrill

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose the proposed rail modifications because it will destroy the Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, a division of the University of New Haven, in the heart of the historic town of Old Lyme, Ct..

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1673 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Polly

Last Name : Merrill

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

This clearly is not in the best interest of Old Lyme, Connecticut tourism, and history dating back to the American Revolution. I urge the FRA to refrain from using this unusually negative idea for Old Lyme, Connecticut and the northeast corridor.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2797 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Mimi

Last Name : Merton

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1007 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/12/2016

First Name : Nancy

Last Name : Mesham

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose option 1 to bring the rail through Old Lyme center and north of the existing rail. Reuse existing rail line. As an Old Lyme resident and real estate agent this runs directly through the center of our only commercial district and historic district. There must be a better choice.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2734 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Brian
Last Name : Bidolli
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached the Metropolitan Council of Governments' comment letter on the NEC Future Draft EIS.

Please let me know if there are any issues in accessing the PDF.

Regards,
Matt Fulda

[METROCOG - Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments]<http://www.ctmetro.org/>

Matthew Fulda
Regional Planner
mfulda@ctmetro.org
203-366-5405 x28
ctmetro.org<http://ctmetro.org/>
525 Water Street, Bridgeport, CT 06604

Attachments : MetroCOG NEC Future Draft EIS Comment Letter.pdf (105 kb)

METROCOG
Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments

February 16, 2016

Ms. Sarah Feinberg
Administrator
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue Southeast
Washington, District of Columbia 20590

NEC FUTURE
U.S. DOT Federal Railroad Administration
One Bowling Green, Suite 429
New York, NY 10004

RE: NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Administrator Feinberg:

The Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments (MetroCOG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Federal Railroad Administration's NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). MetroCOG applauds the NEC Future program, as it has provided a process for considering a long-term vision for the Northeast Corridor. This process will set the stage for the adoption of an investment program reversing decades of underinvestment in the corridor.

As a Council of Governments and Metropolitan Planning Organization in Connecticut situated along the I-95, Metro North and Amtrak corridors, MetroCOG and its member municipalities depend on a safe and well-functioning multimodal transportation system. In addition to its heavily used highway system, the State of Connecticut owns and/or operates several commuter rail and freight rail systems. The most important of these is the New Haven Line, which is the busiest commuter rail system in the nation. This segment is a critical link in the Washington to Boston intercity corridor. It is also vital to the economy of MetroCOG's municipalities since it is a primary connection to New York City, the nation's largest economic center.

MetroCOG strongly recommends that FRA initiate a **phased** Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) program. The first phase of the Tier 2 EIS should focus on enabling <u>all</u> projects identified in the No-Build (funded or unfunded) on the existing New Haven Line, Shore Line East and include similar work for the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Corridor. Further the Phase 1, Tier 2 EIS should address all projects necessary to achieve state-of-good repair and address projects that will deliver the maximum safety, capacity, speed and frequency on these existing corridors. This approach will ensure that the existing corridors have the capacity to serve projected growth in the metropolitan and intercity markets and also

Bridgeport • Easton • Fairfield • Monroe • Stratford • Trumbull
525 Water Street, Suite 1, Bridgeport, CT 06604 • v: 203-366-5405 • f: 203-366-8437 • info@gbrct.org

METROCOG
Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments

enable potential future investments to deliver new, dedicated high-speed alignments along the entire Northeast Corridor, including services in and through Connecticut.

The State of Connecticut, through municipal and regional collaboration, has outlined many of the key projects to meet our Phase 1 Tier 2 EIS recommendation as part of *"Let's Go CT!"* which is the state's 30 year transportation plan. MetroCOG is prepared to work with the State of Connecticut, FRA, Amtrak, New York, Massachusetts and other regional partners to fully advance this strategy on the existing passenger rail corridors.

Finally, as it relates to our recommended Phase 1 Tier 2 EIS program, it is expected that this EIS will meet all federal resource and funding agency's requirements to ensure that all federal funding sources are eligible to advance projects in these corridors.

MetroCOG further recommends that major new capacity that goes beyond investments in the existing rail corridors continue to be evaluated, but only after the Phase 1 Tier 2 EIS is completed for the existing corridors. It is this agency's opinion that improvements to existing infrastructure be prioritized ahead of the more costly, longer term implementation of new rail infrastructure throughout the NEC.

I pledge my support and the full cooperation of MetroCOG in assisting FRA to reach its goal of a Record of Decision and completing an EIS for the Northeast Corridor.

Sincerely,

Brian Bidolli
Executive Director

Bridgeport • Easton • Fairfield • Monroe • Stratford • Trumbull
525 Water Street, Suite 1, Bridgeport, CT 06604 • v: 203-366-5405 • f: 203-366-8437 • info@gbrct.org

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #279 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/25/2016

First Name : John

Last Name : Metzger

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a part of modernizing our rail corridor service. Tested options in rail-bed GPR and other ballast monitoring devices should become regular deployment and tools for track maintenance service. These tools support rail infrastructure service life budgets and corridor development plans.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2452 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Carolyn
Last Name : Meyer
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

RUBY SEIGEL: The next speaker is Matthew Meyer.

MATTHEW MEYER: Good afternoon.

AUDIENCE: Good afternoon.

MATTHEW MEYER: Good afternoon.

AUDIENCE: Good afternoon.

MATTHEW MEYER: Thank you. Just wanted to make sure. My name is Matthew Meyer. I am a Wilmington resident, Wilmington cyclist, and Amtrak guest rewards member. And like tens of thousands of cyclists on the Northeast corridor, a frequent rail rider.

I'm here today to talk about roll-on/roll-off service. I -- if you drove in today -- and hopefully you didn't. Hopefully you took the train, but if you drove in today, you would have seen a sign coming into our city, our great city of Wilmington, that says, "Wilmington, a Place to be Somebody. Wilmington's a place to be somebody. It's also

31

a place go somewhere where within two hours by rail from Washington -- to Washington, D.C. and to New York. For me however, and many of my rider friends, we're not two hours from Washington and two hours from New York. For me to go to New York with my bicycle takes about five hours, because the only way for me to take my bike to New York, I have to get on SEPTA to Philly, then change trains, go to Trenton, and then get on a New Jersey transit train from Trenton to New York. There's no way for me to go to Washington, D.C. with roll-on service. In 2016, that is preposterous.

I speak today on behalf of Bike Delaware, a nonprofit membership organization that is finding tremendous success here in Delaware collaborating with government and the private sector to make cycling a safe, convenient, and fun transportation option.

Look, we should be friends here. If you open the news journal today, there was an

32

op-ed from Bike Delaware and League of Women Voters advocating a bill down in Dover in our State House regarding multimodal forms of transportation; alternatives to car-based life, including rail. We should be collaborating together and particularly with regard to environmental impact.

We're speaking today simply to

emphasize the vital importance that those heading this planning process understand the tremendous opportunity before it, not only to permit walk-on bicycle service on passenger trains on the Northeast corridor during certain times, but to outright encourage it.

When you look at commuter rails, subway, and long-distance rail passenger services globally, you will see Amtrak is one of the only train systems that prohibits walk-on bicycle passenger service, and we believe it hurts their top line. It costs them, and it costs us. Providing the quality, seamless

33

ridership experience to the millions of cyclists on the Northeast corridor is not just good for the environment and responsive democracy. It's great business. When you consider an overwhelming -- there's really a bulge of cyclists, and the younger-aged tier, who are growing older and continuing to cycle, it's an even better business proposition.

This planning process, including the purchase of new trains, prevents a tremendous opportunity to the railroad administration, to Amtrak to get a little greener and to understand more young adults than ever are riding, and walk-on cycling service will be great for rail along the Northeast corridor and further increase ridership. Thank you.

RUBY SEIGEL: Thank you very much.

At this point, I don't have anybody else who has signed up to speak. And I'm perusing the room. So if there are no folks who want to speak, Scott, was that your hand?

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2704 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Dave.

Last Name : Meyers

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Re tunnel to Long Island. 1. Why widest location on LI sound? 2. Why not support and improve existing ferry service at Bridgeport and new London (probably more cost effective considering need) 3 consider environmental impact at both ends of such a project.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2730 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Robert

Last Name : Post

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

at this point without any additional information the Harbor Commission is totally opposed to this proposal.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1894 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Brian

Last Name : Michel

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #355 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/28/2016

First Name : Michelle

Last Name :

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am opposed to the "Alternative 3" and further it is your obligation to properly inform the public of how you intend to spend billions of tax dollars. It would be extremely disruptive to the residential neighborhoods of Long Island, and specifically garden city, to have additional train lines running through next to private residences. The existing LIRR lines already provide a great deal of noise, and anything additional would be highly disruptive to the community.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #396 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/30/2016

First Name : Jennifer

Last Name : Michelson

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

We should do our best to preserve historical districts

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2746 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/16/2016
First Name : Taritha L.
Last Name : Middleton
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As you know, two years ago, the University formed a partnership with Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts, a leading fine arts school in Old Lyme, Conn. The development of this affiliation can be described as nothing short of extraordinary, highlighted by enrollment growth and the creation of new, innovative programs at our main campus in West Haven and our satellite campus in Tuscany, Italy.

However, a recent development is threatening the long-term vitality of this picturesque campus in Old Lyme. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has proposed building new train tracks in the area, and one of the alternatives calls for tracks to run directly through our campus. We believe these plans are unacceptable as they would destroy the campus community, endanger the federally protected areas of the Connecticut River Estuary and ruin the aesthetic quality of Old Lyme's nationally recognized historic district. Other proposed alternatives make far more sense, such as one that would head north along I-91 to Hartford and then on to Providence and Boston, providing much-needed train access to inland areas.

You can help show your support for Lyme Academy College by visiting http://www.necfuture.com/get_involved and expressing your opposition to Alternative 1 of the FRA's Northeast Corridor Futures proposal. You can do this by submitting a simple statement that says the following:

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2833 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Said

Last Name : Mikki

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #238 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/22/2016

First Name : Michael

Last Name : Milardo

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am a resident of old Lyme
I am 68 years old and still working !!!
I just moved to old Lyme in May of 2015
After years of work and smart investments..... I finally saved enough money to buy the house I always wanted in what is considered one of the best neighborhood in old Lyme..... Now only to find that my property values will be trashed if this plan goes through !!!!
I am definetly very unhappy about this and will do everything in my power as a concerned resident of old Lyme ..... To see that this plan gets defeated !!!
MICHAEL A MILARDO

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1849 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Lorraine
Last Name : Miles
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I see no justification for NECFutures
alternative 1 since it would have such negative impacts on the environmental, economic & historic aspects of Old Lyme, CT

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2573 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Anne

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

While I welcome any upgrade of passenger rail in the northeast, I can't believe that the plan for high speed rail bypasses the major urban area of Springfield, MA, instead creating an entirely new route through a rural part of northern CT that does not even have an existing right of way. A recent forum in Palmer, MA concerning a possible passenger rail stop there had over 100 people attending. We have collected over 5,000 signatures in just a few months since then from local small businesses and individuals. And that's just Palmer--there is enormous support in the areas surrounding our small town, some of whom have representatives who have contacted us and are also interested in a Palmer stop, and we intend to expand our campaign to those areas soon. Please reconsider running the high speed line via Springfield and Palmer to Boston.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2403 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Colleen

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To the Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

Colleen Miller
Class of 1992

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2085 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Jeremiah

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #472 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/1/2016

First Name : Laura Lee

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a resident of Old Lyme, CT, I am vehemently opposed to this plan to disrupt and alter the community of Old Lyme which is an historic CT village and the home of the CT River Artists' Colony dating back to 1900. The existing train line is in the least disruptive location and should remain so. We will fight this plan and will not surrender our town, homes and the historic value of this famous CT. shoreline community.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2773 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Libby

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose the proposed route.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1431 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Pam

Last Name : Miller

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I do not support alternative 1. Aside from the impact on old lyme, I believe more connectivity is important.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1358 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Cynthia

Last Name : Miller-Aird

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I was just told about the proposal to build a high speed train through the center of our historic downtown. I am shocked and saddened by that option. Old Lyme is one of the most beautiful shoreline communities and the center of our town is filled with historic homes, our town hall, dozens of art galleries and one of the most important art museums in the state of CT. I commute into NY City out of Old Saybrook on a weekly basis and find the current transportation options more than adequate. I think the idea to destroy a downtown just to improve the speed of a train between NY and Boston reprehensible.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3071 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/17/2016
First Name : Richard
Last Name : Miller-Murphy
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

Richard Miller-Murphy (Rich)
Director of Marketing
Blood, Laboratory and Medical Services

[redacted]
New York, NY 10065

[redacted] Office
[redacted] FAX
[redacted] Mobile

rmiller-murphy@[redacted]<mailto:rmiller-murphy@[redacted]>
[redacted]y<http://[redacted]>

[http://[redacted]http://[redacted]/>
LIFESAVING INNOVATION SINCE 1964
[http://www.[redacted]_public/2015/04/28/facebook-s.png]<https://[redacted]>
[http://www.[redacted]_public/2015/04/28/twitter-s.png] <https[redacted]r>
[http://www.[redacted]_public/2015/04/28/instagram-s.png]
<https://[redacted]>
[http://www[redacted]g]
<https://[redacted]>
[http://[redacted]ublic/2015/04/28/linkedin-s.png]
<https://[redacted]>
Donate Blood<http[redacted]| Volunteer<http://[redacted]
[redacted]Support NYBC<http://[redacted]

This email transmission and any documents, files or previous email messages attached to it may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this transmission to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you must not read this transmission and that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or return email and delete the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2914 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Peter

Last Name : Trentacoste

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please be advised that this firm represents the Incorporated Village of Mineola (Village). The attached comments are respectfully submitted on behalf of the Village

---

Peter S. Trentacoste, Esq.

Spellman Rice Gibbons

Polizzi & Truncale, LLP

229 Seventh Street - Suite 100

P.O. Box 7775

Garden City, New York 11530

516-592-6835

This email and the documents accompanying it contain information which is confidential and/or legally privileged. The information is intended only

for the use of the individual or entity addressed on this email. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited, and that the documents should be returned to this firm immediately. In this regard, if you have received this email in error, please notify us by phone at 516-592-6800 immediately so that we can arrange the return of the documents.

Attachments : Village of Mineola.pdf (85 kb)

INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF MINEOLA

Written Comments Concerning
the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft EIS

February 16, 2016

Introduction

The following comments are submitted by and on behalf of the Incorporated Village of Mineola (Mineola) with respect to the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (NEC Future).

NEC Future is a planning effort to define, evaluate, and prioritize future investments in the Northeast Corridor (NEC) from Washington, D.C. to Boston.

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has developed three distinct Action Alternatives for evaluation in the NEC Future.

Alternative 1 maintains the role of rail as it is today in the region, with the level of rail service keeping pace with the growth in population in the Study Area.

Alternative 2 grows the role of rail, expanding rail service at a rate greater than the growth in regional population and employment.

Alternative 3 transforms the role of rail, supporting trips over longer distances and to places not currently connected by passenger rail, thereby positioning rail as the dominant mode for Interregional travel to urban centers along the NEC. Alternative 3 includes new route options operating between Washington, D.C., and Boston separate from the existing NEC. Specially, Alternative 3 proposes high speed rail service via Long Island by providing service through Long Island and northern New Haven and Hartford Counties, CT.

These comments are intended to assist the FRA in the preparation of an appropriate and useful EIS so that both the lead agency and the public may properly evaluate any proposal for the NEC, especially Alternative 3 as it relates to Long Island. In the absence of a formal detailed plan and based upon basic information provided in the Draft EIS, Mineola provides the following comments.

1. Based upon the information provided, the NEC Future is insufficient in evaluating the significant impacts which will occur in the communities through which the project will extend. For example, traffic impacts may (and will) occur beyond the limited study area both during construction and on a permanent basis. Impacts upon businesses outside the proposed limited study area may well flow from activities

which occur track-side. NEC Future should take into account the unique arrangement of each individual community involved, the individual dynamic of each community and the natural relationship which each community has with public transportation, especially rail transport.

2. NEC Future must consider all potential property acquisitions needed. One of the driving forces in determining the impacts of and thus the construction feasibility of different design (or no-action) alternatives will be the economic effects upon local communities, especially with regard to loss of real estate assessed valuation. This same principle applies to potential temporary takings for construction period purposes.

3. NEC Future must consider all neighborhood and community disruption. Every development has a neighborhood impact. Those impacts must be considered.

4. NEC Future must consider traffic impact and conduct an appropriate traffic analysis and study.

5. NEC Future must consider the noise impact and conduct an appropriate noise analysis and study.

6. NEC Future must consider the impact in parking and conduct an appropriate analysis and study.

7. NEC Future must consider if advancement will result in any loss of assessed valuation in the communities, and a method to compensate those communities on a permanent basis for such loss must be devised.

8. NEC Future must conduct a careful analysis of impacts upon businesses.

9. NEC Future must consider the impact on public safety and security and conduct an appropriate analysis and study.

It is respectfully suggested that the FRA give significant weight and attention to Mineola's above comments.

Conclusion

Commentary upon the NEC Future Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement prior to any presentation of a potential design for the proposed project is a very difficult chore. Without design detail (or even concept), one is left only to surmise what is proposed. Such surmise has not been made here. As a result, further comment will be made once a design shall have been proposed.

Long Island is a special place. The residents of Long Island strive to preserve and promote a quality of life which focuses upon safety, security, fine homes, manicured lawns, uncluttered roads, culture, recreation, education and a sense of community. Any project proposed for Long Island must also protect and promote that quality of life.

Long Island also has a special business community. The business owners and professionals in the village are committed to complementing the residential community in promoting Long Island as a wonderful place to visit or in which to live or work.

It is urged that the environmental review of the proposed NEC Future take into consideration and share in, at every phase and in every category of review, the promotion of the dearly-held values of the Long Island community.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott P. Strauss,
Mayor
Incorporated Village of Mineola

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2080 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Virginia

Last Name : Millhiser

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. It will also destroy the views and quiet of the Lieutenant River, one of the last underdeveloped areas in and around Old Lyme.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2438 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Robert

Last Name : Mills

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2186 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Travis

Last Name : Minetti

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #808 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/11/2016
First Name : Bonnie Gallo
Last Name : Minkler
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

11 February 2016

Ms. Carol Braegelmann
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
1849 C Street, NW-MS 2462-MIB
Washington D.C. 20240

RE: Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Section 4(f) Assessment for NEC FUTURE, A Rail Investment Plan for the Northeast Corridor, Washington, DC, MD, DE, PA, NJ, NY, CT, RI, and MA

Dear Ms. Braegelmann:

Please, please, no! Not another shortsighted state project that puts natural places and wildlife at risk and as a result, diminishes our world and our lives!!! As a citizen of Maryland and a lover of our state's few remaining wild places I am writing this letter in opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan.

This ill-advised proposal would chop off and destroy 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge including pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats, critical to a number of at-risk bird species. It would destroy this valuable wildlife habitat in a region of Maryland where development has taken an immense toll on natural resources, and in so doing would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland-also recognized by Audubon Maryland-DC as an Important Bird Area (IBA) in 2006 because it provides habitat for several declining bird species, including Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler.

The Patuxent Research Refuge was established in 1973 specifically for the purpose of upholding and promulgating the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. The Act was passed to more effectively meet the U.S. migratory bird treaty obligations through the acquisition of land and water for the perpetual preservation for birds.

The laws that established National Wildlife Refuges state that the land should not be used for purposes OTHER than conservation. Allowing the proposed rail line to destroy a publicly-owned natural resource at the Patuxent Research Refuge would set a dangerous precedent for the country's most beautiful and biologically diverse landscapes. Feasible and less destructive alternatives to incising a wildlife refuge exist. Please choose an alternate that does not disturb a national treasure.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Gallo Minkler
Baltimore, MD

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #3077 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/17/2016
First Name :
Last Name : Peter
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Ms. Carol Braegelmann

Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

1849 C Street, NW-MS 2462-MIB

Washington D.C. 20240

RE: Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Section 4(f) Assessment for NEC FUTURE, A Rail Investment Plan for the Northeast Corridor, Washington, DC, MD, DE, PA, NJ, NY, CT, RI, and MA

Dear Ms. Braegelmann:

As a citizen of Maryland and a lover of our state's few remaining wild places I am writing this letter in opposition to Alternate 3 in your rail plan.

This proposal would chop off 60 acres of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge including pristine stream, wetland, riparian and forest habitats, critical to a number of at-risk bird species. It would destroy this valuable wildlife habitat in a region of Maryland where development has taken an immense toll on natural resources, and in so doing would damage the ecological integrity of the largest remaining forest block in central Maryland-also recognized by Audubon Maryland-DC as an Important Bird Area (IBA) in 2006 because it provides habitat for several declining bird species, including Eastern whip-poor-will, wood thrush, Kentucky warbler and prairie warbler.

The Patuxent Research Refuge was established in 1973 specifically for the purpose of upholding and promulgating the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. The Act was passed to more effectively meet the U.S. migratory bird treaty obligations through the acquisition of land and water for the perpetual preservation for birds.

Allowing the proposed rail line to destroy a publicly-owned natural resource at the Patuxent Research Refuge would set a dangerous precedent for the country's most beautiful and biologically diverse landscapes. Feasible and less destructive alternatives to incising a wildlife refuge exist. Please

choose an alternate that does not disturb a national treasure.

Sincerely,

Peter Minkler

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #652 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/9/2016
First Name : Joseph
Last Name : Miragliuolo
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I understand there is an option being considered, which entails going through rural northeastern CT. That would radically change (read: ruin) a beautiful, bucolic area with absolutely no gain for the residents. We already have a suitable corridor, which is already dedicated to transportation--Route 95. If the rural route is acted upon, there will be more than considerable resistance from a well-educated, vocal population.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2063 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Patricia

Last Name : Miranda

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven. As a long time professor at the college I have seen the extraordinary lives of our students grow and thrive, the college build strong relationships and support from local community, who become part of our students lives. With the new merger with University of New Haven the college continues to grow, to develop a unique and powerful arts program. our students go on to major graduate programs with full scholarship, and create dynamic lives in the arts all over the country. Only recently new dorms were built, and our community is truly a testament to the arts and culture of CT. In addition, the town of Old Lyme remains historically important to the history of the arts in America, with a long tradition going back to the American Impressionist movement. To put a rail line right through it would devastate its historical significance, along with our very special school.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2259 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Stephanie

Last Name : Miranda

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly oppose Alternative 1 of the NEC futures proposal because it would destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1923 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/15/2016
First Name : Pouya
Last Name : Mirmahboub
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

"I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven."

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1132 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : arthur
Last Name : misiaszek
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Alternative 1 includes a proposed alignment through my community of Old Lyme, CT. Additional engineering and reasonable mitigation is required to make this alternative acceptable to me and my family. We support the vision of NEC Future and understand and support the proposed improvements in the NEC.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1309 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/14/2016
First Name : Peg
Last Name : Mitchel
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am writing to you today to express my opinion about the possible impact of the proposed rail line which would cut through several towns in our area. Of major concern is your proposal known as 'Alternative 1' which proposes the addition of a new rail segment between Old Saybrook Station and Kenyon, RI. This plan shifts the rail line northward of the current route and will run through several communities in Southeastern CT but it's potential impact on historic Old Lyme Village and the natural resources surrounding the area where the Connecticut River meets Long Island Sound is unthinkable.

The Lower Connecticut River Valley has been recognized by many state, national and international organizations as ecologically important and is considered to be one of the Western Hemisphere's forty "Last Great Places." It is one of our most important natural, recreational and scenic areas in the Northeast and many communities have not only worked hard to protect this natural resource but preserve their town's historical character. Old Lyme is a "jewel" In the Ct River Valley and this proposal will surely comprise the historical significance of this picture perfect community and the natural resources surrounding it.

I understand the importance of improving and expanding our railway systems but not at this expense. Careful planning is key to any good decision. I encourage you to visit our beautiful area and hope that you will see why this proposal must be stopped.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Peg Mitchel

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1033 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/12/2016

First Name : Alison

Last Name : Mitchell

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am 84 years old and a native of Old Lyme Connecticut. I am deeply distressed that the proposed Alternative 1 will virtually disect the town that is a gem of small town America. It has been a flourishing cultural community and has an impressive history since its establishment in the 1600s. It stands proudly guarding the mouth of the Connecticut River.

I find the lack of communication with town officials and citizenry appalling. Please do not destroy my faith in the democratic process. As I have said to my friends and neighbors I plan to fight this proposal in any way that I can. The plan is so poorly conceived that I cannot believe that anyone involved at NEC has ever stepped foot in our town. Please go back to the drawing board and put your glasses on. Thank you for listening.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #986 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/11/2016

First Name : Pamela

Last Name : Mitchell

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The destruction of Old Lyme, CT in favor of NEC's Alternative 1 is an abomination. I'm crying at the thought. Old Lyme has such history, grace, and beauty and is a glorious piece of the small-town America fabric. Please, please stop the madness!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1384 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : SANDRA

Last Name : MITCHELL

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I STRONGLY OPPOSE ALTERNATIVE I FOR THE NORTHEAST CORRIDOR. THE TOWN OF OLD LYME IS AN HISTORIC AND IMPORTANT TOWN KNOWN FOR ITS PLACE IN AMERICA'S ART HISTORY. IT ALSO HAS A FRAGILE ECOSYSTEM.

MR. MITCHELL: Hello. I'm Steven Mitchell. I'm kind of a complicated sort. I'm on the board of directors of the East Coast Greenway, and I'm a car dealer.

I rode my bicycle across country when I was 20. I went backwards through the windshield of a car when I was 32 years old. Being on the board for East Coast Greenway for the past six years, I got to see amazing cities, and multimodal is the way to go, it's the way of the future.

Just as a little preface to the Millennials here, we drove the other night to *Bikes vs. Cars*, the movie here in Hartford the other night, and we used a new Volvo hybrid, and we used zero gasoline. The electricity we used for that car came off of the solar panels on our Volvo showroom. So the Volvo was powered by the sun. Pretty cool stuff.

So in the essence of this, I also have done a walk of shame, I was explaining on the way in. I rode my bicycle from Baltimore to Washington, D.C., and I tried to take an Amtrak back from Washington back to BWI, and I was told to get off the train, because I had a bicycle on the train. And the train had already left the landing, and I had to walk about 400 yards back to the platform. That's unacceptable.

So for the future of America and again for many people in here, most people are here from the State of Connecticut, people are leaving the state. I think we all get that. And for us to attract young people, it's going to be difficult for Connecticut, because we're competing with Boston. My son, who went to San Francisco, is now in Boston. And that's why, the cities that have become bicycle friendly communities, it all comes together. And not to dis cars too bad. But it's a system that has to work. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER SIEGEL: Thank you. I see a hand.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #416 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/30/2016

First Name : Daniel

Last Name : Mittelman

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please recommend alternative 2 or 3. Alternative 1's cost and disruption are not justified by the relatively minor reduction in travel time.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1339 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Joyce

Last Name : Mletschnig

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Old Lyme is one of the last great places in Conn. And should not be turned into a rail corridor. Old Lyme is a historic art community as one of the birthplaces of American Impressionism and the Lyme Academy of Fine Arts would be destroyed. Don't do this to our town!

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1386 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/14/2016

First Name : Peter

Last Name : Mletschnig

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Please extend the public comment period for six months

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #232 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/22/2016

First Name : Bradley

Last Name : Mock

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I have a concern about the placement of the rail in Alterative Option 1 as it pertains to the path through Old Lyme.
The alternative 1 plan on Map Sheet 32 does not highlight any of the cultural significant locations within Old Lyme as noted here:
http://www.oldlyme-ct.gov/Pages/OldlymeCT_Selectmen/FRA_DraftMapCTRiver121515.pdf

The "purple line" appears drawn rather cavalierly through the heart of downtown.
I sincerely hope this drawing is a "rough draft" and not an actual plan as this would completely decimate the only commercial part of the entire town and runs right through the a college campus.

This rail provides nothing for the town of Old Lyme - there is no stop here. I strongly recommend that more care be taken in the placement of any new rail. I understand that communities will be affected, but please refrain from decimation.
Thank you.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1201 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/13/2016
First Name : Bernecia
Last Name : Moeller
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

The high speed express trains running through eastern Connecticut have already negatively impacted several communities, and damaged shoreline habitat vital to fish and fishing in Long Island Sound. To further damage our shoreline--and you must acknowledge it is damage, only justified as for the 'greater good'. This is not the first time that negative impact has been so justified, and no greater good achieved, so that argument holds no water.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1754 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mar

Last Name : Mogollon

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly recommend present rail lines through the CT shoreline be made rails-to-trails and new rail lines added along or between the present freeway I-95 for minimal environmental impact. This would be a very progressive move such as done in Chicago.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1753 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/15/2016

First Name : Mar

Last Name : Mogollon

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I strongly recommend present rail lines through the CT shoreline be made rails-to-trails and new rail lines added along or between the present freeway I-95 for minimal environmental impact. This would be a very progressive move such as done in Chicago.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #863 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/11/2016
First Name : Nancy
Last Name : Mol
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

As a home owner in Old Lyme, CT, I am greatly distressed and concerned about the welfare of our town. I am very much opposed to the Alternative 1 of the draft EIS for the NEC plan to improve rail service.

The Alternative 1 option would destroy our historical district and buildings, specifically The Florence Griswold Museum. Our town's Art cornerstones, Lyme Art Association and Lyme Art Academy of Fine Arts would also be decimated.

The environmental effects on Old Lyme would be devastating in terms of destroying wetlands, open space and areas of archeological importance. Neighborhoods would be destroyed along with our town library.

The real estate value of our property would be greatly impacted.

Please reconsider and not move toward this Alternative 1 option of this plan. I am strongly opposed to Alternative 1 and implore you to look into other solutions to improve rail service between large cities.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #205 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 1/20/2016

First Name : Andrew

Last Name : Moll

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am a frequent user of the NEC trains. I think only Alternative 1 or some variation of it should be considered. There is one bridge in Northern NJ that should be replaced, and the tunnels into NY Penn station should be upgraded/maintained, perhaps also the tunnels in Baltimore. Doing or requesting too much is going to get the entire project killed by Congress or local voters. Tell the public that this is a needed expense and people are probably more likely to approve.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #2458 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]

Record Date : 2/16/2016

First Name : Jessica

Last Name : Monagle

Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Dear Federal Rail Administration,

I oppose Alternative 1 of the Northeast Corridor Futures proposal because it will destroy the campus of Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts of the University of New Haven.

NEC DEIS Comments - RECORD #1497 DETAIL

Status : [redacted]
Record Date : 2/14/2016
First Name : Kimberly
Last Name : Monson
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Hello,
I am submitting this request for the NEC to change the plan to run a high speed train though historic Old Lyme CT. It's an irresponsible choice. Old Lyme is the home of American Impressionism, artistically and historically significant for those unaware (which this plan would suggest). Along the highway is the Lyme Art Association the oldest national art association and a celebrated fine arts college, The Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts that has been training artists traditionally for 40 years. Also along the highway, in the direct path of this bad plan, is the Florence Griswold Museum, Miss Floence house every major impressionist worth a damn when they came in to paint from NYC, Boston, and Philly. Many relocated or bought homes in Lyme or Old Lyme because of the painterly light unique to this area reminiscent of the south of France, UNIQUE. It may seem insignificant as art is not respected and beautiful places get overlooked. But this plan would destroy something very special, fragile and beautiful. This plan is irresponsible and needs to be re routed. Do the right thing.